

Proceedings

OF THE

House of Assembly

DURING THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

Twenty-seventh General Assembly

OF

Newfoundland

1931.

MANNING & RABBITS, Printers,
Prescott Street, St. John's, Newfoundland,
1931.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
**House of Assembly during the Third Session
of the Twenty-seventh General Assembly**

Begun and holden at St. John's, in the said Dominion on Wednesday the Eleventh Day of March, Anno Domini, Nineteen Hundred and Thirty-One being in the twenty-first 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 11th, 1931.

His Excellency the Governor, having fixed the hour at which he proposed to open the present Session of the Legislature at three o'clock in the afternoon of this Wednesday, the eleventh day of March, the Members of the House of Assembly met in the Assembly Rooms at a quarter to three 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 Legislative 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 the Governor 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:

SPEECH
of

**His Excellency Sir John Middleton,
Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire,
Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and Over the Colony of Newfoundland, at the opening of the Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh General Assembly of Newfoundland, begun and holden at St. John's, Wednesday, March 11, 1931.**

**Mr. President and Honorable Members
of the Legislative Council:**

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Honorable House of Assembly:

It gives me great pleasure to greet you at the opening of the Third Session of the present General Assembly.

In the early days of this year it was my sad duty, on behalf of my Ministers and the people of Newfoundland, to present most respectful and heartfelt sympathy to Their Majesties the King and Queen on the death of her late Royal Highness the Princess Royal. A gracious message of thanks was received from Their Majesties.

The effect of the world wide depression that exists was shown in the low price received in the market for our staple product. This fact, together with a small shortage in the catch, reduced the purchasing power of our people by a very considerable sum—one sufficiently large to affect appreciably the general business of the country. On the other hand the exportation of salmon, smelts, cod and other fish in cold storage has made marked progress. Attention to the cure of the salted codfish, standardization of quality when exported, and development of the cold storage method appear to be the points of

greatest value in dealing with our fishery products.

During the fiscal year which ended last June the exports of pulp and paper showed an increase of 32,000 tons, and an increased value of over \$1,000,000. For the same period, with the increased production at Buchans, there showed an increased export of 360,000 tons of minerals with an increased value of three and a quarter million dollars. For the last four fiscal years the total value of the exports exceeded that of the imports. In the fiscal year 1926-27 the excess of exports over imports was more than \$5,000,000; in the following fiscal year the excess was over \$6,000,000; in the next year it was over \$7,500,000, and in the year ending June, 1930, it was over \$8,000,000.

These figures show the progress that is being made in the development of the Colony's resources. Twenty years ago the fishery products constituted 90% of our exports, while in the last fiscal year the value of our fishery products did not amount to 50% of the value of our exports. While the loss to our people, through the stortage in the catch and the very low price received for our codfish in the markets, has been considerable, it is not felt in the same degree as would have been the case twenty years ago.

There has been some distress in the country, for which my Ministers have had to provide, but our people have been able to secure employment in connection with the various development schemes that are in progress, and, providing for the necessities of their families in this way, the expenditure by the Government of large sums in relief has been obviated to a great extent. The actual facts would seem to indicate that our people are not suffering as are many in other countries.

The co-operation of the Empire Marketing Board of London with the Government of this Colony, as arranged by my Prime Minister, having for its object an extended research in connection with our fishery problems, is actively continuing. We had the advantage last summer of the expert opinion of Dr. Harold Thompson, of the Fishery Board for Scotland, and under his advice and guidance steps are being taken that, in the course of time, will result in a greater knowledge of our fisheries and a more intelligent exploitation of the enormous values therein contained.

The re-railing of the line of railway has now been completed with heavier rails from St. John's to Port aux Basques, ensuring greater regularity and increased comfort in the operation of this Service. The erection of the Machine Shop at the Dry Dock is now proceeding, and the installation of up-to-date machinery will enable the Dry Dock to handle effectively the repairs of any disabled ships that visit this port. It is not anticipated that any further capital expenditure will be required by the Railway or the Dry Dock during the present year.

In the Autumn of last year my Prime Minister had the privilege of meeting the Ministers of the Homeland, and the Prime Ministers from the other Dominions at the Imperial Conference held in London. Constitutional and economic questions of grave importance affecting the whole Empire passed under review. The genius of the British race in Government is shown in their powers of adaptability to circumstances as they arise. The discussion of the intricate and often vexatious problems, the meeting of Ministers face to face around the Conference Board, and the more intimate realization of the difficulties confronting the respective

Dominions of this great Empire will tend to a larger sympathy between the component members of the Empire, and lay foundation stones upon which will be builded a greater and more lasting structure. It gives me pleasure to state that this Dominion was honoured when His Majesty the King appointed the Prime Minister as a Member of His Majesty's Privy Council.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Honorable House of Assembly:

I am pleased to be in a position to inform you that for the fiscal year ending last June the revenue exceeded the expenditure by a substantial sum. The figures in this connection will be laid before you in due course.

The estimates of expenditures and the Budget for the next fiscal year will be submitted to you. It is also proposed to submit a Loan Bill providing for the liquidation of the English War Loan, and for certain capital expenditures of the Public Service.

Mr. President and Honorable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Honorable House of Assembly:

In common with the other parts of the Empire it is proposed to take a Census of the people of this Dominion in the latter part of the present year. Preparation is now being made for this work, and an amount to meet the expenses that will be incurred in this connection during next fiscal year, has been placed in the Estimates.

In opening the Session of last year, I informed you that claim had been made upon my Ministers for the payment of interest under the guarantee as set forth in the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited Acts of 1925 and

1926. I regret now to inform you that the said Hotel Facilities Limited is in course of liquidation, a Receiver has been appointed, and under the above quoted Acts my Ministers are responsible for the payment of the principal and interest in respect of the Bonds which were guaranteed. Provision to meet this liability was made in the Loan Act of last year. My Ministers have made every effort possible to prevent collapse of this enterprise, and they will continue to safeguard to the utmost the interests of this Colony in respect of this Hotel undertaking.

In view of the recognition at the recent Imperial Conference of the status of Newfoundland as a self-governing Dominion within the British Empire, and in view of the fact that it will in future be necessary for Newfoundland Government Vessels and the Newfoundland Mercantile Marine to wear at sea colours recognized by law and distinct from those of the United Kingdom and of the other Dominions, my Ministers will place before you a Bill for giving statutory recognition for these purposes to the accustomed flags worn by British ships of these classes with the addition of the historic distinguishing badge of Newfoundland. The flags with this badge, worn in the past under Admiralty warrant by our ships as part of the general shipping of the British Empire, will hereafter be worn by virtue of our own Statute as the flags of the distinct Official and Mercantile Marine of Newfoundland.

One of the outstanding needs of the Dominion for many years past has been a properly organized system for the care of Public Health and for the administration of the Public Charities and Charitable Institutions, and the establishment of such a system cannot but have the effect of increasing the efficiency of the public service in these

respects, while ensuring a greater degree of co-ordination and economy than has hitherto been obtained. There will, therefore, be placed before you a Bill, which has been drafted with the assistance of competent professional opinion, both legal and medical.

My Ministers have long had under consideration the necessity of Legislation to protect the people of the Dominion in respect to the sale of bonds and securities of fraudulent or doubtful character, and the necessity for this has been sharply emphasized by some of the unfortunate events, both in this and other countries, during the past two years. There has, therefore, been drafted a Bill, following the lines of the legislation lately introduced, or in process of introduction, in the various Provinces of the neighbouring Dominion of Canada, which Bill it is hoped will go far to ensure that our people shall have the necessary protection in these respects.

During the past six years there has been adopted throughout the Provinces of Canada, with the exception of Quebec, an Act known as the Uniform Life Insurance Act, for rendering uniform the law in relation to Life Insurance throughout that country. The greater part of the life insurance business in this Dominion is carried on by Canadian Companies, whose policies and other documents are drawn up having in view the Uniform Act. There will be placed before you a Bill bringing our law in relation to life insurance into uniformity with that of the Provinces of our sister Dominion.

My Ministers propose to submit for your information the text of a proposal made by Mr. Alan S. Butler to the Government in relation to the Gander timber areas and water powers.

I feel sure that you will give to all measures submitted to you that earn-

est thought that will result in beneficial legislation, and I trust the Almighty may guide your counsels for the promotion of the best interests of the Country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the regular business, I would ask your permission and the permission of the members of this Chamber to call your attention to the passing, since we last met, of the Hon. John Anderson and the Hon S. K. Bell, two senior and distinguished leaders of the Legislative Council.

Hon. John Anderson came to Newfoundland over half a century ago from Scotland; he came to us for service in that outstanding Baird firm of Water Street, one of the leading commercial houses which has carried on the commerce of this country so successfully now for a century or more. He was later actively identified with mercantile work himself until the name Anderson became almost a household word. In later life he gave considerable active effort to Municipal affairs and was identified with the Co-operative Building Plan so that we still have, and for many years will have, the Anderson Range of houses in connection with that activity. But it is not in connection with these activities alone that the name of the Hon. John Anderson will be remembered.

As far back as 1909 he was identified with promoters in England of the Daylight Savings Bill and it was in 1917 that he successfully introduced the law into this country. The name Anderson has been in honor in Newfoundland through his family as well—his boys—the senior is one of the outstanding dramatic critics of the world I should say, and his son, Mr. Hugh Anderson jr., who has recently

produced a successful play on Broadway of New York, and has brought credit, not only to the family, but to the whole country because of his intellectual and artistic ability.

I would move, Sir, that this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the passing, since the last session of the Legislature, of the Hon. John Anderson, Member of the Legislative Council and some time Member of the House of Assembly.

Permit me to call attention, Sir, to the passing of the Hon. S. K. Bell. Identified, as he was, in the early days with the construction of the original dry dock, he did a job there which we all remember had to be blown out by dynamite when construction was re-undertaken a few years ago. He was a man of substance in work, solidity in character, of enduring reputation, good sense, commercial ability and ship-building acumen. In this country he was regarded as an authority in connection with matters appertaining to ships. Not only did he do good work, but in the early days a steamship badly disabled came into this port for repairs, Mr. Bell repaired this ship, working under difficulties. When the job of repairing was completed the ship went back to England and was examined by expert marine engineers. The owners put the steamship as repaired on exhibition as an illustration of the outstanding ability of Newfoundland workmen and marine engineers to carry out successfully a repair job. It is such men as Anderson and Bell, such families as they have been identified with that succeeds in making Newfoundland strong and great in philanthropy and industries.

I consequently ask leave to move a similar resolution that this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death since the

last session of the Legislature of the Hon. S. K. Bell.

Before I take my seat I would like to refer to the passing of Mr. J. J. St. John, a gentleman well known to the community. There is successful commercial enterprise behind that name. For many years he was associated with this Chamber as representative for the district of Harbor Main. His two parliamentary associates, Mr. Judge Morris of the Central District Court and Mr. W. W. Woodford survive him, though not recently with him associated with political and public life in this community. His years of active association with public life have given him a record which is well worth us to informally remember here this afternoon.

Those of us who are the older members, who for nearly 25 years have been actively identified with public life remember with very great honor and esteem the name of John J. St. John. To his son, The Rev Fr. St. John and the other members of his family we would particularly convey our regrets.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, Hon. John Anderson was an exceptional man in many instances. He was enthusiastic, keen about everything he undertook. He was an exemplary citizen. He gave unsparingly of his time and talents. He has left something behind him that will bear his memory for a time, so far as we can say, humanly speaking, as long as the world will last. He brought in, through his persistency, the Daylight Saving Regulation, after ten years. He was identified with Mr. Willett of London with this movement. Mr. Willett was the promoter of the movement in England. Mr. Anderson will be coupled with the Daylight Savings Regulation of Newfoundland. He was

Mayor of the City for a term of years. He represented St. John's West in this House for a full term. As the Prime Minister has just stated, he was associated, in fact, he was the prime mover of the erection of the workmen's cottages, and it is an unfortunate thing that they were not the financial success they might have been. He has left two distinguished sons who are carrying on the name and reflecting credit on Newfoundland.

In the case of Mr. Bell. He was born at Grand Bank in 1853. In his early days he was associated with the shipbuilding industry, he became one of our most outstanding shipwrights, he has done some very fine work, and, as the Prime Minister has already said, he was looked upon as an authority in this industry. His was a retiring disposition, nevertheless, he did his duty as he saw it and served his country well as a member of the Legislative Council. In later years, unfortunately, he suffered from a very painful ailment, but he bore his sufferings with christian resignation and great fortitude. I had an opportunity of seeing him a short time before his death and I was struck very forcibly how he stood up against the intense agony he was going through. I desire also on behalf of the Opposition and myself to associate myself with the expressions of the Hon. the Prime Minister in relation to the late Mr. J. J. St. John. He too was another very worthy and useful citizen. At one time he took a keen interest in active politics; but of later years he devoted his activities to his commercial business. He was another of that type of men who carried on his business without any great show, but did it successfully and well. I desire to say, Sir, that the relatives of those three gentlemen have our very great

sympathy in the losses they have sustained.

On motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the following Resolutions were passed unanimously:

RESOLVED: That this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death, since the last session of the Legislature of the Hon. John Anderson, member of the Legislative Council and some time member of the House of Assembly.

RESOLVED: That this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death, since the last session of the Legislature of the Hon. Samuel K. Bell, member of the Legislative Council.

MR. BINDON—Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to move that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne so graciously delivered by His Excellency the Governor at the opening of this Legislature, and which I am sure will be received not only by this House, but by the country generally, with sincerest respect.

I will crave your permission to first deal briefly with a few happenings since the closing of the Legislature last year. We, as loyal British subjects, were grieved to learn of the loss the Royal Family sustained in the death of H.R.H. the Princess Royal. His Excellency the Governor cabled Their Majesties the heartfelt sympathy of His Ministers and people, to which Their Majesties graciously replied.

A well-known personage and Member of the Legislative Council, the late Hon. John Anderson, has since our last meeting passed away. Mr. Anderson was well and favorably known throughout the length and

breadth of our country. For years he carried on an extensive business on Water Street. He was a man of sterling worth and always and ever gave of his best in the interests and for the welfare of his adopted country, and I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of the membership of this House when I say that we greatly regret his passing and renew again our sympathy to his relatives and numerous friends.

In the New Year's honors list Newfoundland was not overlooked, and three of our esteemed citizens were included in the list of honors. Sir Tasker Cook, who has filled with credit the high position of Mayor of our City and has also acted in the capacity of Premier, was created a Knight Bachelor. Inspector General Hutchings, head of our police and fire department, was made a Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, and the cause of education was also recognized when Dr. V. P. Burke, Secretary of Education, received the O.B.E. To all three I take this opportunity of expressing my congratulations and I trust they will be spared us many years to carry on their good work and enjoy the honors bestowed upon them.

I would like to offer my sincere and hearty congratulations to the Prime Minister, Sir Richard Squires, on the signal honor bestowed upon him recently by His Most Gracious Majesty the King, in making him a member of the Privy Council. This honor, sir, is one of outstanding merit and a well-deserved recognition. The average public man is at all times open to the severest kind of criticisms, and this is especially true of a Prime Minister, and in a country such as ours where political views are rather narrow, abilities of an outstanding man are very often dwarfed by opposing

factions, especially if that man is to the manor born. It is our just pride then that the Newfoundland who represented England's Oldest Colony, or Newest Dominion, call it what you will, to say the least measured up to the tallest.

I am sure, sir, the country will read with pleasure the statement that our exports of Paper and Pulp show a very substantial increase over the figures for the previous year. The increase for 1929-30 is in the vicinity of 32,000 tons. This represents an additional value of one million dollars. I may be permitted to remark here that this industry is due to the foresight and wisdom of previous Liberal administrations. Grand Falls came into existence under the government of the late Sir Robert Bond, and the very extensive operations now being carried on at Corner Brook are the result of the efforts of our present Prime Minister, Sir Richard A Squires. He, too, like his illustrious predecessor, was opposed in his efforts to foster the paper and pulp industry in this country. Both Corner Brook and Grand Falls have been of incalculable value to Newfoundland during the past few years, when, were it not for the splendid avenue of employment afforded our people, the depression felt the wide world over would have been brought home to us more forcibly than it has been.

It is equally pleasing to note that the output from Buchans has also increased some 360,000 tons with an additional value of three and a quarter million of dollars. These industries are of material help to the country, and whilst occupying a prominent part in our economic life will not, in my opinion, ever eclipse the fisheries, which have made Newfoundland internationally known.

I notice in the Speech from the Throne that the fisheries today represent about fifty per cent of our exports. This is indeed a change from former years when the fishery comprised the major portion of our entire exports. Altho the actual value is down in dollars and cents the majority of our manhood is interested and will continue to be interested for all time. Our people should be encouraged to prosecute the fishery to its fullest, as under normal conditions the returns give satisfactory results for the length of time and effort devoted to its prosecution. Due to the special efforts of Sir Richard Squires a little over a year ago, a new stimulus is being given our fisheries by the association with this country of the British Empire Marketing Board. Sir Richard in this case displays again that vision and foresight for which he is noted, and today as we open this Third Session of the 27th General Assembly of Newfoundland, we are assured of scientific research in all branches of our fisheries.

The immediate results, of course, will not be apparent for some time, but there can be no question that as an ultimate result of Sir Richard's efforts our whole problem of fishing, both the catching, curing, and marketing, will be immensely improved and enable us to make a successful competition with other countries which of late have been getting the edge of the wedge into the markets formerly held almost exclusively by Newfoundland.

Another good measure, Mr. Speaker, is outlined in the Speech from the Throne. I refer, sir, to the proposed legislation dealing with the selling of stocks and bonds in this country by irresponsible Canadian and American brokers. It would be illuminating to know, Sir, just what amount of ready cash has been filched from local in-

vestors during the past ten or fifteen years. Brokers have come in here and sold worthless stocks. Gambling in mines, either gold or silver, is always of interest to people generally, but it is indeed time that Newfoundland legislated against this practice.

I venture to assert that within the past twenty years millions of dollars have been taken from our people by foreign brokers who disposed of mines and lands and other speculative investments which for the most part were positively worthless, and in fact it may not be uncharitable to say, really never existed. The surprising part of it is that shrewd business men have been victimized by these outside sharpers who have made Newfoundland a special hunting ground.

It is, therefore, but right and proper that such legislation be introduced as will put a stop to this sort of trade, and thereby protect the country against the loss of large sums of money annually. The money thus spent would be far more profitably employed in extending local industry or in developing some of the newer exports, such as the blueberry trade or frozen fish.

In common with the rest of the world, Newfoundland is suffering from commercial depression, and this depression is the aftermath of the great war. For three or four years during the war and for nine or ten years after the world was doing business on a rising commodity market; money was never more plentiful, the purchasing power of the people had greatly increased and wages became very high and business generally was going at very high pressure, so much so that any ordinary intelligent man must have known that such conditions could not go on indefinitely. The high standard of living exhausted the earn-

ings of the people generally, and production became more pronounced and it reached a stage where much more was being produced than could be sold at a profit, and the structure toppled over, with the result that panic reigned supreme, foodstuffs and merchandise of every description was thrown on the market at a loss. Manufacturers began at once to curtail and millions of workmen all over the world were thrown out of employment.

The effect that this state of affairs will have on our revenue will be on account of the lower value of our fishery and the shortening of wages and the throwing out of employment of numerous men in our industrial plants has for the time being decreased the purchasing power of our people. We cannot purchase as much in dollars and cents as we did in former years and the natural result is that the revenue is bound to be short. But that is nothing extraordinary. All the Provinces of Canada, with the possible exception of Quebec, will be short in revenue this year, and the great Dominion of Australia is financially hard-strapped. Even the Mother Country will show a large deficit this year. There is no need for me to enumerate further. The whole world is faced with a like set of circumstances and we had to fall in line, although we are usually the last to be hit and the first to recover.

We are, however, unfortunate in this country, in as much as the hardest knockers that Newfoundland has are Newfoundlanders. Our views and ideas are so narrow that just as soon as we meet with any little setback our press begins at once to preach blue ruin to the people. Whether this is done from personal animosity or political spleen I know not, but I do know if it continues in the future as it has in the past, the day may come when

it will have a seriously damaging effect on our credit abroad.

This falling off in revenue has its compensating advantages and our people generally will be in a better position, in as much as the purchasing power of their dollar will have greatly increased. For instance, flour is three or four dollars a barrel cheaper than last year. Pork and beef have gone down in price eight or nine dollars a barrel. Provisions and groceries generally have declined in price, and with clothing and merchandise there is a substantial reduction all round.

I fully realise that we are living in an industrial age and Newfoundland, like our neighbors to the West, is slowly but surely becoming industrialized, and it appears in the course of time (but in a very long time, in my estimation) the Newfoundland fisheries will not bulk as largely as formerly it has as our chief national asset. But this it not likely to occur in our time.

The fishery is the greatest national asset we have, and is to us what wheat is to Canada; its chief source of income. It is a necessary of life, a product that can always be disposed of, and is in general demand, but we must never forget that the consumer wants a good article and it is up to us to give it to him. We are about the only people in the world that seem to think that the consumers must take what we give them and not what they want. I have seen this delicacy—because fish is a delicate food—handled as would be a cargo of white-ends, and some exporters are the greatest sinners in this respect. I have heard of fish reaching the markets in such a condition that part of it had to be shovelled over the side of the vessel, carted away and destroyed.

The average buyer and seller has only his only interests at heart and buys and sells to make a profit. This is alright in certain ways and is only natural to expect, but with the fishery where seven-eights of our people are not only interested but dependent, he should not be allowed to ship to market fish not up to the standard and graded as the particular market desires, because it is of national importance.

A cargo of fish may be shipped to Spain; some particular agent or exporter may get a rush order for a cargo while the market is good, and he rushes off that cargo and probably was not too particular as to the quality of the fish. It reaches the market and he realises a good profit, and if it turns out well it is not only a benefit to him but to the country as well. But, on the other hand, after that fish reaches the retail merchant and from him to the consumer, and turns out inferior or bad, it is not only not a benefit but an absolute menace to the country and it is in cases such as I have just quoted that standardization is absolutely necessary.

I need only cite for you the great packing houses of the U.S.A. that are making huge fortunes and from small beginnings, and if we look back on the early days of those houses we will find that the promoters or managers were nothing more nor less than ordinary butchers, but they had insight enough to call in expert advice and acted upon it, had their products standardized, sent agents broadcast over the world with neat and dainty samples of their goods seeking new markets and finding out what way the different buyers would want it put up and endeavored to please them in every way, with the result that they are an everlasting benefit to their country.

Now, sir, I ask you how many agents have we abroad today with samples of our products seeking new markets and finding out what way we could pack them to suit the would-be purchaser. The answer is obvious. The greater part of our catch is subject to the few buyers in Brazil. We ship them the fish in the same old way and when the markets there are good we reap the benefit, but if like last year the market is poor, we get a knockout blow. In other words, we depend largely upon Brazil for our livelihood, with the whole of South America barely scratched, with Argentine and Mexico, with its forty or fifty millions of people untouched, and their inhabitants are practically the same nationality as Brazil—Spaniards and Portugese—and it is not at all unreasonable to believe that they eat the same kind of food. I fear, sir, we are not to be complimented on our aggressiveness in this respect.

With one or two exceptions where smelts, salmon and codfish are being exported in cold storage marked progress is being made, and the promoters or exporters are to be highly complimented for their activity and general business acumen, and I trust, sir, that their venture will pay them far better than they ever anticipated. But with these exceptions we are catching, curing and marketing our fish in the same old way that our forefathers did, despite the fact that we are living in a technical age and need technical men to handle our products, to advise us as to the habits of the fish, to advise fishermen as to the curing of their fish. There should be some sort of standardization between buyer and seller here and elsewhere. There should be a bureau of information for our merchants. People, politicians and men not interested may talk and shout all they like but the fact remains that some sort of stand-

ardization or regulation is absolutely necessary for the greatest asset that Newfoundland has—the fishery.

So much for standardization. Now let us look back the past twenty or thirty years and see what has been done in this country to protect and encourage the fisheries. I am afraid, very little. Last year our fishermen were faced with a very great hardship by the scarcity of bait, and we had the finest fishermen the world can produce lying on their oars practically the whole summer waiting for the bait that never came. It was so distressing to them that numbers of them chucked the fishery and sought any kind of employment they could secure. I trust we will never experience anything like that again, and I feel we will not. Already, I understand, several bait depots are being started in several places, and the Government is aiding and encouraging the promoters in every way possible.

Some years ago, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Australia were suffering greatly by destruction to their crops by rabbits, and the government placed a bounty on the head of a rabbit, with the result that bunny had to go and the crops were saved the farmers. Not very long ago the salmon fishers of the Pacific coast were seriously handicapped by the havoc the seals were doing to the salmon, and huge sums were voted for the killing of the seals, and even machine guns were brought to bear on them, and the salmon fishery was saved.

About twelve or thirteen years ago dogfish came in small quantities to our waters, and did we then try and find out the meaning of their coming, if they were to be a benefit or menacc to our codfishery? No; we looked upon them as curious and would walk a mile to see one. Each suc-

ceeding year they came in greater numbers, until today they are the greatest curse and the greatest menace that ever came near the shores of Newfoundland, and still nothing has been done. These brutes are fast breaking the spirit of the shore fishermen. We can only imagine and never describe the hardships our fishermen suffer from them. Is there anything more heartbreaking than for fishermen to go to their traps, nets or trawls and to find them not only filled with dogfish but their fishing gear put out of commission, for they actually eat the twine.

Now, sir, I have no doubt that a great many people will laugh at me for what I am going to say, but I will hold to my opinions till someone can convince me to the contrary. I believe that the dogfish can be greatly lessened, if not exterminated. They are not a spawning fish, therefore they can be destroyed, and if something is not soon done I make bold to say that our shore fishery will soon be a thing of the past.

I believe if a bounty, which would need only to be very small, were paid the fishermen for the catching of them it would have the desired effect. In fact a bounty would serve a threefold mission, inasmuch as it would in the first place kill off this menace, it would be the means of keeping our men at the fishery, because when the dogfish appear in great numbers the men get disheartened and leave the fishery to work on the roads only to find that at the end of the summer they are as bad off as when they started; it would encourage the merchant to supply the shore fishermen because their time would not be lost and if prevented from catching the codfish they would at least make a day's pay with the dogfish which would be a great help in paying their supply bill. I

make bold to say, sir, that if a sum of money could be voted for the killing of dogfish it would be the best way possible for money to be spent in this country.

Just at this time, Mr. Speaker, a great many of our hardy toilers are tramping the frozen pans prosecuting the sealfishery—an important branch of our fisheries—and I am sure I can take the liberty of speaking on behalf of every member on both sides of the House when I say that we wish them the best of health, bumper trips, Godspeed and a safe return.

I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an address in reply to His Excellency's most gracious Speech from the Throne.

MR. STRONG—Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure I rise to second the motion made by my friend the Hon. member for St. Mary's who has so ably proposed an Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's most gracious Speech.

Reference has been made to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that His Excellency on behalf of his Ministers and people of Newfoundland presented our respectful and heartfelt sympathy to their Majesties on the death of Her Royal Highness the Princess Royal, which was acknowledged by their Majesties in a message of thanks.

The people of this country, sir, are second to none in their love, loyalty and devotion to the persons of their Majesties, and in the loss that they have sustained we, in common with loyal subjects throughout the Empire, feel that touch of sympathy which, though felt by high or low, rich or poor, makes the whole world akin.

Since we last met in session here the Imperial Economic Conference has met in London, which, altho criticised in some quarters as not having accomplished all that could be desired, on the other hand is in itself an evidence of the new spirit of the times, an evidence of a recognition of the fact that economic and other problems with which our great commonwealth of nations is faced today can best be solved by a free and frank discussion of those problems by representatives of the various dominions within the Empire; and while it would be too much to expect that all that could have been desired by the participants in the Conference, could have been achieved in one session, it is most certainly fraught with great possibilities for the interest and welfare of the peoples of the countries represented.

Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, was fortunate in being represented at that Conference by the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Squires, and at this time, sir, I would like to avail myself of the opportunity presented here of congratulating him on the distinguished honor conferred on him personally, and through him on this Dominion, by his having been appointed a member of His Majesty's Privy Council.

Before passing on to further comment on various matters mentioned in His Excellency's speech, I would also like to join with the hon. member for St. Mary's in congratulations to the three distinguished gentlemen who have but recently been the recipients of honors conferred on them by His Most Gracious Majesty the King. I refer, Sir, to Sir Tasker Cook, who was created a Knight Bachelor, Mr. C. H. Hutchings, who was made a Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, and Dr. V. P. Burke, who was elevated

from the rank of M.B.E. to that of O.B.E. All three are gentlemen of whom Newfoundland may well be proud, who undoubtedly merit the special recognition conferred on them.

We meet here today, Mr. Speaker, under an existing condition of world affairs which from the standpoint of its magnitude at least, is unparalleled in history. Millions of our fellow-men in all parts of the world are haunted by the grim spectre of unemployment with its accompanying sequence of hunger, misery and degradation.

Does life present any more tragic figure than that of a man, with his inherent God-given powers, trained for a task, skilled in the execution of the work demanded by his particular vocation, anxious to feel the tug on muscle and bone in the performance of constructive work, wife and children dependent on him for the necessities of life, and the world saying to countless thousands of such men: You are not wanted. Death itself presents not nearly as great a tragedy as the situation I have outlined.

We are living under the dominance of a great and ruthless economic system the motto of which appears to be: Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost; an economic system so sensitive that the cutting of wood in a forest in Russia affects the earning power of a Newfoundland woodsman; so sensitive that a deficit in the exchequer of a foreign government, or a revolution in a foreign state, may mean the difference in price of a dollar on a quintal of fish to a Newfoundland fisherman. An economic system full of alarming inconsistencies: witness machines which remove tremendous burdens of toil from the shoulders of men and at the same time by throwing them out of employment make it impossible for them to purchase the products turned

out by machinery; an economic system full of absurd paradoxes, witness talk of overproduction in various lines, when thousands of people are starving and clamoring for those things we claim have been over-produced.

This great economic system of the world stands on trial today before the bar of public opinion as never before, and millions of people who have never raised a question regarding it are asking themselves if such a system, with its roots deeply buried in self-interest, may not well be so reconstructed or transformed that it shall work in closer harmony with the thought expressed by that great poet who dreamed of that time when each shall find his own in all men's good, and all men live in noble brotherhood; so transformed that it shall be more in accord with the spirit of brotherhood envisioned by the inspired prophets who foretold a day when men should throw their silver and gold in the streets, realizing that a man's life is of more value than silver or gold.

A greater amount of intelligent thought is, as a consequence of the growing feeling of kindness, abroad in the world today, being directed towards the mitigation and ultimate elimination of the evils inherent in the economic system of the world, and is one of the bright spots in a somewhat dark picture .

I trust you will pardon me, Sir, for this somewhat lengthy digression, and I will proceed:

Our own country, in common with the rest of the world, has during the past year suffered from the effects of the world-wide industrial depression, and with a decline in prices, in many cases below the actual cost of production, more especially in the case

of food stuffs, our fishermen received last year such low prices for the product of their toil that in great numbers of cases they were without the means to provide for themselves and families during the winter, and in too many cases could not even pay their summer's accounts. To aggravate a situation already grave on account of low prices in our markets, we experienced last year a period of hot sultry weather which resulted in thousands of quintals of fish being sunburnt and for which the producers did not receive sufficient returns to pay them for catching and curing it, and the fish that in ordinary seasons constituted the greater part of our No. 1 article, turned out to be of very inferior quality.

Here I would like to make a few remarks, Sir, regarding the necessity for everyone interested in our staple product to concentrate on curing and exporting the very best article it is possible to turn out. **We can always sell good fish,** and often when foreign warehouses are carrying large stocks of inferior quality, which even we ourselves would not eat, the demand would be ample to allow of its sale at a profit if the quality were only up to the standard required.

We are pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that although our fishery has not yielded the returns that we could so ardently wish, in other important enterprises the facts are most encouraging.

The export of pulp and paper shows an increased volume of 32,000 tons, as compared with the previous year, with a consequent increased value of one million dollars.

The exports from Buchans Mine also shows an increase of 360,000 tons with a corresponding increased value of three and a quarter million dollars.

In these particular instances, as well as in the fact that we have a favorable trade balance for the year of over 6 million dollars, we have great reason to be thankful.

Only about 20 years ago ninety per cent of our exports were composed of fishery products, and it is quite evident to all that in that period we have made great strides along the way of industrial development.

The erection of an up-to-date machine shop and equipment in the west end of the city will, in co-operation with the dry dock, result, we feel assured, in greater efficiency and earning power for both, as well as producing very necessary employment for many men at a period when it is urgently necessary.

I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that all will be pleased to learn that the re-railing of the railway has been completed and that it is not anticipated that any capital expenditure on account of our railway will be necessary during the coming year. One has only to travel a short distance over the road today to realize the immense improvement which has been brought about in recent years, both in regard to road bed and rolling stock. It only seems a few years ago since a trip by rail in this country was a case of "off again, on again," while today such a revolutionary change has been brought about that this great public utility compares favorably from the standpoint of comfort and service with the great railways of Canada and the United States.

Leaving other points mentioned to come to our fisheries again for a brief moment. It is most gratifying to learn of the co-operation of the British Empire Marketing Board with our government, in the formation of a fisheries research commission for the

purpose of placing our fisheries on a scientific basis.

The latest scientific knowledge of their fisheries has been available for years past to the fishermen of France, England, Scotland and Norway and other countries, while we, primarily a fishing country have been content to pursue the same old methods followed by the early pioneers in our fishing industry, which while good enough in their day need the additional light which scientific research can bring to bear on our problems, and which may bring a new era of prosperity to the great industry on which so many of our people depend.

Through the interest of the Prime Minister in enlisting the co-operation of the Empire Marketing Board to the extent of financing the undertaking in the sum of \$25,000 per year for five years, with a like sum to be provided by our own government, the country will undoubtedly reap benefits of inestimable value.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sincere conviction that although as a result of a world-wide depression, we are passing through troublesome times, our position is very much better than that of many of our neighbors, and with our acknowledged quick recovery in the past from the effects of various financial reverses, we shall by the energy and persistence in the face of obstacles displayed by Newfoundlanders all the world over, soon be again on the high-road to prosperity.

I have pleasure, sir, in seconding the motion now before the House for the appointment of a committee to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's most gracious speech with which he has opened this session of the Legislature.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I desire most heartily to congratulate the Hon. Mover and the Hon. Seconder of the motion that a Select Committee be appointed to draft the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The Hon. Member for St. Mary's showed us that he has given very diligent study to the preparation of his speech, and it is extremely creditable to him. The Hon. member for White Bay was quite interesting too. He took rather another line, more of general economics, but in my opinion these two speeches are outstanding insofar as speakers for the movement for a Committee to be appointed to draft and Address in Reply. They are more fortunate than I am; they have had an opportunity of reading the Speech through, of studying every line and every word. You know the procedure, Mr. Speaker. We are called here from this House to attend at the Bay of another House. We listen to a Speech; we hear it more or less distinctly from the lips of His Excellency, and we come down here again, and, to use your own words, for the purpose of greater accuracy, have it read over again. After it is read we are handed a copy of the Speech; our manners prevent us from reading that Speech when Hon. members are speaking. Consequently one had very little time or very little opportunity to analyse the Speech. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be no more than an act of courtesy and following out the traditions in other Houses of Parliament all over the Empire that the Leader of the Opposition might be handed or put in possession of a copy of the Speech, say, one hour before the opening of the House.

After all, why should it not be so? Are we not here for the common good? We profess we are. Surely the Govern-

ment are anxious, hoping for, looking for honest criticism, and the only way we can criticise fairly and honestly is by being given ample notice and the opportunity of ascertaining the facts, so that I say it is rather difficult for me to criticise as intelligently as I am able until one gets a chance to study the Speech. There is one other matter and that is the date this House is met. The prorogation was to the 18th of March, with the indication that there would be a further prorogation. The Government for some very grave reason, for one, of which I am quite sure that the Hon. Leader of the Government will inform us on the first opportunity, brought forward the date to to-day. It disconcerted a good many men. They were fully of the opinion that this House would not meet before the last week of the month or the first week of April, consequently they will feel that they may appear remiss in their duties towards the country by not being here when the Legislative Council is in session.

Coming to the Speech, one does not like to criticise it harshly, but it is a very long Speech, and it seems to me that the compiler of this Speech said "I can't give them much in quality, but I will give them lots in quantity." It does not seem to me that there is much in this Speech that calls for constructive thought. One can't see very much of a ray of hope in any part. In the second last paragraph is the only line that gives us hope that there is something coming. I was surprised to see that after the great hurrah made about the standardization of fish; what a panacea it was going to be for the country; how it was going to make every fisherman happy, comfortable and content, I am surprised to see it relegated into the centre of a paragraph. I don't know much about the standardization of

fish. I will give it some thought when the time comes. I understand the Bill will reach the House before the close; it will be time enough then to discuss it. It is impossible for the Government to run a fishing industry; all it can do is to place scientific facts before the people, but it can enact laws and see that they are enforced; the most of that industry is from the fisherman to the merchants who are going to make that industry a success. If I were asked to put in three words the three things most essential to the prosperity of the fishery, I should say Rationalization, Standardization and Centralization. If these three things could be put into operation, it would go a long way towards solving our fishery problems.

I would like to be able to think like the Hon. gentleman who wrote this Speech from the Throne that distress is not prevalent in our midst. Now this Speech must have been written many months ago, because we all know that poverty and destitution is stalking throughout the land and poor relief is being given out all over the country. For example, a member of the Government party told me that not for thirty years has there been such call for poor relief as there has been for the past year. Then why should the Government be afraid to admit that there has been and is at the present time destitution and distress prevailing in the country. Is it because of the outrageous promises made by the Government in the Fall of 1928 and which promises brought the present Government into power. Then the people were told that milk and honey would flow throughout the land and that they would never see another poor day, and now the Government and the members thereof are afraid to admit that there is any depression existing. Why, we hear it from every

district that bad times are obtaining. Even at Corner Brook, the Prime Minister's own constituency, which is supposed to be a hive of industry, we are informed of depression and hard times existing and relief is being given out there. I think the Government is afraid to admit this fact, and, consequently, I think it is a confession of weakness and a confession of failure on the part of the Government.

I notice in the Speech from the Throne that the rerailing of the railway line from St. John's to Port aux Basques has been completed. No doubt this will be very beneficial and I hope it will mean a great saving in the operation of the road and that gradually we will be able to bring down the cost of operating the railway to one-half of what it costs today. It is also gratifying to hear that there will be no necessity for any further expenditure on capital account in connection with the railway, after the completion of the new Machine Shop at the Dry Dock. Of course, last year there was a large expenditure on capital account for the railway and I suppose that accounts for the anticipated reduction this year. Regarding the erection of the new machine shops, I am in entire accord. There is no use having an up-to-date Dry Dock if our machine shops do not give accurate workmanship, and I hope that when our new machine shops are finished and in proper working order we will be able to give a good substantial job, that there will be no more repairs of a temporary character done to ships calling here and that all repair work will be of a permanent nature.

Another paragraph in the Speech from the Throne deals with the Imperial Conference held in London last year. This is very interesting and I am in hopes that later on the Prime

Minister will give more details in connection with the business transacted by the Prime Ministers of the different Dominions of the Empire. I believe that the getting together of the different Prime Ministers around the table is the proper way to do business.

We were told this afternoon by the member for St. Mary's that the revenue for this year will be short and he comforted himself with the thought that that was brought about because we collected most of our duty on an ad valorem basis. I think it is very discomforting, because even if you buy goods which have reduced in price, you must have the money to buy them. The great trouble is the great scarcity of ready money among our people. What is needed is increased purchasing power in the country, but that is not in sight and so we are to go on borrowing more money. I understand that the loan to be retired is for two million dollars borrowed during the war. I am afraid the Government are not taking all the steps they might to reduce the necessity of this borrowing of money and it is time we stopped this borrowing. There is no attempt being made by the present Government to economize, but rather is there every indication to keep on borrowing. It is like a man borrowing to pay the interest on the money he owes.

The Speech from the Throne also tells us that the Census will be taken this year. That is interesting, but it is regrettable in the sense that our population is increasing so slowly and that is accounted for by the number of our young men and women who are leaving the country because they are able to get better conditions than they are able to get at home. I think that is also a problem that should be tackled. I would like to see an effort made to make life more

livable in the outports. I do not blame the younger folks for leaving the outports where there is nothing to occupy their spare time and I believe that some pleasures such as radios, movies, etc., should be provided.

I am pleased indeed to learn that the Government are continuing to operate the Newfoundland Hotel. I do not think we could very well get along without it now and I think it is now really a public utility. I am glad to say too that under the new management good progress has been made towards getting people to stay there.

With regard to the Public Health Bill mentioned in the Speech, I think this is a necessity and we should have had it enacted into law last year when the Bill was introduced here. I congratulate the gentleman who went to such trouble in having the Bill drafted and I can assure him that we, on this side of the House, will use our best endeavours to get the Bill through and make it workable and beneficial to the country at large.

Respecting the Securities Bill, I think, Sir, this Bill should have been in operation here years ago, as too often have our people been fleeced by investing their money in oil wells and other wild cat schemes with strangers. I do not think that our people are any more prejudiced against transactions of doubtful character than the people of other countries are, and I am glad to see that we are going to have a Securities Bill which will be the means of saving some of the hard earned money of our people.

We are also told in the Speech from the Throne that we are going to have a Life Insurance Act introduced at this session. Time was when a man had to argue a great deal with his client to sell insurance. Now it is

generally agreed that the paying of life insurance is as necessary and as important as the paying of rent.

There is just one more paragraph in the Speech from the Throne that I would like to refer to before taking my seat and that is the one which says: "My Ministers propose to submit for your information the text of a proposal made by Mr. Alan S. Butler to the Government in relation to the Gander timber areas and water powers." Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the Speech of last year, and, for the purpose of greater accuracy, I shall read a paragraph of it.

(Reads.)

Now when we heard that read last year everybody was jubilant that there was going to be a Gander Deal and that a "Gang was going on the Gander."

One minister of the Crown on his return from the Conference in New York last year was known to have said the Revenue would be increased by two and a half millions a year by the Gander Deal and that about four million dollars a year was to be expended on labor. Though this had come directly from a Minister of the Crown himself yet when asked about it a few weeks later in the House, nothing was known. Now this Mr. Alan Butler has come on the scene, and it looks as if Mr. Butler is dictating the policy of the Government. The Government acting through the Ministry of Justice placed writs on the property in question, and it seems to me as if there is some betrayal somewhere. If those Ministers are competent and acting in all honesty, why was the Gander Deal mentioned at all in the Speech from the Throne last year. I really, Sir, think it most lamentable that last years session

should have been completed without anything having been done in the matter, as I believe it was the last chance we will get for years. Economic conditions are now such that I fear no such good terms will be now available as on last year. If the contrary it true I shall be most agreeably surprised and I wish to say, Sir, that as far as the Opposition is concerned we will do everything possible for the promotion of the deal and we are most anxious to help by frank and open criticism. It is not our intention to hold up legislation, but rather to give the members of the government the benefit of our ideas. The fact that we are on opposite sides of the House does not mean that we are not patriotic Newfoundlanders.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I should first of all like to join myself in the congratulations to Mr. Bindon and Mr. Strong, the proposer and seconder of the motion of the Address in Reply. Both these gentlemen have acquitted themselves as well as the senior men in the House. Both their addresses were most excellent and displayed a depth of thought and a real knowledge and appreciation of the problems that confront us to-day. To the Leader of the Opposition I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to pull with the government in thought and arguement. There is nothing more beneficial to or more likely to bring about good legislation than open debating. No one group, be it government or opposition, can ever know it all, and it is only the co-operation of both groups and by the blending of thought and arguement that the best results can be obtained. It must always be remembered that when an Act passes this House and goes on the Statute Books it is not the Act of the government only but of the whole

House, and as such it has the force and effect of law.

While the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not said so in so many words, yet I feel that his phraseology has suggested his disappointment at the amount of unemployment that is rife in the country. That there is unemployment is undoubtedly true, but I would like to point out that for the month of February there was not so much unemployment as there was in the same month ten years ago or even twenty or thirty years ago, and despite present adverse conditions, the destitution for the month was not appreciably greater than ten years ago. This is so despite the fact that normally anywhere up to two hundred men are employed by the Council in snow shovelling and street cleaning, and this year there was none. Nevertheless there was this year less destitution and less unemployment than for any year since the war, and that this is so, is due in no small measure to the adjustment of trade. As an instance of this I have only to point to the agreement made some two years ago between the Government and the Municipal Council for the taking off of the coal tax from ships. This has been the means of bringing a great number of ships into the harbor as they found it better to come here to re-coal than to proceed on to Sydney, and a great deal of trade has been the result.

Other arrangements made two years ago for the refunding of duty or the placing of no duty at all on materials for ships' repairs effected in the dock have meant that our contractors could compete with docks abroad. More trade and more employment have resulted and a great number of people have benefited.

It was stated recently by a party member, at a meeting of the party,

that there was no destitution in his district, and a gentleman who has recently come in from Port au Port states that in that section of the country things are eminently satisfactory. The recent smelt industry has been responsible for putting a clear profit of over \$15,000.00 into the hands of the people of this district. This year for what were probably good and sufficient reasons of their own the owners would not send a steamer for men going to the seal fishery and so the Government sent down a boat. Only twelve men came up that did not pay their way in cash, so that there was no charity and absolutely no charge on the Government involved. This would not indicate that the people were poverty stricken. On the other hand the products from the fishery are five million dollars less than last year and there is bound to be stringency. While Grand Falls, Corner Brook and Buchans are keeping up the general average, it is true that Bell Island is working on half time, and while this does not involve much actual destitution it does mean severe stringency. It does mean a severe tightening of the belt, but it does not mean the forming of breadlines and the widespread destitution of the dole with its consequent degradation. Our Poor Relief is exceedingly small as compared with countries like Canada, the United States, Italy and the Mother Country. France I believe is an exception. Our economic situation is not so bad as some people would have us believe. There are twenty nine million dollars in the savings banks of St. John's at three per cent. Over fifty million dollars worth of life insurance is carried and last year the actual cash value of life insurance premiums paid in St. John's was over a million and a half dollars. When we remember this and couple it with the fact that

throughout the length and breadth of country out side St John's the people own their own houses, built on freehold land and paying no rent or charge to nobody we cannot think in terms of destitution. This does not mean that there are no cases of distress, no bitter tightening of the belt, but my experience has always been that when the country gets down to sound business and is watching the leaks and looking for 100% efficiency then we are getting down to the solid foundation of future success.

Reference has been made by the Leader of the Opposition to the Gander Deal, and I will tell why we had no Gander last year. It was because the Reids wanted 15 million Dollars for themselves, and when they came and asked the Government to guarantee them fifteen million dollars they were refused, and until the Reids get down to a reasonable position and are willing to discuss business on a fair basis it will be difficult to do anything. No financial people would do business or give more concessions than the property would warrant. When the matter comes up for discussion I shall ask permission from the Reids to lay on the table of the House the full correspondence in connection with the matter.

Last year the Reids requested that I should not do so, and that was why it was not done. However, this year, if I obtain their permission, I intend putting the whole matter in toto on the table of this House, and I am sure Mr. Alderdice as a business man will see what was the only course open to us, and that he will give us his heartiest support for what was done.

It was moved by Mr. Bindon and seconded by Mr. Strong that an Address of thanks be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to

the Gracious Speech with which he had been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature, and that a Select Committee be appointed to draft such Address in Reply.

It was ordered accordingly and that the following gentlemen be such Committee: Mr. Bindon, Mr. Strong, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow move an humble Address to His Majesty the King praying that he may be graciously pleased to cause a Measure to be laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to give effect to certain Resolutions set forth in the Reports of the Imperial Conferences holden at Westminster in the years 1926 and 1930.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Provide a National Flag for Newfoundland, and Colours to be worn by Vessels."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act V., Chapter 3, entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.'"

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary."

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs."

Hon. the Solicitor General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the law relating to Life Insurance."

Hon. the Solicitor General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in relation to the Sale of Securities."

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Canning of Rabbits, Birds and Shell Fish."

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Report of the Examinations conducted by the Council of Higher Education, Newfoundland, 1930; and the Financial Statement of the Council of Higher Education for the year ended December 31st, 1930.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the full text of a memorandum submitted by Mr. A. S. Butler, Debenture holder of the Reid Gander properties, to the Colonial Secretary on Saturday, February 21st, 1931, for the consideration of the Government.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the St. John's General Hospital, also the Report of the Municipal Council for the year 1931.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 12th, 1931.

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

Petitions were presented by Mr. Puddester, from Grates Cove, re Road.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a petition from the residents of Grate's Cove, in the electoral District of Bay de Verde, asking that a road be put through from the railway station to the end of Grate's Cove, a distance of two and a half or three miles. I am not presenting this petition for the purpose of getting money to do the road, as I am aware how a process of that kind has to be proceeded with. I may say that I have done my best within the past three or four years to get this road completed. In August, 1928 I had the road designated as a second class highroad and since that time all the road money possible has been devoted to this section. In the Fall of 1929 the people held a public meeting and passed a Resolution to the effect that, if the Government would grant a sufficient amount of money to complete the road, it would obviate the giving out of poor relief during the Winter of 1930, they would give their lands

on each side of the proposed new road for nothing. Last year the Highroads Commission very kindly loaned me an Inspector to inspect the road in that place, and all the men, with one exception, willingly gave their land free. Still we did not get a sufficient amount of money to do the work. Recently a Solicitor of St. John's gave notice that, on behalf of one man whose land was taken, he was suing for the value of the land at the rate of \$2400.00 per acre—an exorbitant charge. Not long since the people met again and had this petition signed and it not only asks that the road be finished but states that the people generally are not supporting the action of the man who has sued for the land taken from him.

In supporting the prayer of this petition I would ask for the co-operation of the Highroads Commission in having this road completed.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the following public documents:

Statement of Customs Revenue collected in the Colony during the year ended 30th June, 1930.

Statement of the Imports and Exports of the Colony for year ended 30th June, 1930.

A Comparative Statement of Goods, Wares and Merchandise imported into the Colony during the years ended 30th June, 1929, and 30th June, 1930, showing increases and decreases for the year 1929-30.

A Comparative Statement of Revenue received at each Outport for the years 1928-29 and 1929-30.

A Comparative Statement of Light Dues, showing collections at each Outport for the years 1928-29 and 1929-30.

A Return of the Bank Fishery for the year 1930.

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, 1930.

An Abstract of Shipping for the year ended 31st December, 1930.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the following memorandum between Mr. Alan S. Butler and the Colonial Secretary relating to the Reid-Gander properties:

Department of the Colonial Secretary,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
March 9th, 1931.

Sir,

Not only have the individual members of Committee of Council had the opportunity of personally discussing with Mr. Reid and yourself the proposition which you submitted to the Government recently, but Committee of Council as a body, in so far as the members have been available for business during recent weeks, has devoted careful consideration to the matter.

Of the points of outstanding importance there is one in particular which has not been made clear. It is understood that your desire is to sell to the Government such quantity of Debentures as would make the Government a minority Debenture holder. It does not appear what proportion of the voting stock, if any, in the Reid Newfoundland Company, the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited, the Mines and Forests (Newfoundland) Ltd., and other Reid Companies and subsidiaries goes with the debentures, nor is it apparent how the interests of the Government would be

protected by being merely minority bond holders or the holders of minority voting stock in connection with these several companies, the entire assets of which it is understood are pledged by way of first mortgage security for the protection of the bond holders.

I am sure you appreciate the fact that the Government's interest in this matter is to promote the prompt development of a Gander proposition for the purpose of employment, revenue and industrial progress. To you, on the other hand, a Gander proposition means a proposal whereby you and your associates may sell your Newfoundland interests to the best advantage of yourselves as individuals, and as private companies. Your interests would be to hold these areas for the highest price which you could expect to secure for them. The interests of the Newfoundland Government would be to secure the development of the areas at the earliest possible date without regard to the profit which you might hope to secure for them, whether as individuals or as private Companies.

You can fully appreciate the absolute clash of interests between yourself and the Reids, on the one hand, and the Newfoundland Government, on the other. This particular difficulty might be met by you and your associates fixing a price for which you would sell that portion of the security for the debentures comprising such of the property and assets necessary for the Gander development as are owned by you.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. BARNES,

Colonial Secretary.

Alan S. Butler, Esq.,

City.

St. John's, Newfoundland
March 10th, 1931.

The Hon. A. Barnes,
Colonial Secretary,
City.

Sir,

I have your letter of yesterday's date.

I cannot understand how there can be any doubt as to the position of minority bondholders. It was made as clear as I could make it to the Members of the Executive Government that these minority bondholders would have no voting interest in the stock of any of the Reid Companies.

Neither can I understand your suggestion that the interests of the Government and of those in control of the Reid Companies would clash and that the only object of the latter would be to hold out for the highest price they might hope to obtain. The control of the companies would be in the hands of the bondholders, whose main object would be to avail of the earliest reasonable opportunity to get their money back and, if the Government became a holder of part of the bonds, their interest to that extent would be identical with that of the other bondholders.

If, as you say in your letter, "the Government's interest in this matter is to promote the prompt development of the Gander proposition, "I cannot understand the Government's desire to evade dealing with my proposals, as is evident from your letter.

With regard to the concluding paragraph of your letter, you appear to overlook the fact that the Reid Companies and their associates claim to own ALL of the property and assets necessary for the Gander development and their solicitors have today served

upon the Minister of Justice formal notice of intention to proceed against the Government for damages in connection with the Gander properties.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) A. S. BUTLER.

St. John's, Newfoundland,
March 10th, 1931.

To the Rt. Hon. Sir R. A. Squires,
K.C.M.G., Minister of Justice.

Dear Sir:

We are instructed by Reid Newfoundland Company, Ltd., Mines & Forests (Newfoundland) Ltd., Gander Valley Power & Paper Co., Ltd., and the Royal Trust Company to give you notice that one month after date hereof it is the intention of our clients to present a petition to the Supreme Court praying relief by way of damages in the sum of \$10,000,000.00 against the Government of Newfoundland for breach of contract on the part of the said Government arising out of:

- (1) The issue of 22 writs of summons out of the Supreme Court in May, 1930 in suits wherein His Majesty's Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines were plaintiffs and the aforesaid Mines & Forests (Newfoundland) Ltd. and other parties were the defendants, claiming the forfeiture of certain lands held by said defendants under licenses from the Crown to cut timber
- (2) The issue in December last out of the Supreme Court of 22 writs wherein the said His Majesty's Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines were plaintiffs and the aforesaid Mines & Forests (Newfoundland) Ltd. and Gan-

der Valley Power & Paper Co., Ltd., and other parties were defendants, claiming the forfeiture of certain lands held by the said defendants under licenses from the Crown to cut timber.

All of the above named claimants are and were at the time of the issue of said writs severally interested in the properties the subject matter of said writs and it is contended by them that the said writs were improperly issued and in breach of:

- (1) The contract between the parties evidenced by such licenses.
- (2) The agreement dated the 16th day of August and made between the Government of Newfoundland of the one part and the said Gander Valley Power & Paper Co. of the other part and of the extensions of said agreement.
- (3) The said agreement and extensions thereof, and of the undertaking of the Government with the said Gander Valley Power & Paper Co. contained in the Minute of Council passed on the 4th day of August, 1930 and communicated by the Government to the said Gander Valley Power & Paper Co., Ltd.

In consequence of the said breaches the claimants suffered great damage in that the lands the subject matter of the said writs and other lands of the claimants were rendered of less value to the claimants and the claimants were hindered from selling same as advantageously as they might have done, had the said writs never been issued.

The claimants Reid Newfoundland Co., Ltd., Mines & Forests (Newfound-

land) Ltd. and Gander Valley Power & Paper Co., Ltd., are incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland regarding companies and their respective Head Offices are situate in the Reid Building, Duckworth Street, St. John's, Newfoundland.

The claimant the Royal Trust Co. is a company incorporated under the laws of the Dominion of Canada and authorized by special Act of the Legislature of Newfoundland to do business in Newfoundland and its Newfoundland Office is situate at the Bank of Montreal Building, Water Street, St. John's. It claims as Trustee for the holders of the bonds of the other claimants.

The solicitors for the said claimants are Messrs. Conroy & Conroy, whose address is Reid Building, Duckworth Street, St. John's, Newfoundland.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) CONROY & CONROY,
Solicitors for Petitioners.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, the foregoing memo which I have just tabled for the benefit of the members of the House was submitted to the Government on or about February 21st by Mr. Alan S. Butler. I say on or about the 21st, as I am not sure whether it was received late on Saturday or early on Monday. I table that document without making any comment whatever on it in order that the members of the Opposition may have the privilege of reading it before it comes before the House for discussion.

The Leader of the Opposition has also referred to the early opening of the House, and I want to assure him it was not done with any intention of taking advantage of members who

were absent. No members of either House approached me or notified me that they would be unable to attend. Neither directly nor indirectly did they seek information as to the date the House would open.

The Leader of the Opposition also referred to the New Standardization Bill that is to be introduced. Standardization is no new idea. I believe it originated in the Book of Holy Writ or even before that time. I agree with the ideas as to standardization as expressed by Mr. Alderdice and am in full accord with Mr. Monroe that the process of Standardization should be developed from the stores to the foreign markets and that all goods that are shipped from this country to outside markets should be good goods and should bear such a brand. This coincides exactly with the Policy Programme and views of the present Government. Before taking my seat I would like to say that I hope the session of the House now in progress will be bright, brief and breezy, and productive of valuable legislative measures.

Before adjournment of the House I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating Mr. Robert Walsh, the veteran Sergeant-at-Arms, who is today with us taking the place of a younger man who through illness is unable to attend. Mr. Walsh is one of the outstanding figures in this House and has been connected with it for the past fifty years and now at the age of ninety, he is as well and strong enough to fill the breach caused by the illness of the regular Sergeant-at-Arms.

Pursuant to notice, Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister moved that an humble Address be presented to His Majesty the King praying that he may be graciously pleased to cause a Measure to be laid before the Parliaments of the

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to give effect to certain Declarations and Resolutions set forth in the reports of the Imperial Conference holden at Westminster in the four years 1926 and 1930.

On motion it was ordered that the said Address be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to provide a National Flag for Newfoundland and Colours to be worn by Vessels," was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary," 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 Rt Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 3, entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company,'" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to 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.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Solicitor General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the law relating to Life Insurance," 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 Solicitor General, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in relation to the Sale of Securities," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Canning of Rabbits, Birds and Shell Fish," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Bindon, on behalf of the Select Committee appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech from the Throne, presented the Report of the Select Committee, which was, on motion, received and read as follows:

To His Excellency, Sir John Middleton, Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Colony of Newfoundland.

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.) JAMES BINDON,
J. A. STRONG,
J. H. SCAMMELL.

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

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 16th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 16th, 1931.

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

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister made announcement of such information as he possessed concerning the loss of the sealing steamer "Viking."

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 18th, 1931.

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

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 23rd, 1931.

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

On motion of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the following Resolutions were passed unanimously.

RESOLVED: That this House desires to record its sincere sympathy with the families and relatives of those Newfoundlanders who lost their lives, or suffered bodily injury, under such tragic circumstances in the Disaster which befell the S. S. Viking.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That this House desires to place on record an expression of its sincere sympathy with the families and relatives of Varrick Frissell and A. E Penrod, citizens of the Republic of the United States of America, reported among the missing in the S. S. Viking.

RESOLVED: That this House desires to place on record an expression of its appreciation of the splendid services rendered in connection with the Viking Disaster by:—

(1) Otis Bartlett, Wireless Operator at Horse Island.

- (2) James Winsor, Wireless Operator at Exploits.
- (3) Charles Winsor, Wireless Operator at Port Albert.
- (4) A. E. Batstone, Wireless Operator at Little Bay Islands.
- (5) Mrs. Malvine Evans, Wireless Operator at Campbellton.
- (6) Paul Moores, Wireless Operator at Twillingate.
- (7) A. J. Crocker, Wireless Operator at St. John's.
- (8) And the Operators in charge of the Canadian Marconi Wireless Station at Fogo.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I would call attention particularly to the great help rendered by Mr. A. J. Crocker, whose private wireless broadcasting set was used for communication with Mr. Leslie of Port Albert and thus the transmission of messages made possible between St. John's and Horse Island during the unfortunate interruption of the regular service because of a break in the land near Badger.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table copy of telegraph message sent by me to Sealing Captains and others in Bonavista Bay in answer to enquires as to whether a steamer would be sent North to convey sealers to St. John's.

Nathan Winsor, Esq., M.H.A., Wesleyville,

Capt. Jesse Winsor, Wesleyville.

Capt. P. S. Carter, Greenspond,

Capt. R. Hounsell, Pinchard's Island,

Capt. A. L. Blackwood, Wesleyville.

Referring your message re sealers getting St. John's for voyage. Owners of steamer absolutely refuse send steamer for men. Railway Manage-

ment are prepared send Sagona. Fares will be collected in advance from passengers in the ordinary course of steamship business. Any man having berth to the ice and who is certified by Relieving Officer, Magistrate, or Justice of the Peace or other person as being so destitute that he can neither pay passage nor secure advance from friends for payment of passage as is so frequently done will give an order on Captain who has promised him berth for payment fare out of results of voyage. If by any misadventure any individual man makes no bill order will then have to be honoured through Department Public Charities. If total number passengers not sufficient pay cost steamer the difference between total receipts from venture and total cost will have to be taken as Vote of Legislature on Poor Relief Account. Minister Marine and Fisheries who has conducted negotiations with sealing steamer owners and Railway Management will be telegraphing you direct.

RICHARD A. SQUIRES.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled Report of the Auditor General on Revenue and appropriation for year ending June 30th, 1930, also Report under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, and Municipal Council Accounts.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act to provide for the creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates charged to the Public.'"

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to External Affairs."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 3, entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to Enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company,'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 3 entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to Enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company'" be now read a second time.

The Bill recites the passing of an Act of Parliament at the session of 1929, whereby an agreement was entered into between the Newfoundland Government and the American Telephone and Telegraph Company to the effect that the Company would undertake certain telephone activities in Newfoundland, thereby connecting Newfoundland with the Continent of America on the East side of the Atlantic and Great Britain, Ireland, and the Continent of Europe on the west side of the Atlantic. The franchise

grant contained a condition under which the franchise would be forfeited if telephonic communication between Newfoundland and the Mainland of North America were not established before the 20th of June, 1932. The season during which it is possible to lay cable near Newfoundland is from the middle of May or the first of June until about the first of September. The completion date above referred to, therefore, requires that the cable be laid during the season of 1931.

After the completion of the arrangement with the Newfoundland Government the Company proceeded with its work. Landing rights in Ireland were arranged for, and during the years 1929-30 nearly one hundred acres of land in the County Mayo in the Irish Free State were purchased by the Company at a cost of \$20,000. A twenty-mile section of the proposed cable was manufactured and laid off the landing site in Ireland for test purposes. These tests were completed during June and July of last year and were entirely satisfactory.

Cable ships equipped with sonic depth finders were engaged to make accurate sounding of the entire course of the cable between Newfoundland and the Irish Free State. These soundings have been completed.

Necessary corporate rights were secured in Canada, and the company and its Canadian subsidiary embarked upon the programme of acquiring the necessary rights of way and building an entirely new land line from Bangor, Maine, to Sydney Mines, Nova Scotia. The right of way between Bangor, Maine, and the United States-Canada boundary has all been secured. The right of way in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia has been in

large part secured and two hundred and twenty miles of the new pole line have already been constructed. The amount invested for right of way and pole line construction for this line in Maine, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, between May, 1929, and December 1, 1930, is in excess of \$1,175,000.

The cable will be manufactured under inventions made by the company, and patents owned and controlled by it. Considerable time was occupied in concluding satisfactory patent licenses with cable manufacturers which either or both the Company and the British Post Office desired to have qualified as bidders for the cable construction contract.

The last of the necessary patent licenses was entered into in July, 1930, and the Company at that time immediately held preliminary discussions with the various manufacturers in England and Germany regarding specifications, contracts and other manufacturing details. Specifications for the manufacture of the cable were placed in the hands of British and German manufacturers in August, 1930. In October last conferences in connection with contracts for cable construction were held by representatives of the Company with representatives of the British Post Office and representatives of firms capable of tendering for such an undertaking.

As a result of conferences between the British Post Office, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, and the representatives of the anticipated cable contracting firms, it was found that it would be physically impossible to complete the cable in sufficient time to have it laid during those months of the present year of 1931 as would be suitable for cable-laying purposes. It has to be remembered that out of the twelve months

there are but three or three and a half months during which it is possible to lay a cable in the vicinity of Newfoundland, namely, June, July and August, with a possible week or two in May. From September of this year until the expiry of the period, namely, May of next year, is an absolutely dead season so far as cable-laying, either from Newfoundland eastward or Newfoundland westward, is concerned. In this situation the Company asks that the franchise be extended, as to completion, until the end of the year of 1933.

It is not necessary for me to refer to bona fides in the case of a company of such a world standing as the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, and I have already given evidence of the work which has already been completed. As a further evidence of good faith of their activities in this connection, I would say that in order to secure sufficient supplies of balata, the material necessary for the insulation of the cable, they purchased a large percentage of the entire world's supply of this material, covering a period of nearly two years, at a cost of approximately a million and a half dollars. This material comes from South America, and as there is but a limited supply produced for the world's markets, it was necessary for them to make these arrangements in advance of actual construction.

Gutta percha and Balata have been the standard materials for insulation of deep sea cables since submarine cables were first manufactured. These materials are quite similar in composition, the gutta hydrocarbons which form the base of each being the important element which makes them suitable. They are superior to other types of insulating materials for the following reasons:—

(1) They become plastic at warm temperatures and can be readily extruded over a conductor in multiple layers in a continuous sheath with great exactness and freedom from mechanical defects. The material quickly sets to a hard tough covering when drawn through cold water

(2) The electrical characteristics are well adapted to submarine cable construction.

(3) The electrical and mechanical characteristics are maintained constant under sea bottom conditions over a great many years.

The above characteristics make the Balata and Gutta Percha very satisfactory for telegraph cables, but the dielectrical losses are too high for the requirements of long cables carrying frequencies of the voice range, or for shorter cables carrying carrier current frequencies. For this reason it was necessary to find or develop a new insulating material having similar characteristics to the balata or gutta percha mechanically and much superior to them electrically. As a result, paragutta was developed, consisting of the purified hydro-carbons of balata and of rubber with minor waxes to modify the mechanical characteristics.

Balata is used in the manufacture of paragutta, since it is more free from impurities than gutta percha, and, being in liquid form, can be produced and transported more readily. The purity of the hydro-carbons is very important from the standpoint of dielectric losses in the long submarine telephone cables.

A digest of the status of the development of the project as at the 24th of February, 1931, is as follows:

Bangor, Maine,—Canadian Border (82 Miles).—Survey work has been completed and right of way purchased. No clearing or construction work has been started. The central office equipment for Bangor was to be installed by the New England Telephone Company. I understand that requisitions for the equipment were placed a few weeks ago.

St. Croix River Crossing—International Border.—Application for permit has been made, but permits have not yet been secured.

International Boundary, St. John, N. B. (72.8 Miles).—The pole line work is completed. Wire has been strung on 67 miles of pole line. The remaining wire work in this section will be completed within the next week.

Toll Entrance Cable Work, St. John, N.B. (32700 Feet).—Nearly all of the conduit work has been finished and the cable and loading has been ordered and partially delivered. The New Brunswick Telephone Company will have an interest in this cable and conduit.

St. John, N. B.—New Brunswick—Nova Scotia State Line (121 Miles).—Survey work has been practically completed; 97% of the right of way has been optioned and 48% of the right of way purchased. 39% of the right of way has been cleared and poles have been set for 22 miles. No wire has been strung in this section.

Nova Scotia—New Brunswick State Line—Amherst, N. S. (3½ Miles).—Line work has been completed and the wire is strung.

Amherst Toll Entrance Cable and Conduit (2500 Feet).—Engineering work has been completed. Conduit work started December 1st, 1930.

Amherst — New Glasgow (86½ Miles).—Pole line and wire work completed. Wire temporarily cut into both offices.

New Glasgow Toll Entrance Cable And Conduit (Approximately 6,000 Feet).—Engineering work has been completed. This Maritime Company is to have a reservation in a part of this cable and conduit.

New Glasgow to Strait of Canso (64.4 Miles).—Survey has been completed; 91% of the right of way optioned; 90% of right of way purchased; 85% of clearing finished; 27 miles of pole line constructed; 20 miles of wire strung.

Strait of Canso.—Engineering work has been completed and right of way secured.

Strait of Canso—Sydney Mines (85 Miles).—Approximately 70% of the right of way has been staked. About 70% of the right of way has been optioned. None of the options have been taken up. No clearing or pole line work has been done.

Sydney Mines, N. S.—A lot has been purchased and architects plans have been completed for the proposed building. Bids have not yet been secured from contractors for the erection of this building. Permit has been obtained from the Dominion Government for the Sydney Mines-Port aux Basques cable landing.

Port aux Basques, Nfld.—Preliminary survey work has been completed. The work is under way to secure options on building sites.

Grand Bank, Nfld.—Real estate for a building site has been optioned, total cost to be approximately \$4,500.

New Perlican, Nfld.—Application has been filed with the Newfoundland Government for about 20 acres of Crown land and an option has been secured on some private property in the centre of this tract to cost approximately \$1,000.

Burin Peninsula and Avalon Isthmus.—Preliminary surveys have been completed of proposed overland cable routes across the Burin Peninsula and the Avalon Isthmus.

Termonecarragh, Ireland.—Land has been purchased for a building site. The Bell Telephone Laboratories are conducting experiments on this site at present and have laid some test cables.

Central Office Equipment.—Orders have been placed on the Northern Electric Company for central office equipment installations for St. John, N. B., Amherst, N. S., New Glasgow, N.S., and Sydney Mines, N. S. Some engineering work has been completed but no manufacturing has as yet been started.

I would call attention particularly to the fact that the preliminary survey work has been completed at Port aux Basques and options are being secured on necessary sites there, that options have been secured in connection with sites at Grand Bank and also at New Perlican; preliminary surveys have been completed of overland cable routes across the Burin Peninsula and the Isthmus of Avalon.

The main points in connection with the route of the cable from New York are Boston, Portland, Bangor, St. John, N. B., Amherst, New Glasgow, Sydney Mines. These are landline services; cable from Sydney Mines to Port aux Basques; cable from Port aux Basques to Grand Bank; ditching

across Burin Peninsula, thence by cable to a point on the Isthmus of Avalon, ditching across into Trinity Bay; thence to New Perlican and from New Perlican to Termoncarragh, Ireland.

The particulars that I quote in connection with the Company are authoritative, as are also the plans, in that I secured them personally from Mr. John H. Ray, one of the senior counsel for the company. Mr. Ray was the attorney who visited Newfoundland in connection with negotiations here. I had conferences with him in London during November last, and had further conferences with him and with several of the leading executive of the company in New York, during the first week of December of last year.

It is not necessary for me to say that I am satisfied that the American Telephone and Telegraph Company are capable of carrying through this undertaking. I feel that it is also unnecessary for me to offer any further assurances to this House that they have already gone a long way towards the carrying out of their programme. Their investment in the undertaking already represents an expenditure of several million dollars, and with this extension I feel confident that before the end of the year 1933 the carrying on of a telephone conversation between Newfoundland and the Continent of North America to the west and south, and Great Britain, Ireland and the Continent of Europe to the east and south will be a practical accomplishment.

I consequently move that this Bill be now read a second time, and in doing so recommend it to the favourable consideration of the Legislature.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill

entitled "An Act to provide a National Flag for Newfoundland and Colours to be worn by vessels," was read a second time.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary," was read a second time.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, the procedure which I had intended to suggest in connection with the handling of these Constitutional and Imperial matters was that this House should resolve itself into Committee of the Whole and meet in joint secret session with the members of the Legislative Council, but, as the other Chamber will not be in session until Monday next, I propose tomorrow to make the necessary formal Motion so far as this Chamber is concerned. This is not a departure from correct technical practise, as I remember an occasion during the war when certain matters were dealt with in joint session of both Houses in secret.

I, consequently, move that these separate Bills be dealt with by Committee of the Whole of both Houses. Meanwhile I would suggest that on tomorrow the Bills be read a second time so that the whole thing would be in form for a joint session.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I cannot concur in the suggestion of the Hon. the Prime Minister and would ask for a postponement of the second reading of this Bill in relation to the Colonial Secretary until we have decided the question of the acceptance or otherwise of the new title of the Colonial Secretary. I think, Sir, that is the main point. The other matters deal with a different subject altogether.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, do I understand there is some doubt existing in the mind of the honourable member?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, yes.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that so far as I am concerned there is no doubt. However, I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition, that, as he expresses a doubt, we defer the second reading of these Bills.

I move that this Committee rise and report its request that it meet a joint Committee from this House and the Legislative Council in this Chamber at a time to be decided upon later.

I think the proper procedure is for a request of this kind to come from this House through that channel.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 21 George V., Chapter 14 (Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930)" be now read a second time.

I feel that I might at this moment make a detailed explanation of the whole Bill, rather than wait until the matter comes up for consideration verbatim in Committee of the Whole.

Would honourable members kindly refer to Section 1 of the Bill? This relates to Sub-section 1 (c) of Section 155 of the Act as passed last year.

This Section of last year's Act provided that the Rule Committee may regulate costs and charges payable under distress warrants issued by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, while the scale of costs is provided in the 6th Schedule.

Various objections have been raised by Magistrates to the working of this scale of costs and it is felt that a permanent scale ought to be drawn up only after careful consideration and consultation with the Magistrates and that it would be inadvisable to hastily draft a scale and to embody it in the Act.

The general system of charging costs in Magistrates' Courts requires revision, in view of the increasing volume of civil business done in these Courts. The present system is hardly fair to a successful plaintiff, who may be at considerable expense in conducting an action before Magistrates and yet has great difficulty in recovering any of his costs from the unsuccessful party. The matter was under consideration at the recent annual meeting of the Law Society and a sub-committee was appointed to enquire into the matter and place some suggestions before the Government.

The Rule Committee under the 1930 Act consists of the three Judges of the Supreme Court; the Registrar of the Supreme Court (who is Taxing Officer); the Solicitor General; the Deputy Minister of Justice, and the Judge of the Central Court. It is felt that this Committee, five of whom are judicial or semi-judicial officers, and two of whom are law officers who have reached that degree of seniority when they no longer have much personal interest in proceedings before Magistrates, can be relied upon to draw up a scale which will be fair to litigants.

Would honourable members now refer to the second section of the Bill? This deals with the second schedule of the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1930. There was a slight error in subsection (d) referring to actions of libel and slander as drafted last year and it is desired to correct this. As regards sub-sections (2) and (3) these appeared in the draft which was placed before and passed by the House last year, but these two clauses were omitted in the King's Printer's copies, which have now been distributed broadcast throughout the country. It would, strictly speaking, be in order to have all these copies corrected, but this would be very difficult. The simplest way of dealing with the matter now is to repeal the whole Schedule and re-enact it as now printed.

With regard to Section (3) of the Bill, by a clerical error the wrong heading was put to the Sixth Schedule in the Act as drafted last year. Section 3 corrects this error. The whole Schedule, however, will now be subject to revision by the Rule Committee.

The Summary Jurisdiction Act of last year was an Act submitted by the Committee on the Consolidation of Statutes. This amending Bill is submitted by the same Committee. I asked the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. B. E. S. Dunfield, who is also Secretary of the Consolidation Committee, to confer with the two Hon. gentlemen opposite who are practising barristers, so that they might be fully acquainted with the nature and scope of and necessity for this amendment, and I earnestly hope that this Second Reading has their full concurrence. If these gentlemen have any suggestions to make as to the wording of this Bill or any details in connec-

tion therewith, I am sure they will let this House have the benefit of their opinion when the Bill is before us in Committee stage.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks about the same matter, as I am personally familiar with the circumstances which make the proposed amendments necessary. I should like to call attention to the fact that after this Bill passed the House last year, an engrossed copy was sent to the King's Printer, and two sections of the Act were omitted. I don't know where the blame lies for errors of this kind, but I think the matter very serious. I know of one instance in particular where the word "not" was omitted. The serious consequences of errors of this kind are obvious, as a rule it never occurs to judges or practitioners to check over King's Printers copies. The same thing is likely to occur when some of the larger Acts, such as the Crown Lands Act of last year are re-printed in pamphlet form.

From time to time the Ministers of various departments have Acts of this kind re-printed and distributed, and because of their convenient form they are largely used by practitioners. Serious errors have occurred in these in the past, and they may be the means of practitioners giving wrong opinions. I say wrong opinions as bad judgements cannot be given under any circumstances. I do think it an extremely serious state of affairs when printers copies are not to be relied upon, and I think that some steps should be taken to prevent its recurrence in the future.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Solicitor General the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Relating to Life Insurance" was read a second time, and it was ordered to be

referred to a Select Committee to consist of Hon. the Solicitor General, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Winter and Hon. Mr. Speaker.

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill in connection with Life Insurance Companies I would like to say that the Bill is as near as possible to the Act introduced in Canada in 1921 affecting Life Insurance Companies. The Canadian Bar Association and the Legislature in Canada realized that all these Companies in British North America were somewhat handicapped by the Bill and through the efforts of the Canadian Bar Association and the Legislature an Act known as the Model Act was put in force in all provinces of Canada except Quebec and as the Napoleonic Code was in force in Quebec the Model Act which was based on the Common Law and the Juricature Act it was not possible to put the Act in force in Quebec. The Model Act was first enforced in Toronto and later made law in the whole Province of Ontario and the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia where it has since proven very satisfactory.

The bulk of Insurance Companies writing Life Insurance in this country are Canadian Companies and for the protection and advantage of the public at large who are being insured and the Companies who are writing the Insurance. It would, I think, be advisable to enlarge the Canadian Model Act and alter it in places in so far as possible to have it applicable to this country.

Sections of the Act will no doubt be as mystifying to the ordinary lay man as a medical man's lecture on anatomy would be to me and for that reason I would suggest that the Bill be placed

in the hands of a select Committee who could go over it section by section, adopting the Model Act in force in Canadian Provinces as a pattern and making the necessary changes to suit the conditions existing in this country.

(Reads Sections)

These are practically all the alterations made and as I have already pointed out they are matters with which the ordinary lay man cannot deal and would best be handled by a Select Committee.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I take it that the general sense of the Bill is that it will improve the position of the people of this country who are being insured.

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

—Mr. Speaker, yes, the Model Act as I have stated before has the full approval of the Canadian Bar Association and some of the sections were opposed by the Insurance Companies.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Solicitor General the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in Relation to the Sale of Securities" was read a second time, and it was ordered to be referred to a Select Committee to consist of Hon. the Solicitor General, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Hon. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Winter, Mr. Alderdice and Mr. Godden.

In moving the second reading of this Bill I might say that what was known as the "Blue Sky Law" existed in connection with business of this nature in this country and no doubt most of the people listening to me will recollect the transaction of brokerage concerns that have been carried on in this country during the past two or three years which have caused considerable loss to the people who have invested

monies with these Brokerage Companies, due to the fact that there was no control over the said Companies.

In various provinces in Canada steps have been taken to control these Companies and the Act of Ontario and the Act of Nova Scotia were introduced for this purpose.

In this connection I would like to say that this Bill is of such a character that it is altogether beyond the comprehension of the ordinary lay man and if it meets with your approval, I would like to ask this House to refer it to a Select Committee for their approval or otherwise.

The first section deals with the definition. The second section deals with the definition and defines certain terms in the Bill. The third section deals with the registration of brokers and provides that brokers be registered. Section four deals with exemptions from registration. There are many transactions which are analogous to brokerage transactions in connection with certain institutions which can be put through without the intervention of a broker.

There are twelve of fifteen of these exemptions. Section five deals with temporary registration. Section six deals with information that must be supplied with applications. Section seven deals with filing of bonds. Section eight deals with bonds forfeited. Section nine deals with power given to the Attorney General with regard to registration and cancellation. Section ten deals with investigation into the alleged transactions of any broker. Section eleven deals with the powers of the Attorney General to investigate any alleged offences against this Act. Section twelve is the same. Section thirteen deals with power given to hold any funds or securities of any

broker pending investigation into his transactions. Section fourteen deals with the sale of securities purchased outright or held on margin.

Most of my hearers can recollect cases where private investors had ordered their broker to purchase shares which they assumed were being held in their name and when the affairs of the broker were liquidated it was found that these shares had been sold without their knowledge. Sections 16-23 deals with Audits, Accounts and Information. Section 24-25 describes general provisions. Section 26 gives power to the Governor in Council to make regulations. Section 27 provides penalties. Sections 28-29 are the same. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Speaker, does this Bill contain any instructions as to whom will enquire into the type of bonds or shares offered in this country?

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL
—Mr. Speaker, no, the Attorney General has full powers in that respect.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Speaker, the securities that brokers sell are subject to scrutiny by the Attorney General?

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL
—Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General can step in and prevent the sale of any bonds or shares offered but it is not provided that any type cannot be sold. This matter was discussed but we could not throw the responsibility on the Attorney General of watching every broker and seeing that every security or share is good.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, some years ago there was a large amount of certain mining stock sold in this country which was worthless and re-

sulted in a very heavy loss to people who invested in it. This aspect of share pushing is not covered by this Bill and before the Council meets again I hope that they will consider this aspect. It was the subject of comment in the newspapers and in other countries is the subject of strict legislation and I think that this matter should be covered in this Bill.

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

—Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with my Hon. friend the Member for Placentia East, there is no provision made to handle this situation. It is a very difficult one and if we had the assistance of some lawyers outside the Commission we might be able to get something in shape to cover it.

MR. PUDDESTER—Is this Bill the same as the Ontario Act?

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

—Yes.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, in the last twelve months the Attorney General of Ontario has been the subject of much criticism and I trust that steps have been taken to remedy the causes of that criticism in this Bill.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, in reference to question No. 25 asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I beg to table an answer. In reference to question No. 18 asked by my Hon. friend Mr. Moore, I beg to table an answer. Mr. Speaker, since the last session of this House, I received the following communication from the Rt. Hon. R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada:

(Reads)

After the House closes I will take the opportunity of expressing my ap-

preciation for his courtesy and make a suitable reply.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, there are quite a lot of questions addressed to the Colonial Secretary to which we are very anxious to receive replies so that we can get ahead with the Address in Reply, I would ask the Prime Minister to undertake to see that the replies are tabled as soon as possible.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I understand that the answers are ready but the Colonial Secretary is not here today.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION

Mr. Speaker, in reference to question No. 25, I would like to ask whether Mr. Conroy has given an answer one way or another.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I have received his reply and I will table it tomorrow. I will table in writing memorandum of negotiations between the Government and the Hearst syndicate. One document Mr. Conroy refused to admit as a public document, it consisted of a series of contracts signed by several parties, it is a commercial document and the contents may not be disclosed.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION

Mr. Speaker, in other words the memorandum of the proposed agreement between the Government and the Hearst people?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, there is no correspondence to show that these people meant business, except this final document which they produced to back up their representations and they are not prepared to table it because it would affect their internal relations with other concerns. If there is any other documents which are not confidential and

bear on the matter I will have them looked up and tabled.

One copy of the contract was given me and I had copies made and given to each member of the Executive Council.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, were not several copies made and given to members of the Executive Council? Wasn't Mr. Dunfield, the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, furnished with a copy for the purpose of reporting on same? I do not see why it is that if other outsiders were able to see the document there should be any objection to having it laid on the table of the House for the information of the members.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the only copy that Mr. Dunfield could have had was my private copy. The only way another copy could be got was by being stolen from my private desk by the same people who broke open my desk some time ago and took other documents. And if I thought that Mr. Dunfield had shown the contract to others I should most certainly ask for his resignation, and I shall immediately ask for an explanation.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I did not say that Mr. Dunfield showed any person the copy and the Prime Minister is not going to get away with anything like that. I am not concerned with the robbery of your political documents. And it's no use for the Right Honourable the Prime Minister to "go up in the air" about public matters before the House. This is a question of public interest and as such we are dealing with it and we are asking for information. I might tell the Prime Minister that we have a public duty to perform and that duty we are going to perform according to

our view point, and though we may be small in numbers that does not lessen our responsibility to the country no matter who it pleases or displeases and the document in question should be tabled.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, if that position is taken it looks as though the Reid interests are afraid to let the document see the light of day and I think that in taking this attitude they are severely prejudicing their own interests.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Speaker, if that attitude is taken it is impossible to do business in this House as the Opposition are talking rubbish. We are asked not to allow a certain document to be made public and then are subjected to such impudence from the Leader of the Opposition. The Government is not afraid to let the information be tabled.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I did not say the Government were afraid to table the document, what I said was that if the Reids did not wish the document to be made public then they were acting in a manner detrimental to their own interests. And I think the Right Honourable the Prime Minister should retract his statement.

HON. THE SPEAKER—That is what the Leader of the Opposition said.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition did not mean to say what I quoted him as saying, then I retract my statement.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I did not only mean not to say it I did not even insinuate it.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister should remember that

we have a duty to perform. He should put himself in the place of the Opposition members on the other side of the House and ask himself what he would do in a similar position. Wouldn't he demand as we are doing that these documents be tabled especially as we know they have been seen by others. We have our duty to perform, and if that is the attitude the Prime Minister is going to take in displaying as much heat as he does today at the beginning of the session then the session isn't going to be a very friendly one.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, the Hon. member has said that more copies were issued than those given the members of the Executive and if he thinks so then it is up to him to name those members who have broken their oath of office.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have said that these copies were seen by others outside the Executive who did not hold the only ones, the Government were not the only people consulted about the Gander contract. The Opposition were interviewed also.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I know that the Leader of the Opposition had several interviews with Mr. Powell on the matter of the Gander.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, that may be true and it is also true that the Opposition were asked for their support of the proposition by the Reid interests so that the House might be united when the matter came before it.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Wednesday afternoon, the 25th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 25, 1931.

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

MR. BINDON.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Joseph's and Newbridge, Salmonier, asking that a precaution board which was placed there by the Game & Inland Fisheries Board and which prohibits salmon nets being set inside it, be put back to where it was formerly. I understand, Sir, that this notice was originally placed two miles from Salmonier River, but in recent years was shifted five or six miles, thereby creating a great hardship on worn-out fishermen to have to go such a long distance to catch a few salmon. I give the petition my hearty support and in doing so I believe that the alteration would not in the least be a hindrance or determent to salmon going up Salmonier River. As the time is now approaching when notices will be sent out regarding this fishery, I trust that the earliest possible consideration will be given the prayer of this petition.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Pouch Cove, and in doing so would like to thank the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, to whose office it was sent, for passing it on to me. This petition is signed by every fisherman in the settlement of Pouch Cove, which has a population of 1500 and of which from 250 to 300 prosecute the fishery each year. The petitioners ask that a breakwater be built there in order to enable them to carry on their avocation, as Pouch Cove is

the most exposed settlement in the district of St. John's East (Extern) and in the Spring and Fall seasons it is almost impossible for them to prosecute the fishery without sustaining severe damage to property. Very often fishermen have had their stages demolished by heavy seas, and to accentuate the great hardship inflicted upon these fishermen, it is very difficult to get timber in that section of the district to replace the damage done. Only last year some of these fishermen had to send to St. John's to procure lumber to replace the stages that had been sea-swept. In giving the petition my hearty and unqualified support, and whilst asking that it be given the earnest and sympathetic consideration of the Government, I would ask the Clerk of the House to read the petition, so that honorable members can see there is nothing unreasonable asked for by the petitioners.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged to the Hon. member for St. John's East (Extern) Mr. Tobin, for having done me the courtesy of presenting the petition which was forwarded to me from his constituency.

I am satisfied that a breakwater at Pouch Cove would be a great asset to the town, and, if possible of construction for a reasonable cost, would be an asset to the country as a whole, because of the increased earning and revenue producing power of the people of that neighbourhood. There are few more independent and prosperous towns in Newfoundland than the town of Pouch Cove.

During the period of grave distress which swept over the world in general, and this country in particular, as an aftermath of War, the town of Pouch Cove was one of the comparatively

few places from which there was no clamor for assistance. During the past year, in spite of the drop in the price of codfish, which is the staple industry of the town, the reserve wealth and independence of the place meant that there was no necessity for public assistance in the nature of dole or able-bodied relief works. A community of that sort is deserving of every encouragement, and the construction of the breakwater would give that encouragement in a very practical form.

The petition itself points out that an average fishing value of \$90,000 was reduced last year because of shortage of catch and depreciation in price, particularly the latter, to \$46,000. In spite of that, there was no distress.

I feel this petition to be of sufficient importance to justify me in asking the Speaker to permit the petition to be considered and read and recorded in the Hansard.

During my previous term of office, when representative for the constituency of St. John's West, I made several visits to Pouch Cove for the purpose of examining into this same problem. I then made arrangements whereby there were certain improvements in connection with the dangerous gulch which was the only protection which the boats had, and succeeded in having an arrangement made with the Department of Marine and Fisheries for an improvement in connection with the launchway and hoisting appliances. This was a very substantial protection to property and helped in fishery operations.

I arranged at that time for a visit to the place by the Government Engineer, who looked over the spot with a view to preliminary survey. A report as to the probable cost was

such that it was felt impossible to undertake the work. That was in the time of very high prices of material. Now that the price of material has fallen very considerably, and particularly in view of the fact that the people of the place themselves offer to subscribe not less than one-third and probably one-half of the labour free, the construction of a breakwater may be a proposition capable of consideration from a financial standpoint. Certainly I cannot speak with any definiteness, as I have no detailed knowledge.

When this petition was presented to me some days ago by the Rev. Mr. Meaden and the Rev. Mr. Winsor, who also called upon the Colonial Secretary, the Hon. Dr. Barnes, as a formal approach to the Government in connection therewith, I requested the Government Engineer to take some early opportunity of visiting Pouch Cove for conference with Mr. Alex C. Grouchy, and Mr. W. B. Easterbrook, the Chairman and Secretary respectively of the Citizens Committee appointed by the residents of the place for the consideration of the breakwater problem. Mr. Hall will make a tentative survey, so that some general idea may be secured as to what can be done under the circumstances and what would be the cost of the construction of a breakwater which would be of a permanent character and of practical value to the town.

I must frankly admit that I fear that the cost will be greater than it would be possible for funds to be secured so far as this year is concerned. The Harbour is open to the Atlantic; an enormous sea rolls in, and while I understand from Mr. Hall's conversation with me in connection with the matter some years ago, there is a solid rock ledge which

might form the basis of a breakwater, yet the structure thereon would have to be as solid as the rock itself to withstand the impact of the waves in stormy weather and under tidal conditions. This is a matter which I should be glad to have looked into from the standpoint of practical business, but can venture no opinion whatever until after the completion of such preliminary survey as may be necessary to give some general indication as to the ultimate cost.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by the honorable member for St. John's East (Extern). Looking at the matter purely from a business point of view, I think it would be a good investment for the Government to have a breakwater built at Pouch Cove. The cost would not bear heavily on the resources of the Government, and by giving the people of Pouch Cove ten weeks longer fishing each year than they have up to the present, would mean an increased catch of six thousand quintals per year, and this increased earning power would naturally mean an increased revenue for the Government. For that reason I look upon the outlay in this connection more as an investment than an expenditure, and it would be sound policy on the part of the Government to give the prayer of this petition their very earliest and earnest consideration.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker Having been asked by several gentlemen of Pouch Cove to support the prayer of this petition, I have very much pleasure in doing so. One does not want to have much vision to know the dangers that have to be contended with by the fishermen of Pouch Cove,

which is so much exposed to the storms of the Atlantic Ocean, and those of us who have visited Pouch Cove know the difficulties, adversities and hardships that have to be encountered by those fishermen after they do get from the grounds to handle their fish. It has been truly said that the people of Pouch Cove always make excellent fish. I have been often surprised that this is so, because the fishermen have to make so many heaves of the fish before it reaches the stages. In supporting the prayer of this petition, I do so because I believe that this breakwater is absolutely necessary, and I would support anything that would be of benefit to the fishermen of this country at the present time when the price of fish is so low.

Now, Sir, there are two or three places in my district somewhat similarly situated as Pouch Cove and badly in need of a breakwater; particularly is that the case at Lower Island Cove where the conditions are as bad for the handling of fish as at Pouch Cove and where there is dire need for a breakwater, owing to the place being so open to the sea.

The people of Lower Island Cove have been looking for a breakwater for many years past, but without success, and I do trust that the Government will give that serious consideration to this request for a breakwater at Lower Island Cove as they will give to the prayer of the petitioners of Pouch Cove.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS tabled Report of the Board of Liquor Control.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER tabled Report of Government Directors of the International Power & Paper Company, of Newfoundland, Ltd.

Report of the Government Directors of the International Power & Paper Company of Newfoundland, Limited:

March 21st, 1931.

Rt. Hon. Sir R. A. Squires,
Prime Minister,
City.

Dear Sir:

During the year ending December 31st, 1930, there were held ten meetings of Directors, or four more than held for the previous year. As these Directors' Meetings are all held at New York, it is impossible for your Government representatives on the Board to be present at each one.

The representative of the British Treasury whose interest in the International Power and Paper Company is similar to that of the Newfoundland Government, attends one meeting in each year, and Mr. E. J. Godden, Newfoundland Government Director, arranges his annual business visit to the United States so as to be present at the same time as the representative of the British Treasury at this particular meeting, which is considered the most important of the year. A condensed report of all other Directors' meetings is on hand.

Herewith is submitted copy of the Company's report of assets and liabilities as at December 31st, 1929, which is in accordance with the Guarantee Agreement of June 1923, made between the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company and the Newfoundland Government, as amended by a subsequent Agreement with the International Power & Paper Company of Newfoundland, Limited, and which shows that the Net Liquid Assets of the Company greatly exceed \$500,000.00 as provisionally agreed. The report for the year 1930 will be available shortly.

All insurable property specifically mortgaged by the "A & B" Trust Deeds respectively is fully insured against loss by fire.

The policy of the Company is progressive, and the attached letter signed by the principal Directors is very informative, particularly as regards future extension.

The employment situation is at all times a difficult one. There were eighty-three less on the payroll at the close of 1930 than at the close of 1929. Since assuming office, your Directors have stressed on all occasions the desirability of employing local men wherever possible, with the result that whereas about two hundred outsiders were on the payroll, the number is now brought down to ninety-nine.

Yours truly,

(Sgd) EDWIN J. GODDEN,
J. H. SCAMMELL.

Ridell, Stead, Graham & Hutchison,
Chartered Accountants,
460 St. Francois Xavier St.,
Montreal,
28th March, 1930.

In accordance with the provisions of the Guarantee Agreement, dated 9th June, 1923, and made between the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company, Limited, Sir W. C. Armstrong Whitworth & Company, Limited, and the Agreement with the International Power & Paper Company of Newfoundland, Limited, we certify that the Liquid Assets and Current Trade Liabilities of the International Power & Paper Company of Newfoundland Limited, and Subsidiary Company, according to the Books of the two Companies as at 31st December, 1929, were as follows:

Current Assets	
Newsprint in Warehouse	\$2,522,943.36
Pulpwood and Felled Timber, including advances to Contractors	2,004,009.13
General Stores and Supplies	1,485,545.15
Accounts Receivable, less Reserves	1,641,314.54
Cash on Hand and in Bank	116,376.07
	<hr/>
	\$7,770,188.25
	<hr/>

Current Liabilities	
Sundry Creditors, Accrued Wages, Int., etc.	1,424,774.81
Notes and Accounts Payable to International Paper Company and Allied Companies	2,982,086.37
	<hr/>
	\$4,406,861.18
	<hr/>
Net Liquid Assets	\$3,363,327.07

Having examined the Books, Accounts and Documents of the International Power and Paper Company of Newfoundland, Limited, and Subsidiary Company, and having received all the information and explanations required by us, we further certify that the Net Liquid Assets as at December 31st, 1929, were in excess of \$500,000.00.

(Sgd) RIDELL, STEAD, GRAHAM & HUTCHISON.

November 13, 1929.

To the Board of Directors,
I. P. & P. Co. of Nfld., Ltd.
New York City.

Gentlemen:

In accordance with the request of the Board, we have the following recommendation to make as to the

Company's policy in the purchase of timberlands.

The purchase of timberlands is a capital investment, the annual charges upon which the mill must carry and which constitute a yearly reduction from profits. It should, therefore, be the policy of the Company to own only such amount of timberlands as is necessary to insure a sustained yield to support the needs of the Company.

The present holdings should give a sustained yield sufficient to supply the Corner Brook Mill at its present size. The Company, therefore, would not be warranted in purchasing further lands for the Corner Brook Mill at its present size, unless some small amount of timber was offered at a sufficiently low price to make the carrying charge small, or unless the Company had the opportunity to acquire at low cost some block favourably situated to the Mill or necessary to consolidate the present holdings. Such purchases should be minor and would be desirable as a protection against possible loss from fire, insects or blowdown.

The Company should complete the construction of two more paper machines as soon as practicable. The addition of two more machines, adding 50% to the production of the mill, will increase the Company's profits, particularly through reduction of fixed charges, inasmuch as many of the facilities for additional machines are already installed, particularly power. Also, the possibility should not be lost sight of that in the not too distant future it may be advisable to bring the Mill up even to an 8-machine basis.

Eventually, therefore, the Company must add to its timber holdings by about 50% (with the possibility that it might be advisable to add 100%) and while the present holdings would pro-

vide sufficient wood for many years to come, additional timberlands should be acquired when they can be purchased on reasonable terms, up to the amount necessary to provide for the Company's needs including the extension on a sustained yield basis. Such acquisitions should be made gradually and only after the consideration of the effect of the carrying charges on the earnings during the period between acquisition of the lands and operation of the new machines.

(Sgd.) N. C. HEAD
JOHN F. ROLLINS
E. A. CHARLTON
JOHN H. HIRMAN

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY
tabled Report of Operations of Newfoundland Railway for the year ending June 30th, 1930.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the following telegram I have just received from the North Sydney Board of Trade.

North Sydney, N. S.,
March 25th.

Sir Richard Squires,
Prime Minister of Nfld.,
St. John's, Nfld.

This Board, on behalf of the residents of North Sydney, begs to express its sympathy to the people of Newfoundland in their recent bereavement over the unfortunate sealing disaster and also wish to express its appreciation of the information broadcast by your Minister of Marine which was of especial interest to friends and relatives of your people residing in North Sydney.

N. SYDNEY BOARD OF TRADE.

I desire to express the appreciation of the Government and Opposition and I will take the earliest opportunity of sending a suitable reply.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER presented the following cable from Mr. David Cheever, of Boston, Mass:

Boston, Mass,
March 25th, 1931.

Sir Richard Squires,
St. John's.

Am placing Royal Bank of Canada, St. John's, One Thousand Dollars from Mrs. Sargent and other members family to be expended at your discretion for relief Viking disaster.

DAVID CHEEVER,
193 Marlboro St. Boston.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

In relation to my question No. 25, to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House all correspondence relative to sum of Fifteen Million Dollars referred to in his speech made on March 11th, the Prime Minister in his reply, stated that he had applied to Mr. C. O'N. Conroy for permission to lay on the table of the House his letter and memorandum.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is correct. I asked Mr. Conroy, and his letter and memorandum will be tabled tomorrow.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, before replying to any further questions asked by members of the Opposition, I would like to refer to the manner in which the answers to the questions are published in the papers of the Opposition. I refer particularly to a question asked by Mr. Puddester in connection with increases and new appointments in the Department of which I happen to be in charge.

The question was properly answered by me, but not properly published in the Daily News, and the publication as it appeared would convey to those reading it that all the names listed were new appointments.

In the question answered, the names of the gentlemen who received those appointments were given, but the names of the men whom they succeeded were left out, deliberately; and, Mr. Speaker, before I answer any more questions, I want the answer to this question published properly.

MR. PUDDESTER.—That will be done.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—But, Mr. Speaker, I want to see the members opposite mean what they say. Mr. Puddester is by accident a member of the firm that publishes this paper. He asked this question and the answer was not put in the paper as it was answered, and in justice to the Department and myself I am not going to answer any more questions until this is done, as I think that it was deliberately misrepresented by the editor of that paper.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Speaker, that is an absurd position to take. This House is not responsible for the Daily News or the Evening Telegram. I think the Hon. member should supply the answers to any questions asked.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—

In reply to the honorable member, I would say that I don't want these answers misrepresented; I won't stand for it. One of the members of the Opposition is a member of the staff of this paper. This information was given to this paper by the member of the Opposition, and not I am sure by the Clerk of the House. I contend that if I give information and it is published, it should be published as it is given.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I gave the question to the paper and I will explain how it happened that these names were left out. Everything was upset with the news of the tragedy and the night boss came into me and asked how he was going to set it and I told him to leave out the names and the dates and set it double column. I will undertake to have it published properly, and I assure the honorable member that this was how it happened that it was cut out. I will have it published, and I think he will accept my word that this was what happened.

MR. EMERSON.—I take it that it is the privilege of the members to ask for any information they desire and the Minister has to give it, no matter if it is misrepresented. The questions are for the information of the whole House, as much for the information of the members of the Government as for the members of the Opposition, and the Minister has no right to lay down that rule. He has no power to do so. The business of this House must go on; that is why we ask these questions and if these questions are not an-

swered, the business of the House must stop.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

—The Minister's answer is very clear. He will table the answers tomorrow.

MR. EMERSON.—Oh no, he didn't.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

—Mr. Puddester explained how the inaccuracy occurred, and when it is rectified the Minister will table the remainder of the questions tomorrow.

MR. EMERSON.—I don't care if it isn't; the questions have got to be answered.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Does the Minister accept this explanation?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—

—Yes, when the question is properly put in the paper, as you took occasion to put it in wrongly. No one is going to compel me to answer questions if they are not published by the Opposition press as tabled by me in this House.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Speaker, in reference to question No. 56, I would like to say for information of the honorable member that the Minister is not in the House this afternoon, but it will be attended to to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—

Mr. Speaker, with reference to question No. 63, that question is a very difficult one to answer. I told the Hon. member I would not be able to get the answer for many months, but I will get what I can and let him have it as soon as possible.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

—Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I asked the Auditor General to audit the German Reparations Account. This has been done by him, or if not actually completed, it is in course of preparation.

Unless Mr. Quinton, who is himself, a Great War Veteran, considers it would be in the public interest, I would not table the names of the soldiers and sailors who have received payments from this fund, together with the amount received, in the same way as we do not table the names of soldiers and sailors who are receiving pensions or other gratuities, together with the amounts received. If the honorable member personally, or on behalf of the Great War Veterans' Association, or if the President or other Officers of the Association, desires to see the names, or expresses a wish that the names be published, I am entirely agreeable, and would be glad to lay upon the table of the House the full particulars.

My recollection is that in June of last year, when this Legislature was in session, details of account were tabled up to that date. I shall have that answer looked up, recopied for the renewed information of my honorable friend, and have it brought up to date, the matter of the publishing of the names of the soldiers and sailors who have received amounts standing over for further consideration.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 3, entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to Enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 same Bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Cap. 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to External Affairs" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be

read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Address to the King.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, I move that this Committee rise and report its request that it meet a joint Committee from this House and the Legislative Council in this Chamber at a time to be decided upon later.

I think the proper procedure is for a request of this kind to come from this House through that channel.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter referred to them and reported that it was the desire of the Committee that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference of the Committee of the Whole of that Chamber with a Committee of the Whole of this House in this Chamber; the date of such conference having been first agreed upon by the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of this House.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was so ordered.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 26th, 1931.

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

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

The Governor has the hono 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. 7, Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) as set forth in the accompanying certified copy of a Minute of the Honourable Executive Council approved on the 13th of March, 1931.

Government House,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
13th March, 1931.

Certified Copy of Minutes of The Honourable Executive Council Approved By His Excellency the Governor on The 13th of March, 1931.

March 12th, 1931.

Under the provisions of Section 4 of Cap. 7, Consolidated Statutes, "Of the Internal Economy of the Legislature," it was ordered that the following persons be the Commission of Internal Economy of the Legislature, namely:

Hon. President, Legislative Council,
Hon. Sir Tasker Cook, Kt.,
Hon. J. V. O'Dea,
Hon. Speaker, House of Assembly,
Hon. H. M. Mosdell, K.C., and
Hon. P. J. Lewis.
Certified true copy,

(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS,
Deputy Colonial Secretary.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the

residents of Carbonear East, also the motor car owners of Carbonear, requesting the re-construction of a road known as Captain Frank's Lane. The road as it now stands is 12 or 14 feet wide and the petitioners are asking that the land required on one side for widening purposes be purchased. This land amounts to about 5800 feet, and if the road was widened it would be a great benefit to the residents of Carbonear and to the people of Bay de Verde and Heart's Content as well; besides it would be the means of avoiding many accidents to traffic having to use Bennett's Hill. Last year a truck laden with fish capsized coming over this hill caused by the brakes giving out and two men were nearly killed. Previous to that a motor cycle collided with a motor car there with the result that a young man who was on the cycle was badly injured and spent three months in hospital.

I have already spoken to the Government Engineer on the matter. He sent a Surveyor there to examine the place and he thought it was a necessary work to be done. In supporting the prayer of the petition I would like to point out that very soon some people of Carbonear who are out of employment will be applying to the Government for relief and I think it would be far better for the Government to give out work on this road than to give out dole.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I know the locality referred to by the Hon. member for Carbonear very well. Nearly forty years ago when at school—the late Dr. Robinson was the teacher at the time—I first played marbles at the corner there. The road for motor cars does give a much easier grade than the steep process of over the hill.

My information is that the purchase of the lands there would mean an expenditure of \$250 or \$300 and in that situation I hope that with the cooperation of the Government Engineer and the Hon. member for Bay de Verde something will be done in the way of re-conditioning and re-constructing the road complained of.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, having to go over Bennett's Hill on the way to my district during the Summer season I am in a position to say that if this lane was widened and improved by the Highroads Commission it would obviate the necessity of going over the hill as well as be the means of averting accidents. I give the petition my hearty support.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Hr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill relative to the Standardization of certain Vegetables.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in tabling the letter and memorandum of Mr. Chas. O'N. Conroy relating to the Gander Valley proposition as asked for by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and promised him by me at last sitting. The letter and correspondence are as follows:

February 12th, 1930.

The Honourable
The Prime Minister,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

Dear Sir Richard,

I enclose herewith a written statement setting forth the present position of the proposals for the establishment at Indian Bay, B.B., of a 1000-ton-a-day newsprint mill which were recently the subject of discussions between Mr. J. P. Powell and a Committee of Council.

Attached to the statement is a copy (with some minor revisions) of the memorandum already submitted by Mr. Powell for the consideration of Council, showing the amendments in and additions to its charter requested by the Gander Company to enable the project to be carried out.

The statement was prepared and the memorandum revised jointly by counsel for the Hearst organization and myself, and the Hearst representative in charge of the Gander negotiations informs me that the statement correctly represents the attitude of his organization towards the project.

Faithfully yours,
(Sgd) CHAS. O'NEILL CONROY.

General Counsel,
Gander Valley P. & P. Co., Ltd.

MEMORANDUM

Amendments and Additions to existing legislation (1924 Act and 1927 Act) relating to Gander Valley Power and Paper Company Limited requested by the Company.

1. Repeal the 1927 Act, and re-enact the provisions for extension of time contained in Section 2 thereof.

2. Amend Clause 1 of the 1924 Agreement.

(a) by inserting after the word "tributaries" the words "and the waterpowers of all streams flowing into Bonavista Bay from Middle Brook to Indian Bay Brook, both inclusive."

(b) by substituting for the words "drainage area of the Gander River" the words "drainage area of the said River tributaries and streams (hereinafter sometimes called "the drainage area aforesaid.")"

3. Repeal Clause 2 of the 1924 Agreement and substitute the following:—

"The Government hereby undertakes to grant to the Company for the purpose of quarrying and shipping limestone a fee simple grant of 640 acres of land now belonging to and in possession of the Crown and not now under lease or license situated on or near Cobb's Arm, or elsewhere in the vicinity of the site selected for its paper-mill, if so much be available. The Company shall have a period of three years from the date of commencement of actual construction work upon its hydro-electric plant in which to make selection of such land."

4. Strike out Clause 3 of the 1924 Agreement and substitute the following:—

"The Government undertakes to grant to the Company at the price of 30 cents per acre any lands now belonging to or in possession of the Crown and not under lease or license and being situate either within the drainage aforesaid or within a radius of ten miles from (1) the junction of Barry's Brook with the Gander River or (2) the outlet of Indian

Bay First Pond, which lands may be required by the Company in connection with its operations.

- (a) as incident to flowage rights within the drainage area aforesaid, or
- (b) for rights of way for telegraphs, telephones, power transmission lines, cables, pipe lines, railways, tramways or roads, or
- (c) for sites for towns, canals, reservoirs, mills, works, factories, stores or warehouses,

and also so much of the seashore or foreshore and of the public waters and land thereunder situate within the radius aforesaid as may be required by the Company in connection with its operations for wharves, docks, quays, piers, warehouses and other buildings, or shipping facilities. Provided (A) that the quantity of land so granted shall not exceed in the whole ten thousand acres, and (B) that the Government shall not be under obligation to grant any such lands at any time after the 15th day of September, 1940."

5. Amend Clause 4 of the 1924 Agreement

- (a) by substituting for the words "drainage area of the Gander River" the words "drainage as aforesaid."
- (b) by inserting after the words "from the junction of Barry's Brook with the Gander River" the words "or from the outlet of Indian Bay First Pond."

6. Amend Clause 7 of the 1924 Agreement

- (a) by substituting after the words "Gander Bay" the words "and/or Indian Bay."

(b) by substituting for the words "drainage area of the Gander River" the words "drainage area aforesaid."

(c) by inserting after the words "from the junction of Barry's Brook with the Gander River" the words and/or from the outlet of Indian Bay First Pond."

7. Amend Clause 13 of the 1924 Agreement by striking out the words "specification contained in the Railway Contract of 1893" and substituting the words "type and quality of construction of the portion of the Railway replaced," and by adding at the end of the clause the words "The diversion shall be completed and connected within the Main line before the use of the main line is interfered with."

(This is from Clause 12 of the Agreement of 1927.)

8. Strike out Clause 15 of the 1924 Agreement and substitute the following:—

"15. Upon the erection and completion by the Company at Gander Bay or Indian Bay of a paper-mill of a capacity of not less than 500 tons of newsprint per working day, and its operation for a period of six months ,the following provisions shall apply in respect of all Crown timber licenses now held by the Company and all Crown timber licenses in Newfoundland (but not in Labrador) now issued to third parties and hereafter acquired by the Company and all Crown timber licenses in Newfoundland (but not in Labrador) which shall be issued under Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) to the Company, or to third parties and hereafter acquired by the Company namely:

(1) The ninety-nine term of such licenses shall be deemed to commence on the date of the passing of the requisite legislation affecting this amendment, except that in the case of licenses issued thereafter such term shall commence from the date of issue ;

(2) The provisions of Sections 12 and 15 of Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) shall not apply to such licenses, (and so on as in Clause 1, sub-clause (c) of the 1927 Agreement mutatis mutandis).

9. Add a new clause to the 1924 Agreement (to take the place of Clause 6 of the 1927 Agreement) providing for

(a) The construction by the Company for the Government at the rate of \$22,500.00 per mile (including permanent sidings) of a Branch of the Newfoundland Railway from Glenwood to Gander Bay or from Benton to Indian Bay, (according to the site finally selected for the Company's paper-mill), the Government supplying rails and fastenings and providing the right-of-way except where same passes through the Company's lands, in which case the Company will provide it .

(b) The renting by the Railway Commission to the Company of locomotives, cars and other railway equipment for use by the Company in the construction of said Branch and of its own works, at rates to be agreed upon between the Commission and the Company.

(c) Payment for construction of the said Branch to be made in . . .

. . . . bonds of the Colony as each five-mile section is completed, on the same method as that in the Branch Lines Contract of 1909.

(d) The Company to have general control of the operation of the Branch during the construction of the Company's works, and to hand it over to the Railway Commission on the completion of the first (500 ton) unit of its paper-mill in a condition at least equal to that of the other Branch railways. All details (e.g. as to the division of paid freight earnings) to be settled between the Company and the Commission.

(e) The Company to enter into an agreement to furnish ties and bridge and culvert-timber for the maintenance of the Branch during a period of thirty years from the completion of the said Branch at market prices.

(See Section 4 of the 1927 Act.)

(f) Power to be given to the Railway Commission to make transportation agreements with the Company, as provided in Clause 8(b) of the 1927 Agreement.

10. Add a new Clause to the 1924 Agreement providing that when the Company's paper-mill is enlarged to a designed capacity of 1000 tons of newsprint paper per working day the Company shall be entitled to acquire a supply of timber from Labrador, to be used exclusively for manufacture in the said mill, on the following terms:—

(a) The Company to have the right for ten years from the passing of the requisite legislation to survey and select a sufficient area or areas in Labrador to

- give an estimated yield of twenty million cords of pulpwood.
- (b) Such selection to be made (i) on the watersheds of the rivers flowing into the sea between Chateau Bay on the south and Cape Porcupine on the north, or (ii) if the Government is unable by reason of the existence of valid and subsisting timber licenses covering all or any part of the area described in (i) hereof, to give the Company a valid title to the timber selected then upon an area bounded and described as follows, namely: commencing at a point where the 62nd meridian of longitude crosses the Susan River, thence south to the southern watershed boundary of the Hamilton River, thence east along said watershed boundary to a point where it crosses the 59th meridian of longitude, thence North along said 59th meridian of longitude to the shore of Lake Melville and thence along the shores of Lake Melville and Grand Lake and along the River Susan to the point of commencement.
- (c) The survey to be made by the Company at its own expense, and copies of all data acquired to be furnished free to the Department of Agriculture and Mines as and when so acquired.
- (d) The Government to be at liberty to send an experienced forestry engineer with each of the Company's survey parties, for the purpose of verifying the surveys and the estimates of pulpwood. Such engineers to supply their own outfits, but the Company to feed them and move their outfits.
- (e) On completion of its selection the Company to be entitled to a 99-year license of the selected area, subject to the payment of a bonus and a royalty, and to the condition as to the manufacture at the mill in Newfoundland. The bonus to be \$200.00 per square mile, payable in five equal instalments, without interest, the first instalment being payable on the issue of the license. The royalty per cord of pulpwood to be, for the first ten years of the term fifty cents, for the second ten years one dollar, and thereafter one dollar and fifty cents.
11. Provide by appropriate legislation that if the Company secures the underwriting of not less than Thirty-five million dollars nor more than Forty-five million dollars of an issue of First Mortgage six per cent thirty-year Bonds for the establishment of the enterprise the Government will unconditionally guarantee principal and interest of an issue by the Company of Fifteen million dollars fifteen-year Debentures bearing interest at a rate of not exceeding six per cent per annum. The proceeds of sale of such debentures to be used for construction purposes only. A Debenture Reserve of Five million dollars to be created before any dividends are paid on the ordinary shares of the Company.
12. The Government to establish a credit of not exceeding \$ for the Company, as an advance against the proceeds of the guaranteed debentures, for the purpose of facilitating the speedy commencement of the works, including the railway, as was done in the case of the Humber works.
- Gander Valley Power & Paper Company, Limited, hereinafter referred to

as the Gander Company, is a subsidiary at present owned and controlled by Reid Newfoundland Company, Ltd., hereinafter referred to as the Reid Company. The Reid Company has available for the purposes of the Gander Company fee simple and Crown timber bearing lands in Newfoundland, the pulpwood content of which has been ascertained by Mr. James W. Sewall, A.B., consulting forester of Old Town, Maine, to be not less than 11,000,000 cords. The hydro-electric development hereinafter referred to is planned upon extensive surveys made by and under the direction of Mr. H. G. Acres, M. & E.E., D.S.C. of Niagara Falls, Ontario. Mr. Acres reports that this development will produce 80,000 continuous electric horsepower.

The Gander Company formerly contemplated the erection of a paper mill at Gander Bay, the hydro-electric power for which would be secured by damming the Gander River at a point below Glenwood. The capacity of a mill erected at Gander Bay and deriving its power from this source would be limited to about 500 tons per day. Later researches have developed a plan under which the mill will be located at Indian Bay and derive its power from the damming of the waters of Gander Lake and the diversion of the overflow by way of the Benton end of the lake into a canal ending a short distance above Indian Bay. By this plan the capacity of the paper mill can be made not less than 1000 tons per day, or, in other words, not less than 310,000 tons of newsprint paper per year.

Given this nucleus for the development of 1000-ton mill and auxiliary power supply, it is apparent that certain additional things are essential to make the project practicable. These comprise:

1. Amendments to the Gander Company's present charter to enable it to effect the change of location from Gander Bay to Indian Bay.
2. Additional wood reserves for the operation of such a mill—estimated at 20,000,000 cords.
3. Financing, which under existing conditions involves the procuring of a firm contract for purchase of the output of the mill.

The requisite additions and amendment's to the company's charter are given in detail in the accompanying memorandum. These will in the main be found self-explanatory, but the following comments may be helpful:

I. Charter Changes:

- (a) For purpose of clarity, it is proposed to repeal the 1927 statute and incorporate in the statute now requested such elements in the 1927 statute as are still appropriate to the scheme as altered.
- (b) The 1927 Act contemplated the construction by the Government of a branch railway from Glenwood to Gander Bay, a distance of about 33 miles. If the mill is located at Indian Bay, the branch would have to run from Benton to Indian Bay, a distance of about 25 miles. The construction of this railway being an essential preliminary to the construction of the hydro-electric plant and paper mill, the attached memorandum contains a proposal by the Company to build the railway for the Government, payment to be made in bonds of the Colony.
- (c) The other desired changes in the charter relate mainly to

the modifications which are necessarily incidental to the proposed change in site of the mill.

2. Extra Wood Supplies:

By way of addition to the Company's charter, the right is requested to survey and select a sufficient area or areas in Labrador to provide the 20,000,000 cords of pulpwood above referred to.

When this matter was first brought to the attention of the Government, a definite area in Labrador was indicated as being most desirable for the Company's operations. Since that time it has developed that the title of the Colony to the area in question is disputed by persons claiming to be licensees thereof. The Company still desires to make its selection from this area, but, in case the title of the Government thereto is not maintained, an alternative area is indicated in the accompanying memorandum as the Company's second choice. Request is accordingly made that the area first indicated be made available to the Company subject to its right, in the event that the Government's title thereto is not confirmed, to use the alternative area.

3. Financing:

Since the newsprint industry is already suffering from over-production, it is apparent that a prerequisite of any financing of this project is the securing of a firm commitment for the purchase of the output of the proposed mill. Accordingly, the Company has brought this project to the attention of the

Hearst organization, as represented by Newspaper & Magazine Paper Corporation of New York, and by a subsidiary company, Dominion Newsprint Company, Limited, of Montreal. The Hearst organization is the greatest owner of newsprint paper in the world, its annual requirements being about double the output of this proposed mill. The Hearst organization has indicated its interest in the project, but makes the grant of the application now submitted to the Government a condition precedent to its participation in the venture, as it is not interested in a Gander mill of less than 1000 tons daily capacity.

Upon the basis of the reports made by Mr. Acres, as mentioned above, and by Mr. Hardy S. Ferguson, a recognized authority on pulp and paper mill engineering, of 200 Fifth Avenue, New York City, it is apparent that the Company must raise approximately \$60,000,000 for the purpose of completing the project and establishing itself on a proper operating basis. Obviously the bulk of this money must be derived from the sale of First mortgage bonds and second mortgage debentures; the United States market for preference and ordinary shares in a foreign construction project of this kind being at present extremely limited. It is accordingly intended to offer for sale not exceeding \$45,000,000 principal amount of thirty-year first mortgage bonds, bearing interest at not exceeding 6% per annum, and \$15,000,000 aggregate principal amount of fifteen-year second mortgage debentures, bearing interest at not exceeding 6% per annum. The Government guarantee of payment of principal of and interest in these debentures is essential because the Company is re-

liably advised and believes that this security would otherwise be unmarketable under existing conditions. To protect the market for the Colony's loans, it is proposed that these debentures be sold under an express stipulation to the effect that they shall not be offered to the public on a yield basis which is higher than the average yield basis in that market of direct obligations of the Government of Newfoundland outstanding in the hands of the public at the time of offering.

It is impossible accurately to determine in advance upon what basis the first mortgage bonds of the company can be sold, but, since the equity in the company of the Reid Company and of the Hearst organisation will be represented entirely by shares, it is obvious that they will have every incentive to obtain the best possible terms for the senior securities and to sell as small a quantity of them as is possible. Necessary funds not produced by the sale of first mortgage bonds and debentures will have to be provided through the sale of preference shares.

To facilitate the sale of first mortgage bonds and preference shares it is recognized that a substantial bonus of ordinary shares will have to be contributed by the controlling interests.

Subject to the grant of this application by the Government, and subject to the confirmation of the representations which have been made in respect of the potentialities of this project, which representations are as summarily outlined above, the Hearst organization has expressed its willingness to make a serious and bona fide effort to arrange for the sale of the Company's bonds, debentures and preference shares in such amounts and

upon such terms and conditions as will produce the funds required to bring this mill into successful operation. Its efforts in this direction will be predicated on the basis that, if successful, the Hearst organization will forthwith enter into a contract with the Company looking to the purchase of its entire output of newsprint paper, during a period which will not be less than the term of the debentures, at the general annual contract market price of newsprint paper in the United States from time to time prevailing, less three per cent (3%) discount and ocean shipment allowances, but in no event at a price which will be insufficient to provide for the estimated interest and sinking fund requirements of the company.

To ensure that the holders of the Company's bonds and debentures shall at all times enjoy the full security represented by the newsprint purchase contract, the Reid Company has stipulated that it shall be assigned by the Company to the Trustees for the bondholders and debenture holders respectively.

If and when financing of this project has been arranged by the Hearst organization control of the company will pass to it, but the Reid interests will have representation on the Board of Directors.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 3, entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a Contarct with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company,'" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930," 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.

Address in Reply

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne which was delivered two weeks ago from yesterday is now so long ago it is hard to know how to begin the several matters to be discussed. It was the intention of beginning the discussion a day or two after the Speech was delivered but the unfortunate news of the terrible sealing disaster was received and both sides of this House agreed and rightly so that to start discussions and arguments on controversial and contentious matters would be out of place when the dead bodies of the unfortunate victims of the disaster were arriving in St. John's and relatives were mourning their loved ones in all parts of the Island. We all know now the history of the disaster and the sympathy of both sides of this House has been given to those who suffered bereavement in that terrible tragedy. We also passed resolutions of congratulation to those people who did their duty nobly and bravely and did their utmost in that trying ordeal especially to the brave men and to Captain Kean and it would not have been proper unless we had done so.

There is one man whom I have had the privilege of knowing since childhood and that is Wm. G. Johnson whose name stands out in bold letters as an example of courage and duty well and nobly done. As I have stated

before I have known him since childhood and from the days of his youth he has always been a brave and fearless person and plucked his living from the jaws of the great Atlantic either by going to the icefields or fishing from a boat many miles outside Cape St. Francis. When the fishery is over he has secured his living by working in the lumber woods and he stands out today as a man whose duty has been well done. I do not wish in any way to take away credit from the master and crew of the Viking for the wonderful work they have performed but I want to say in this House that I am proud to represent the District from which Mr. Johnson comes and proud to know him and to have his friendship.

We all know of the splendid manner in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries carried out the arrangements and made the plans and give him just credit for his work. There is only one fly in the ointment and I have no doubt that the Minister will explain that defect when the proper time comes. I refer to the sending away of the steamer Sagona as a relief ship with only enough provisions to last her regular crew for fifteen days and if it had not been that the Imogene arrived with succour the tragedy would have been a greater one than it really is.

In the early hours of this morning I read the speech of the Rt. Hon. MacKenzie King, Leader of the Opposition in the Canadian Federal House in criticism of the Speech from March 12th in the Canadian Parliament. He tells them the government was in power for eight months and was subject to censure and I am sure that the gentlemen opposite cannot object to me censuring them considering they have been two and a half years in control of the government of the country.

The government of the day, says Mr. King, although in power only eight months are directly responsible for the conditions of Canada. I shall not be so forceful as MacKenzie King. I will leave that to my Leader when he winds up the debate on the Address in Reply to be as forceful as he likes and to follow in the path of MacKenzie King in his condemnation of the government of Canada. The time honored rule in this House has been for the members of the opposition to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on the honor done them on being appointed to make the proper motion, and 't must not be any exception to the rule. The mover and seconder of the motion acquitted themselves well. They had the advantage of the Leader of the Opposition by having the address before them for some hours at least before they had to speak.

It was an ordeal they had to go through, and I sympathize with them, because I have passed through the mill myself, and I have had quite a knee knock immediately that I started to speak. They made the best of a bad job. They could not say that they approved of what was in the Speech from the Throne and in relation to the things of the country or any hope for the country, because there was absolutely nothing to approve of. The members of the Opposition are supposed, Mr. Speaker, to criticise in a constructive manner the Speech from the Throne, and what the Speech from the Throne contains, but, Sir, it is very hard to speak in a constructive manner when you have nothing to speak of when no legislation is foreshadowed, when no constructive legislation is foreshadowed that will benefit the country as a whole.

It becomes an impossibility for any speaker on the opposition side of the

House to give any constructive criticism because, as I say, there is nothing in the Speech to bring forth constructive criticism. My only quandary is to find out where in the world the members for St. Mary's Bay and White Bay found enough in it for half an hour to defend it at all. I shall very briefly refer to their speeches, and I can well remember the time when I spoke on the other side in their capacity, the capacity in which they found themselves the other day. I was very frightened for a couple of weeks when the members of this side of the House got up to make their speeches in reply, and the late Mr. Warren was down there sitting in an independent seat, and he told me that he would spare me the humiliation of replying to what I had said. It was only a defence of the Government and I was very provocative.

I shall deal as gently as I can with the two honorable gentlemen who spoke the other day, and I trust that whatever is said in the heat of debate, perhaps that we don't mean to say or would be sorry for afterwards, the gentlemen on the other side of the House will take it all in good parts, because we are all human and apt to make mistakes, especially when provoked. I hope it won't come to the point during our session here where it will end in what happened in the Nova Scotia House one day last week —Friday I think it was—when the debate became so hot that they ended up the Budget Debate in a fist fight; so we don't have all the hot times in Newfoundland, they have some up in Nova Scotia and perhaps in the other provinces. They take politics very seriously in the Maritime provinces—just as seriously as we do in Newfoundland.

The Hon. member for St. Mary's, in the course of his review of the

Speech from the Throne, referred to the honors that had recently been bestowed upon certain gentlemen for their extraordinary services in forwarding the cause of Newfoundland for the past number of years, and I could not help but recall the fall of 1928 when the election campaign was on, when members opposite were wont to talk about blue bloods and about lounge lizards, and others who were connected with the opposition. These honors, Sir, were conferred on the blue bloods; they have become blue bloods, I suppose, since 1928, and if it goes much further the next thing you will have is an honour conferred on the man who invented the saying and spoke about it down in the Star Hall, the honorable member for St. John's West and we will all congratulate him on joining the class of blue bloods and lounge lizards. I did not think that we would have to congratulate these gentlemen or any gentlemen on the honors conferred on them in this House after the present government came into power. Honor blue bloods! Honor lounge lizards! And still we have a member of the government who was denouncing blue bloods and denouncing lounge lizards, denouncing all and sundry getting up and congratulating these gentlemen because honors were bestowed on them. When honors come that way—not from His Majesty the King—they are recommended by the Prime Minister.

After he had congratulated the blue bloods on their honor, he gave the present Government, or the present Prime Minister credit for the work that is being carried on today at Corner Brook, the Humber industry. I take no credit from anyone that had anything to do with establishing industries in Newfoundland but in the year 1926 or 1927, if the government

in power at that time had not rescued that industry from the receiver's hands, we would not have had very much industry in Corner Brook today, and Newfoundland would have been called upon to pay the interest and principal on a ten million dollar guarantee given to the bond holders of that company by the government of Newfoundland, because, as it was said at that time, the industry could not be established unless the government of Newfoundland gave a guarantee of \$10,000,000, the Trade Facilities Board of England another \$10,000,000, and I think, the Bank of England another \$5,000,000—\$25,000,000. The amount was going to be the cost of that industry when it was started, but the cost ran up to \$47,000,000 and you had the interest on \$22,000,000 to be provided for, and the profits on the undertaking, on the sales, could not pay the overhead of \$47,000,000; therefore the receiver was to be called in, they would have to liquidate and there would be no industry. For the initiation of that industry at Corner Brook, I give the credit to John P. Powell, who worked incessantly for years and years and got that industry going. For the guarantee of the bonds to the extent of what I have named, I give the credit to the government of that day, and that is where, in my opinion, and in the opinions of others, the sorry mess was made, and the guarantee given at that time must now be followed up by giving every other company coming in to establish an industry the same guarantee or more.

The government of Newfoundland is interested now to the extent of \$10,000,000 on the industry at Corner Brook, and as such they cannot expect another company to come in to establish a \$70,000,000 industry without asking the government to take some share in it, if for nothing else,

to show good faith, so that they won't favour one company and penalize another. The mistake was made in the first instance, and opinion is that that industry would have gone on the Humber if there never had been any guarantee.

Times were depressing in 1921 and 1922 and it would have been better to wait for a year or two and get the industry established without the guarantee because it came to be a nightmare in 1925 and 1926. Hon. members of the Government of 1923 in a general election went over the country preaching that the fishing industry of Newfoundland was no more; we had to establish the mill on the Humber to save Newfoundland. They preached it everywhere.

The Hon. member for Bonavista East if he were sitting in his seat, I could show him where he made the statements in his campaign; where he made it to his Union Councils that the Humber industry had to go on the Humber or Newfoundland was doomed. It was the salvation of Newfoundland that the fisheries were finished. They have not been finished; they did come back some years afterwards to a certain extent, but they are in a bad way again now. The Humber did not save the fisheries, and the Gander won't save the fisheries either. It will be an adjunct to the fisheries, but it will never take the place of the fisheries of Newfoundland. The blunders of erecting those mills, the extravagance and the waste made the Capital Account ran up to \$47,000,000, when \$25,000,000 was the amount supposed to be spent there for the cost of erection. That was the blunder. That was why the Monroe Government had to save the Humber industry from the receiver's hands in 1927.

If the Hon. member for St. Mary's gives the credit to the Prime Minister

of the government of that day for creating that industry, he must certainly ask him to bear any criticisms we may make when we talk of the blunders, the extravagance and the waste in establishing that industry and the fact that the next government that came into power had to rescue the industry from the hands of the receiver. You can choose whichever horn of the dilemma you like.

Talking about the depression in the world to-day, the Hon. member said that it was caused by the high standard of living. The people had dissipated their earnings in high living. That is a fine position for a public man to take, because that is what this House was put in existence for, to raise the standard of living and we are bound, members of the government and members of the opposition, to govern the country so well that the standard of living will be raised and not lowered. That is not a matter of complaint when we know that the standard of living has been high. During the war and the years immediately following, the standard of living was very high, but that did not cause the depression. What does the Hon. member wish us to do? Go back fifty or a hundred years to the days of our grandfathers? Does he want us to get back to the days of meal and molasses. The standard of living is not too high but it is higher than it was. The government is responsible, they are bound to so govern that the standard of living will be raised and we cannot complain that the standard of living conditions brought about the depression. We are living in a modern age and the people of today are anxious to raise their standard of living and we should not complain if it is raised from what it was in the days of our forefathers.

The Hon. member said that all the other industries were only a sideline to the fisheries. I quite agree with him. The value of the fisheries does not amount to quite fifty per cent of the other industries but its benefits are spread along every bit of our coast and we must look out for it and encourage it for I think it is very important, serving as it does, the country all round the coast with the exception of a couple of places like Grand Falls and Corner Brook. The fisheries are the mainstay of the people of the country, the people who work at the fisheries and the people who don't, and not the few industries carried on in other places. "A crash was inevitable," "the standards of living were so high that a crash was inevitable," said he mover of this motion. This is the first time I ever heard anything like that. "The earning power of the people of Canada and Australia and all over the world was reduced because the standard of living had gone too high."

He said that the press of Newfoundland had preached blue ruin. I would like him to show me when the press preached blue ruin, within the last twelve months or so at any rate. I think that the press of this country has given this government a square show. It was the stated policy of the press when the present government first came into power that they would be given a square show so that they could prove that they were keeping faith with the people and I think that the press carried this undertaking into effect. You should not complain as there were many times when the press could have spoken of conditions in Newfoundland when for the sake of the country and the government governing the country we held our peace. You cannot have any complaint of the criticisms of the press. You have had

a free hand and did as you pleased and you are going to have a free hand. I wish the same thing had happened when I was on the opposite side of the House and some of the members opposite now were on this side.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—We had no press.

MR. PUDDESTER—There was the Advocate and Toby B. Your pictures were in it every week.

What did you say, "Innocents Abroad?" I guess you will admit that it is harder to govern now that you are in the government. But do I infer that this was done for political purposes? Do I infer that all the criticisms made on this side of the House are made for political purposes? There was never a government that had such nasty propoganda used against it as the Monroe Government had from 1925 to 1928 and if the Hon. member thinks that there was something said in the press that shouldn't be said he should be tickled to death because when he is on this side of the House, as he will be some day, he will say things differently.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—We had no press.

MR. PUDDESTER—You are unduly sensitive, I was not speaking to you, you have been given a free hand for two and a half years so now you might give me the same for two hours to say what I like.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—You know I am delighted to hear you.

MR. PUDDESTER—Oh, I can recall the actions of the Hon. member on this side of the House. There was nothing but a weekly stream of abuse every time his paper came out and

I resent any member saying what is not true as regards the press that I am connected with for we always gave you a square show and are going to give you a square show. "Damaging to our credit abroad." I thought that Newfoundland newspapers never went anywhere.

As regards the standardization of fish, there was very little said in the Speech from the Throne about it. We thought that there was going to be paragraphs about fish because the standardization of anything else is not worth much if you leave out the standardization of fish, and any reference to it is done in a couple of lines.

(Reads)

The Hon. member took up that question and talked about the standardization of fish. I am not criticizing him as I agree with most of what he said. I lived in an outport for the first twenty years of my life and caught and cured fish myself. Some people would like to see the standardization take place when the fish is being brought from the fisherman. I agree with that in some measure but I want to see the standardization of fish take place just before it goes through the Narrows to the market. People blame this one and that one and the fishermen for making bad fish. It is not always the fault of the fishermen. It doesn't pay the fisherman to make bad fish, he wants to make good fish. People who talk so much about how fish should be made and criticise the fish that is made, never had the experience themselves of curing a tom-cod and if they had to cure it themselves they would not talk so glibly. When that Bill comes before the House I shall have more to say than at present.

Standardization is alright but it should not be made on the culling board. What we need are large curing plants. It is impossible to cure fish properly when five men are using the one stage and flake. What happens? I wash my fish one fine day when there is a nice south-westerly wind blowing, the next day some other man brings up his fish and the rain comes down or the sun comes out and splits it and its all rotten and no good. And the poor women have to go curing the fish because the men must go out and catch more. And when the fish goes out through the Narrows No. 2 goes as No. 1. and it has to take its chance.

If the Government want to take credit for the standardization of the fishery let them do so but if the Government is going to play at politics with the standardization of the fishery then let me tell them they are not the only ones who can play at politics and let them remember in dealing with it they are using a two edged sword and if they are going to take the credit which may come to them then they must be prepared to accept any blame and if there is any credit due them let them take it; the public usually knows who to give credit to without any boasting on the part of the Government being necessary.

The Hon. member for St. Mary's has referred to the dog-fish menace and I quite agree with him that everything that can should be done to exterminate this pest or it will in time exterminate the fishery. I remember some thirty years ago when I was catching fish even then we were troubled with this pest, though in these times it was only small but even then you would put down your lines in the evening and the following morning find them stripped and lay them down again only to have them

stripped again. It is the duty of the Government to do everything in their power to exterminate the pest.

The Hon. member for White Bay told you in his speech of the depression in Russia and other countries. Well, I do not blame the Hon. member for this remark.

And, Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of speeches may I make the suggestion that in future we follow the example of Parliaments in other Countries; that the House open on a Thursday, the Speech from the Throne is read and the House is then adjourned until the following Monday. This would afford the Leader of the Opposition opportunity to prepare and he could come into the House the following Monday fortified with facts and figures.

It is not fair to expect the Leader of the Opposition to reply to a speech which he has had no chance of hearing before and for which he has not had time to prepare a speech. Nor is it fair to expect the Prime Minister to make a reply. If we followed the practice of other parliaments the members would be able to prepare and deliver themselves of speeches on the subject under discussion that their friends and the public could congratulate them on.

I speak from experience. I have attended the Parliaments in Canada and England and the House of Lords in England and I may say that in passing, I do not think the members of these Houses should be credited with any more intelligence than the members of our own House.

And, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to suggest while I am on the subject that when the Finance Minister brings down the Budget the Speech be made

and discussed in the House and not in Committee. I should like you to look up that point Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—What has the practice been in the past?

MR. PUDDESTER—The House has gone into a Committee of the Whole to deliver the Budget.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—I hope that practice is correct as I should enjoy joining in the discussion and not stay here in the Chair.

MR. PUDDESTER—Oh, you'll be comfortable there in the Chair.

The Prime Minister in replying, delivered himself of a speech of fifteen minutes during which he dealt with one question only, that is when he stated there was no depression in the country, but the Prime Minister has tried to prove this before and face to face with the members he was forced to admit that there was a stringency and God knows the difference between depression and stringency is very small; but why if there is no depression was it necessary for the government last October, yes, and last September, when the Prime Minister was out of the country, to take steps to relieve the unemployment situation and authorizing a loan of a million dollars for that purpose.

Now it is just as well for us to face the music. Other countries have faced the music and I have before me now a copy of the speech delivered by MacKenzie King, Leader of the Opposition, in the Canadian House of Commons, who spoke four and a half hours in dealing with the record of the Bennett Government. He did not mince matters at all. He simply told the Government what they were up against and he told them not to blame other countries for it either; but

when you talk about depression in Newfoundland the Government are very quick to say that depression is all over the world. Certainly it is, but our point is that it should not be so great as it is in Newfoundland, and if we had a Government in this country who were not looking out for number one and giving the people of the country a square deal and not looking out solely for themselves we would not have the serious depression in evidence that exists today, and when I get down to the Auditor General's Report I propose to tell this country some things they do not know at the present time. Mr. MacKenzie King was not afraid to tell the people of Canada how much depression and poverty was there and it is just as well for the Government of this country to act in similar fashion and face the music. Mr. King, in dealing with unemployment and depression, says:

(Reads)

That applies to us too. Our Government, after all their promises of Ganders, Geese, and all the rest of them have not ended unemployment and distress. They have not put a "Gang on the Gander" and I am just as free on this side of the House to tell the Government that as was MacKenzie King to tell the Government of Canada. The Government there has been in power for eight months only, but we have a Government which has been in power for two and a half years. Yet conditions are very much worse in Newfoundland today than they were in 1928. Something similar to the Speech from the Throne in Canada delivered by His Excellency the Administrator was put in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor in Newfoundland.

Here is what MacKenzie King says on the matter:

(Reads)

These are pretty strong words although conditions in Canada, I venture to say, are not half as bad as they are in Newfoundland; but the Prime Minister of Canada saw the deluge coming in September last and called the House together and voted twenty million dollars to relieve unemployment and that twenty millions was added to considerably by the Provincial Governments and Municipalities. The result was that two hundred thousand men were put to work on the 1st of October and are working there at the present time.

The Prime Minister of Canada would not go to the Imperial Conference until Parliament had met and voted money to give work and to alleviate the sufferings and privation of his people. But what did our Government do? They put lots of men to work on the highroads all the Summer, and in the month of October after voting one million dollars to end unemployment they turned all the men off the highroads and then they resorted to the practice of giving out dole. And this notwithstanding the fact that this same government told the country in 1928 that dole was degradation and that work was independence. Mr. MacKenzie King further says in his criticism:

(Reads)

I say that too, and our government, after being in power for two and a half years without doing anything for the people, cannot complain if from this time forward, so far as the Opposition is concerned in dealing with their sins of omission and commission, we give them no quarter. The Prime Minister here on opening day drew a comparison with other countries and told us what the people of Newfound-

land had. He said that they had twenty seven million dollars in the Savings Bank; that they owned their own homes, gardens and cabbage patches, etc.; that they carried fifty million dollars in life insurance and that there was one and a half million dollars paid in life insurance premiums last year. There are two and a half million men unemployed in England today and there are six hundred men in England worth more than one million pounds each. Is not this comparison just as good as the Prime Minister's.

It is all very well for the Prime Minister to say that the people of Newfoundland had twenty seven million dollars in the Saving Bank, but he did not say whose money it was. What fisherman in Newfoundland today who is looking for the bare necessities of life can boast of a bank account? I am sure the men who were looking for dole this winter do not, and the men who do own the twenty seven millions are not going to open their purse strings and give it out to those less fortunately situated than they are. I have heard that statement of the Prime Minister's before but it is no criterion of conditions as they actually are.

There is not one in a thousand of the people who have money in the Banks looking to be sustained by Government relief, but there are thousands of fishermen and other workless men in Newfoundland today who are looking for poor relief for themselves and their families, and, if there were five times as much money in the Saving Bank, it would not make any difference to the poor mortals who did not make more than one or two hundred dollars each out of last Summer's fishery to keep their families for twelve months.

I know of people in my own district who shipped to planters last Summer and did not clear more than \$170 or \$180 and out of that amount of money were called upon to feed themselves and their families until they ship again this Spring.

Now what good is it going to do that class of fishermen to know that his neighbor got \$1,000 in the Saving Bank and if I have an amount of money in the Saving Bank what good is that to my friend Mr. Emerson, who is a starving lawyer? No, Sir, not a bit in the world, and when that statement is made by the Prime Minister it is done for buoying up the crowd, keeping up their spirits, but that soap bubble will burst and when it does the whole thing will come down with a bang, and the Colonial Secretary well knows that burst will happen by the end of June next when the Government will be called upon to pay the bills. The Government are not going to get away with the small amount of money they thought they were, and if they think they are they are living in a "fool's paradise."

The Relieving Officers in the outports have had to feed the people, hence the Government are not going to have an easy time of it with regard to voting money to meet the bills. I asked a question today in the House about that very same thing and I trust that the Commissioner of Public Charities will go through his bills and give us a full statement as to what is not paid, because I will guarantee you, Sir,—and I have the proof of my statement in the Auditor General's Report—that you will be voting \$20,000 each month between now and next September to pay the bills for the able-bodied pauper relief given out in the Winter of 1931. That went on last year and it is going to go on

again this year because there is more poverty in the outports this year than has been experienced in Newfoundland for the past forty years.

It stands to reason that conditions are bad because the fishermen got a very poor price for their fish. The people in my district, through no fault of their own, made bad sh and got only \$2.75 a quintal for it. It was an exceptionally warm Summer and the fish split in pieces and no cull or standardization could have saved it. Hence the fishermen were unable to pay their merchants for supplies and are now hundreds of dollars in debt. But I know what is keeping them alive this Winter and the Government know too. Why did not the Government take the advice of the Auditor General, as contained in his Report, and come down like men and have the money voted for relief in the House instead of voting \$20,000 each month by Minute-of-Council.

The Government say we are only raising the cry of "Wolf! Wolf" But I say here now, that you'll find that wolf at your very door before June is out, and I'll tell you why. It's because our earning power is five million dollars less this year than it was in 1929. This year the merchants have not been paid and next year the merchants will not be able to supply, and still in the face of that people say there is no depression and that the Opposition is merely persecuting the Ministers of the Government. We are told again that there is over twenty seven million dollars in the Saving Banks of the country, but as I said before, there is little comfort in that to the starving man.

What comfort is it to the man on dole to know that his next door neighbor has a couple or three thousand dollars in the Saving Bank?

The only way it can do any good to him is for the Government to pass an Act empowering it to seize the millions in the Saving Banks and distribute them amongst the poor of the country, and to seize and apply the million dollars which is paid in life insurance premiums to poor relief. If they are courageous in one thing let them be courageous in another. As it is those millions in the Saving Banks are absolutely no good to the poor mortals who are looking for dole. It has no effect on those who have to run to the Relieving Officer looking for the means to keep body and soul together. If propaganda were needed that's the best we on this side of the House could look for as everybody knows it is not true.

There's another thing I want to deal with and that is the Prime Minister's speech on the opening day of the session when he said he would tell the House why the Gander Deal had not been completed. The reason he said that was because the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars for themselves. Now Mr. Conroy's letter which is tabled today says that Reids didn't want more than 40% of fifteen million dollars. Everyone knows that the Reids will require some money for their outlay of years, and who can blame them. They have been spending money steadily now for over five years trying to swing the proposition. A fabulous sum has been spent by them in the making of maps alone. They have expended money lavishly. They have spent all they had, and have borrowed more than a million dollars from Mr. Butler besides and their business is now in the hands of receivers.

Who can blame them now when they seek to recover what they have expended? For years and years some

of their employees have gone without any salary whatsoever, and Mr. Conroy's letter says that what they are looking for now is not forty per cent of fifteen million dollars. With the private deal between the Hearsts and the Reids we are not concerned, but we are concerned whether the Gander Deal does go through or not, and last year I say that deal was as near completion as it was possible to be. But as I was not in the country at the time I will leave it to my Hon. Leader to deal with what happened last year as he is well able to do. But I do say this, that last year a deal near completion was placed before the Government and instead of turning it down they had a right to follow it up, and try and put through a deal in the best interests of the country. Is this what happened? There was some opposition in the Government itself because a guarantee of fifteen million dollars was requested. That is far different from what the Prime Minister said; he said the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars for themselves and he would not table the correspondence dealing with these negotiations.

It's true a guarantee was asked for but what was the difference of guaranteeing for the Gander fifteen million dollars on a seventy million dollar expenditure and guaranteeing for the Humber ten million dollars on twenty five million expenditure? Ten million dollars was guaranteed the Humber in 1923 on an expenditure of twenty five millions, and now in 1930 fifteen million cannot be guaranteed on a seventy five million expenditure. What's the reason for this? It is because the Prime Minister realises his mistake after eight years. Other members of the Government were opposed to the Gander Deal because they thought it would hinder the sale of Labrador as a whole. I know of one

member in particular, at any rate, who was not in favour of the deal because he held that opinion.

The sale of Labrador as a whole, in my opinion is an utter impossibility, and the only way to secure development of it is by having its raw material taken from there and manufactured in this country. The only way that we will ever get any value from the Labrador, is to bring the wood and pulp from there and turn out the finished product from mills in Newfoundland. No mills will ever be erected on the Labrador itself. No one is ever going to put up a thousand ton a day mill on the Labrador where there is not all the year round shipping facilities. The thing in my mind is an utter impossibility. But we can develop the Labrador by erecting mills in Newfoundland, and not by selling it as a whole. Those who were afraid that the Gander Deal would hinder the sale of the Labrador were those whom Mr. de Champlain had obviously pulled the wool over their eyes—a speculator who would sell Newfoundland itself if he thought it would do him any good—and he seems to have taken in some members of the government with his rosy schemes.

I do say, Mr. Speaker, that that contract should have been finalized last year. It takes two to make a bargain, and I think that if negotiations had been pursued with vigour last year, terms could have been arrived at, and we would have a mill being erected on the Gander this year, and I say further that the government are entirely at fault in letting the opportunity slip. They knew when the business was going on that the Hearsts interest had to get paper from a proposed new mill before November, 1933, and if the mill was not erected in that time they would not be interested in the proposition.

Therefore when there was no hope of a contract with this Government in 1930 Hearst went to Canada and tried to make a deal with the Canada Power and Paper Company. He made a tentative agreement with the Canada Power and Paper Company, whose mills were operating last year at only 70% of their capacity, so that all they had to do was to speed up their production to 90% capacity to satisfy Hearst.

I firmly believe that if negotiations had been entered into in the proper manner an agreement would have been arrived at, and this year instead of having 4,000 men employed on the Highroads, we would have them working on the Gander.

In 1928 when he went to the country the Prime Minister told the people of the country that he had the Gander proposition practically in his pocket. Now he and members who told their districts this will have to face the facts because they will surely have to tell their people why there is no Gander.

I was told by a man from Bay d'Espoir that when the representative of that District got the Bay d'Espoir vote they firmly believed that a mill would be erected up there as promised. The Prime Minister told the people in his manifesto that he then had a mill ready to start on the South West Coast. Two and a half years have now passed since the manifesto was published and there have been no mills erected either on the South West Coast or on the Gander, nor is there any sign of one to be erected in the near future, I sincerely hope there will be. However, we will see. I am very much afraid that the promoters did not know the type of people they were dealing with.

I now come to what might be termed a funny paragraph and will deal with the Speech from the Throne and criticise it if I may. The part I refer to is "The Co-operation of the Empire Marketing Board of London with the Government of this Colony as arranged by my Prime Minister."

Nothing apparently happens in English or Newfoundland politics that the Prime Minister does not take credit for starting. I was amused during the Viking Disaster when the Prime Minister tried to take all the credit from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the work done in that connection and it was only when the Minister demanded that the work and messages be sent through his department that he succeeded in getting the credit and of keeping it from the Prime Minister who really did nothing in connection with it.

The Empire Marketing Board distinctly states they were waiting until the Prime Minister arrived, not to consult him about their operations, but inform him just how much money they were willing to spend in this country. I believe that if there were a proposition started in the moon and the rays of it reached down to Newfoundland that the Prime Minister would try to take the credit for starting it, but he should be aware that Newfoundlanders know that type of person and are wise enough to only give credit where credit is due. They are quick to recognize an imposter.

Another instance of his trying to take credit is where he tries to credit himself with the programme of re-railing the railroad. It was started by the Monroe Government, and three sections of the roadbed were done by them. A diversion of the railway in order that the bad and difficult parts of the railway at the

Gaff Topsails be avoided was planned and started by the Monroe Government and was being helped by the A.N.D. Co. of Grand Falls, but what happened to it when the present antagonistic government came into power? It could not come to any agreement or make any satisfactory arrangements with the Companies interested, with the result that we are still going over the Topsails, at a great loss to the country and at a great disadvantage and inconvenience to the travelling community and the money that was already expended is wasted.

The manner of electing representatives by the Secret Ballot came into force in 1887, and I am surprised that he does not claim the credit for that. It was brought in by what was then termed the Tory Government, which was in power between 1885 and 1889 and I first heard it spoken of when I was a small boy that Sir Robert Bond introduced the Ballot Act. It must have been Sir Richard Squires.

I will now read for you the section of the Speech from the Throne dealing with the Imperial Conference:

"In the autumn of last year my Prime Minister had the privilege of meeting the Ministers of the Homeland and the Ministers from the other Dominions at the Imperial Conference held in London. Constitutional and economic questions of grave importance affecting the whole Empire passed under review. The genius of the British race in government is shown in their powers of adaptability to circumstances as they arise. The discussion of the intricate and often vexatious problems, the meetings of Ministers face to face around the Conference Board, and the more intimate realization of the difficulties confronting the respective Dominions

of this great Empire, will tend to a larger sympathy between the component members of the Empire, and lay foundation stones upon which will be builded a greater and more lasting structure. It gives me pleasure to state that this Dominion was honored when His Majesty the King appointed the Prime Minister as a member of his Privy Council."

Our Prime Minister when he spoke regarding the Imperial Conference informed us that in his opinion it was a great success and that wonderful things had been accomplished. Now I would ask you to listen to what the Hon. MacKenzie King has to say on the Imperial Conference, and I want you to remember that he is addressing himself to a country that has nine millions of people. He says that the Imperial Conference was a fiasco.

The Prime Minister went as representing Newfoundland and a Liberal Government. He met a Labor Government. Liberal representatives came up from Australia and New Zealand and out of the whole lot of representatives there was only one Tory representative, and he was the representative of Canada.

The opinion of the Canadian statesman was as I said before, that the Conference was a fiasco. He claims that it did nothing for any of the Dominions except confirm what was done in 1926. Sending our representative to the Imperial Conference cost this country between fifteen and twenty thousand dollars in expense, despite the fact that the British Government paid the expenses of the delegates from this and other countries. The Prime Minister drew the sum of \$5,346.00 for his own expenses from the treasury of this country, and \$2,749.00 for expense of his chief clerk and \$1,500.00 for the expenses of his secretary.

The result of the Conference is that we are asked to enter into Dominion Status. My great-grandfather, grandfather and father have lived under Colonial Status and the protection of the Motherland and the treatment received was always of the best and is good enough for me.

I think we have received fair treatment from the Old Country. Is it because Mr. Herzog wants to be free from England, free to secede when he wants to, that we should want to follow his example; we, the Oldest Colony in the British Empire, the fairest gem in the British Crown, why should we follow Mr. Herzog. These are my sentiments. I did not mean to express them until the Bill came before the House, but there they are. I don't want Newfoundland to secede from the British crown. The old flag that has braved the battle and the breeze for so long is good enough for me I don't want to appear an ultra patriot or ultra-British, but I can't help saying this. I don't want to see it happen. I wouldn't mind if we were a country with a population of ten million people, but a country with a quarter of one million people and a hundred million dollar debt, to be thrown on our own resources, to have nothing more to do with Great Britain, and to be told 'to' paddle our own canoe." If we require to be defended from invasion we will have to build a navy to defend ourselves, we would get no help from the Mother Country, we would be thrown absolutely on our own resources.

The statesmen who attended the 1926 Conference heard Mr. Balfour when he told them that if they wanted their freedom, here it is, he had the papers all ready and would move to nullify the Colonial Validity Act so that you have the right to secede

and our Prime Minister said he didn't want to secede. There is a Conference being held in Canada in April and I don't think that Mr. Bennett will get the provinces to agree to change the British North America Act to allow them to secede. Now everybody knows my feelings on the matter and I am prepared to wait for the wonderful secret session that we are going to have, when I will express my view further.

When the present Minister of Finance and Customs was on this side of the House he demanded, without let up, that the Finance Minister of the time put in his Budget the deficits of the Railway and have the payrolls passed here. He was very anxious to have that done. He promised to do it and now he has brought down two Budgets and not yet have the deficits of the Railway appeared therein. If the deficit had appeared last year we would have a deficit for the country of \$235,000, but by the manipulation of current account into capital account, and other ways that the Finance Ministers and Auditor Generals have of turning one account into another, the Minister showed a surplus of \$144,000, but there was a Railway deficit of \$385,000, or a quarter of a million deficit if the Railway deficit were added to the Budget. What would have happened if the income tax and the business profits tax had not gone on? There was \$930,000 received from the Business Profits Tax and Income Tax last year. If this had not gone on there would have been a deficit of a million dollars. The Business Profits Tax is paid in the first instance by the business men, but it is passed on by them to the consumer, and the consumer pays as he always does. There was a man into my office today talking to me in connection with the proposed taxation on

galvanised buckets. He told me a few things that opened my eyes. He told me of the amount of money business people get over and above their costs and expenses. He said he was not in Newfoundland very long and he was not going to stay very much longer. The difference between the cost and the selling price is too great, and it is the consumer who is paying.

Every year the government came into power the Finance Minister increased the estimates and expenditure. Last year the expenditure was increased by nearly \$400,000. In 1929 the Revenue was \$10,025,649.06 and the expenditure was \$11,132,822.43, or the expenditure was increased \$391,897.40. In 1930 the revenue was \$11,470,541.41 and the expenditure was \$11,461,773.15, or the expenditure was increased \$328,951.00. In the two years the expenditure was increased, and for which the people must pay \$720,848.40. If the expenditure had not been increased the people need not have been taxed; it would come out a nearly even sheet.

MR. SKANES.—Didn't he balance his Budget?

MR. PUDDESTER.—I told you how he balanced his Budget. Why didn't you listen; if you can't take it in I can't help it. Now, the Customs revenue is going down; it was predicted both in this House and the Upper House that the revenue was going down, and very seriously going down, and there are none who know it better than some of the members of this House. We either have to decrease expenditure, or increase the revenue; there is no other way out if the Minister is to balance his Budget. I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister a speech delivered in reply to the Speech from the Throne in another place. This is a very serious

situation and I think it should be drawn to the attention of the Colonial Secretary. This is an extract from the speech of the mover of the Address in another place.

(reads)

Isn't that a terrible situation? It is a very serious statement to be made by a member of another House. I think the Government should take it up. I am of opinion that the Finance Minister of the Monroe Government did not go half far enough, he should have gone a great deal farther than he did; and I say to this Government, your duty is clear, even if it may hurt your friends or those who contributed to your campaign funds. If that state of affairs is continued next year, we shall have something more to say about it.

I advise you, political office-holders, to be in reality holders of offices, not figureheads. I tell you you must go down to your offices and be bosses, and not let your deputies run you, and you must keep a tight hand on the purse-strings. This sort of thing must be stopped, it can't go on; it's just as well to face it now. It's no use in putting it off. Remember Micawber's advice to David Copperfield? Remember what Dickens makes him say to Copperfield: "Income £20 0. 0., expenditure £19 19. 11½—result happiness; income £20 0. 0., expenditure £20 0. 6—result misery." Misery, unless something is done, if Government keeps on as it has done since 1928.

Our twenty-seven millions in the savings bank or our fifty million of insurance won't save us. Unless we can cut down our expenditure we're facing blue ruin. We can't go on voting subsidies. Last year we voted \$56,000.00 for two ships, most of it absolutely unnecessary—\$28,000.00 of

it anyway—for Channel-Ramea service. It is not going to be voted this year if the Opposition can help it. What's going to happen when the man comes out from the Bank of England on behalf of the bond-holders, what is he going to say to us. He will tell us what he told Australia: Cut your expenditure; cut out your services. And we're going to take our medicine and pay for our sins. What is this Government, leaving to posterity—a bankrupt country.

What is Bennett doing in Canada, what did King say he was going to do in his speech. He has a hundred million dollar deficit he's going to cut expenditure fifty million dollars and he is going to raise fifty million dollars more but he is not going to borrow it. Canada hasn't borrowed a dollar since the war. What have we borrowed since the war? Double what the war cost, and the war cost us 18 million dollars.

Last year the government spent \$193,000.00 for pauper relief and the dole. I thought the dole meant degradation and work meant independence. I seem to have heard it on a gramaphone somewhere yet we have to vote \$193,000.00 for degradation. \$413,000.00 was spent in two years since the government came into power on dole or able-bodied relief. The government must cut these extravagant expenses, we can't go on raising further loans. Since this government came into power they have spent \$6,000,000.00 more than was voted and yet they had to go to the Bank of Montreal and borrow a further \$500,000.00 to run the country, and according to the Speech from the Throne it is intended to raise a further loan which will, we are told, be used in paying off deficits and for other capital expenditure.

It has to stop, the poorer classes and the under-dogs can't stand it. These are the people the Government was going to help, they can't stand this taxation and now it's getting so that the middle-classes can't stand it. If the government will try and cut this extravagant expenditure the Opposition will do all in their power to help them for things are in a very serious condition and when a country keeps on borrowing as we are doing there we are treading on very dangerous ground. And they have been doing it for a number of years. This government is no greater sinner in that respect than any other government; they are borrowing money to pay deficits, and have been borrowing money because the people of the country could not afford to give us what we wanted to spend.

We borrow \$1,000,000.00 this year, and next year we borrow \$50,000 in advance to pay the interest on what we borrowed last year; next year we borrow \$11,000 or \$12,000 to pay the interest on that. Tell me, sensible men, where that is going to land any country. I think this government ought show to the people that they intend to live within their income; that they intend to stop borrowing, and they have only got one more session in which to do it, perhaps they may not have that one. Loan bills all the time! I think I have covered pretty well all that is worth covering in the Speech from the Throne.

As I said before, it is hard for an opposition member to say anything constructive on a Speech from the Throne that has nothing in it, no legislation foreshadowed that is of any benefit to Newfoundland. There is not a single ray of hope in that Speech, not one, for the people of Newfoundland who have been so hard pressed

during the past two years; not a ray of hope. The first year we did have something about a Smelters Bill and something else about a Telephone Bill.

Last year we had a prognostication about the Gander Bill. There is not a single thing in this year's effort that can offer a ray of hope to any people in Newfoundland. I defy any man to say that there is anything in that that will benefit the common people of Newfoundland. I propose to read to you from the official records of this House what the Government has done since it came into power to benefit the under-dogs. In their first year of office they passed 38 Acts. The House will bear with me when I read down the Acts to show you if I am correct when I say they have done nothing to benefit the people of Newfoundland.

(Reads list of Acts passed in 1929.)

Legislative Disabilities Act. That enabled five members of this House to take jobs in the Agriculture and Mines Department.

(Reads)

Public Utilities Commission: It took a year and a half for a Commission to be appointed. According to the report brought down yesterday they worked on a number of things, had a few meetings, took a lot of evidence, and discovered that bread could be sold for ten cents instead of twelve, but when they come to put their findings into effect they find that they had no power to enforce the law; now there is another Act coming to amend that Act, I am not surprised at it; they appoint a Public Utilities Commission, let them work for a year, call evidence, incur lots of expense, and then discover they have no power. Now they come to look for power.

(Reads)

These are the Acts of 1929. Now I will read the Acts of 1930. Every member of the House will be able to judge what benefits came from the doings of this Government for the past two and a half years.

(Reads)

Steel Company's Act. That was going to furnish employment on Bell Island for a full staff the year round. Now they are working on half time. How is it there was not a clause in that Act to force the employment of men. The Companies are going to give work on half time all the summer.

(Reads)

Small Towns Electric Lighting Act. That is an Act which enables the people of Conception Bay from Harbor Main down to Old Perlican to meet together, have a public meeting, order lights on the streets, and then put their hands in their pockets and pay for them. I was not here when that Act was passed.

(Reads)

There are the Acts; 38 in one session and 28 in another; 66 Acts passed in two sessions, and not one single Act to carry out the policy that the Prime Minister went to the country on and announced in his famous manifesto over a gramaphone, which I shall next go into, analyse and talk about. For that purpose I am going to postpone my remarks until to-morrow and would move the adjournment of the debate.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Speaker, since we have been waiting two weeks for these remarks, why no let us have a night session and get through business?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, any night after to-night; the members on this side have a party engagement to-night.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, we as outport members have come here to attend this session. We don't want to be held here all the summer. The House has now been open for over two weeks. It has been held up chiefly owing to the Viking disaster. If the session can be got through by having night sessions why not have a night session? Men living in St. John's and not having board to pay can easily come here. I see no reason why we can't have a night session to-night and continue having night sessions.

MR. SKEANS—Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with Mr. Brown. I think we should carry on. Mr. Puddester was waiting for questions; he will probably be looking for some. I hope that the Opposition will be with the outport members. We know that the Viking disaster has caused delay. I am sure that the Opposition members will agree with carrying on to-night.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I am only too glad to facilitate the government after to-night.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in view of the request of the Leader of the Opposition saying that he has some party arrangement to-night, I am only too happy to concur.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 Geo. V, Cap. 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public'" be now read a second time.

When the above Act, commonly known as "The Public Utilities Act," was drafted in 1929, it was passed with the idea that the Commission should have simply powers of enquiry into the matters referred to in Section 2, for the benefit of the Governor in Council and for the benefit of the public if the Commission should under Section 5 of the Act of 1929 decide to publish the findings in general terms. It was also provided that there might be a number of members of the Commission, not exceeding seven, of whom three, or five, or seven, might be delegated to investigate any given subject. This was partly to provide for the selection of Commissioners particularly qualified in each individual case, and partly to provide for the omission from the Committee upon any given subject of any Commissioner who might be thought to be personally interested in any given subject. Only three Commissioners, however, have up to the present time been appointed, and under these conditions they cannot function unless all are present, as three is a quorum. The present Bill is based on the assumption that there will be only three, and amends the Act by providing that a majority of the appointed Commissioners shall be a quorum, so as to enable two Commissioners to continue work if one is ill, absent, or otherwise unable to act.

The new Bill also provides what, as above stated, was not provided for in the 1929 Act, that is to say, a power for the enforcement of the findings of the Commissioners. Members will appreciate that in almost all other countries Commissioners of this kind have the power, either with or without the assent of some other body, to enforce fair prices by actual regulation instead of merely by moral suasion as would be the case under the 1929

Act. In the present case the Commissioners may make regulations governing the prices or rates charged by public utilities, and the prices or rates charged by suppliers of staple products and necessities, including fire insurance, but the regulations must be approved by the Governor in Council before taking effect.

It may not be necessary for these legal powers to be made use of, as the mere knowledge that the powers exist may in itself have a persuasive effect upon those in charge of business enterprises; but at any rate under the present amending Bill there will be a positive power to make sure that any concession which it is considered the public ought to receive from those supplying services or staple products can be obtained by legal means if moral suasion is not sufficient. There are cases in which this power should be applied. For instance, an investigation has been held into the prices charged for bread, in view of the great reduction in the cost of flour, and while the Commissioners recognise that there are difficulties involved, owing to wages, overhead costs, etc., they are of the opinion that the price of bread should not now be more than ten cents instead of twelve cents per loaf of twenty-six ounces. This is an instance where unless the trade takes some steps to pass on to the public the benefits it is receiving, there ought to be some means of seeing that the public are properly protected.

I feel every member of this Chamber will fully recognize the fact that the Public Utilities Act of 1929 was a strong step forward in the protection of the public against unjust prices and unjust profits. This amending Act is a further step in that the moral effect of the findings of the Commissioners will be backed, as in almost all other

countries such Commissioners are backed, by positive legislative authority to enforce fair prices by actual regulations of legal status instead of by moral suasion only.

In passing the Bill through Committee there should be added to Section 10(b) as amended after the word "insurance" the words "against fire." This is apparently an omission on the Commissioners' part, as the original Act gave power only to enquire into fire insurance, and I understand from the Commissioners that it is not the intention to go beyond that.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Cap. 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I would strongly advise that the Government go slowly with regard to this matter of price fixing and I think the application of moral suasion would be more judicious and effective. I am of the opinion that the Public Utilities Commission should have the right to determine what should be a fair price for bread or any other food commodity should be charged, and I believe that an advertisement in the papers calling the attention of manufacturers, bakers, retailers and the public generally ought be sufficient to bring down prices. Besides the fixing has been always found to be vicious, dangerous and wrong in principle. It is contrary to the law of supply and demand and has been found to be unworkable everywhere it was tried, ex-

cept where monopolies existed, and surely we do not want to have legislation that may lead to monopolies in bread.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 27th, 1931.

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

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the fishermen of Torbay in the District of St. John's East (Extern) to ask that a sum of money be expended on a branch road leading from the beach to the main road, known as Dawe's Lane. Last year a petition was made for this, and owing to the heavy rains of March and February the road has been rendered almost impassable by loose boulders and ruts and I ask that a sum of money be allocated for this purpose. I have also been asked by the residents of Broad Cove to ask that a sum of money be expended on the road known as Grove's Road. This road connects quite a few farms with the main road and I ask that a sum of money be allocated for this purpose.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain amendments to the Rules of the House.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Standardization of Certain Vegetables," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, I beg leave to introduce the Bill entitled "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips."

HON. THE SPEAKER.—With reference to question No. 334 asked by Mr. Winter, it is possible that we could change the name of the Minister to whom the question is addressed and address it to the proper Department and leave it on the Order Paper.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—To save the honorable gentlemen opposite all that trouble, I will answer the question myself. The Port Commission comes under the Department of the Minister of Finance and Customs, and as regards what I have received from that Department as Port Doctor, I received nothing.

Address in Reply

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, during the course of my remarks yesterday afternoon, I reviewed as well as I knew how, the Speech from the Throne and the remarks of the mover and seconder of the motion for

the Address in Reply directed to His Excellency the Governor. I spoke of the speech of the Prime Minister on the opening day and the record of the present Government since it came into power in 1928 and ended my remarks by reading the sixty six Acts passed during the two sessions 1929 and 1930. I think that I proved conclusively or to the satisfaction of members who think as I do that the record of the two and a half years of the present Government's administration is anything but creditable to themselves and conducive to the general welfare of the country. Those Acts referred to related to sixty six minor matters, they are not Acts in the strict sense of the word but routine matters that must be attended to by every Government when they come into office, such as the Public Service Act which must be passed by every Government and is a necessity for the business of the country to be carried on.

As for reducing the burden of taxation that is crushing our people or augmenting the small purchasing power of the people of the outports with which they have to sustain their families during the winter, as regards anything like that there is nothing to the credit of the government.

I am now going to show how the Government made definite promises in 1928. A manifesto was issued to the South West Coast telling the people there what was going to be done if this government was returned to power. Another manifesto was issued in the shape of a gramophone record which was broadcast everywhere throughout the country and took the form of a manifesto. It reviewed the history of the Liberal party from the Ballot Act in 1887 up to the time when the present Government appeal-

ed for power in 1928 and there was not a thing done in the country during that time that the present Government did not take credit for. And then is asked "What of the future." It outlined what was going to happen in 1929 and 1930. Whether or not the promises contained in this record were carried out I leave it to the country to judge and my colleagues who are to follow will further develop it.

We are not finished with that gramophone record yet, even if we have to bring a gramophone and play that record here in the House. You haven't heard the last of that record yet. I ask no better campaign material in my District next elections than that gramophone record. I shall have great pleasure in carrying that record from one place to another, letting the people hear what was promised and what has been done since 1928.

Agriculture was going to be improved, I asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines a question as to the notice sent out all over Newfoundland and posted up everywhere relating to land for agriculture for residents and for land to build a home on. It has been the history of Newfoundland since its discovery that if any man wanted a place to build a home and have his little garden, he could go and fence it in with no hesitation and rear his few vegetables and dig them in the Fall of the year and help sustain his family during the winter months without hindrance.

In carrying out the Act passed last year if the Department of Agriculture and Mines intends to enforce it according to the strict letter of the law no man can get a piece of land on which to build a home for his family unless he comes to the Department of Agriculture and Mines and pays his

money to the Department, which seventy-five per cent of the people of the outports are unable to do, and get his grant. I asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to table the notice, this he did, together with a little dissertation on what he intends to do in the future.

(Reads)

Now that's not the answer to the question I asked the Minister. The Minister evades the question. This treats of timber lands fenced on the three mile limit, but what about the people of Conception Bay and other places where there is no wooded land. They cannot fence their lands now unless they get a grant from the Agriculture and Mines Department, and I, Sir, say it is a hardship, and very little credit will be given the government for the enforcement of this measure.

Many of these people find it hard enough as it is to keep body and soul together without being put to the additional expense of obtaining a grant for their small pieces of land. The measure was never enforced until now and notices have recently been sent around to that effect. I say again. Sir, it is harsh, and the people of Conception Bay and other places, who are in the habit of augmenting their slender resources from their kitchen gardens will be very little obliged to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and to the Government. Another question I asked was for copies of the messages which had been sent to Wesleyville by the prime Minister to sealing captains and others regarding the bringing of men here from the north to sign on the sealing steamers. The Prime Minister sensed what was in my mind and tried to take the wind out of my sails by publishing the message before hand. That was all right

as far as the Prime Minister is concerned, but I can comment on it as much as I like. I say it was extremely harsh. The Prime Minister smelled a rat and was afraid of what the people of the north would think of him if he did not change his tactics.

The people of the North will be very little obliged to the Prime Minister in times like these, with \$143,000 being spent on Pauper Relief, when he tells them that they have to give orders on the captain for passages to be stopped out of their earnings at the sealfishery in order to get here to get signed on. I say the rule was most stringent, and it would have been just as well to provide the wherewithal for these poor mortals to get to the ice and put them in the way of making \$20 or so to sustain their families as for others to get thousands and thousands. I shall now read the message in question.

(Reads)

Now if there is anything more strict than that message I can't think of it. I never heard of anything more strict. Here is this message with every i dotted and every t crossed to prevent those poor mortals from getting a free passage to St. John's to get to the ice. I say in such a time as this, men ought be encouraged to go to the ice even if their passage to St. John's was paid. I say that conduct such as this is not at all in keeping with the promises and pretensions of those who, before the elections, professed to be the champions of the under dogs, of the common people. They asked for the means to get to the ice to snatch a few dollars and this is what they got. So much money has been taken by the Prime Minister during the past twelve months for himself that it wouldn't have hurt him if he had paid their passages himself out of his own pocket.

They called themselves the friends of the common people in 1928, but friends of the blue bloods, that's what they are. Its not the common people the Prime Minister is catering to now, he is leaving no stone unturned to win the friendship of the blue bloods. They are buying steamers from the blue bloods, they are buying goods from the blue bloods, they are buying everything in creation from the blue bloods, they are wining and dining them at the Newfoundland Hotel Lounge Lizards they were before the election but they are being invited to dinners now, their steamers and their goods are being bought, and their tub factories and their butterine factories are being protected, and when the sealers ask for the means to get to the ice they get the answer which I have just read. When the Disaster came they were all solicitude, Oh Yes! They saw they had done wrong and were trying to atone for it.

I have before me another document which was put on the table of the House a few days ago. It is the Report of the Board of Liquor Control. Now everybody knows the part that Liquor played in the election of members on the other side of the House. While the campaign was on even a bottle of beer was condemned. The bottle a day act was going to be repealed. Women in some of the districts were told that there would be no more liquor if they voted for this government. I remember talking to a lady shortly after the elections and she was positive that the Bottle a Day Act was going to be repealed. She said "There's going to be no more liquor sold after the first day of January, and if I was as sure of getting to heaven as I am of that I'd feel all right." I told her that that Act might be amended, but I was sure it was not going to be repealed. I was satisfied

to wait and see what happened with the present Act. I wanted to see the difference between the Bottle a Day Act and the Three Bottles a Week Act, and I have the evidence before me now. The position is this: 300 bottles a year were allowed to be purchased under the Monroe Act and 150 under the Squires Act. I'd like to see the man who punishes that much liquor in a year. I say the great majority of people can't afford to buy it, not to say drink it. No one drinks three bottles a week any more than anyone drinks a bottle a day. The common people, at any rate, can't afford it. I say it is as broad as its long, and I ask the temperance people of the North, St. John's and of Conception Bay, who voted to curtail liquor to listen to this.

(Reads Board of Liquor Control Report.)

According to this report of the Liquor Control Board the net receipts for last year's operations exceeded the receipts of the previous year to the extent of \$18,752.71 and the profits for last year amounted to \$338,448.95 as against \$329,514.14 for the year 1929. The Customs duty on liquors amounted to \$400,316.17. This it will be seen that the Government drew from the liquor traffic a profit of \$738,765.12, and this from a Government that preached temperance from the house tops and this from a Government who went to the country in 1928 and told the people they were going to do away with the Bottle a Day and who said that no more liquor would be sold. The total sales of liquor for 1930 amounted to \$1,227,000 and upon which the Government hauled into their coffers \$778,765.12. Now if that not a complete answer to the Government and to the Government candidates who went to the country

preaching temperance, I do not know what is.

I shall now come to the story contained in the Auditor General's Report. At the outset I want to give credit where credit is due and I want to be as fair as possible to the members of the Government. I shall not misrepresent as I do not believe in misrepresentation. The Auditor General states there was a saving in the department of Public Health last year to the amount of \$100,000 and in this connection I want to congratulate the Chairman of the Board, the Hon. Dr. Mosdell for putting a straight interpretation on the law relating to hospitals and for bringing about such a large reduction in the cost of operations. I wish the other departments would do the same thing, but I do not know what connection the Hon. member for Fortune Bay has with other departments.

During the first session of the present government in 1929 when the business of the session was drawing to a close and I was talking on the Budget I gave to the House a tabulated statement showing that from their first six months of office they came down to this House with their regular and Additional Estimates and increased the salaries of civil servants of this country by over \$70,000. There was some consternation over it amongst the rank and file members of the Government and one member told me how it would cease, but private members of the Government do not know what is going on in the Executive Council since they took office any more than I do. They only know what they are told in caucus and then they can take it or leave it. They are told if they don't support the party machine they can get on the other side; but there are members on the Government side today who are very much interested to

know what we were going to disclose as far as the Auditor General's Report is concerned.

With regard to voting money under section 33b of the Audit Act the Auditor General makes one good recommendation and I would recommend it now to the Colonial Secretary, in the absence of the Prime Minister, who always leaves his seat when somebody from this side is speaking. You know, Sir, and your Government knows that extravagance has reigned supreme and you know that this country cannot afford such extravagance and a halt must be called very soon.

What the Auditor General recommends is in vogue in every Parliament throughout the British Empire with the exception of Newfoundland. It is true we are comparatively small here, but the money voted here is proportionately as great, if not greater, than what is voted in other Parliaments. In the olden days when the rules of the House were made the expedient was not thought to be worth while and this expedient is now recommended by the Auditor General and it is this, that a public accounts committee be appointed by the Legislature. You can have four from the Government side and three from the Opposition side and let that committee take the accounts of the Colony every year and sit on them, study them carefully and enforce the rules of the House to get evidence and find out if the people who had contracts and who did any supplying were straight and above board in their dealings. You could find out from the heads of the different departments by taking evidence as to whether or not expenditures were economically sound. If expenditures and charges are not justifiable the Opposition will expose them and the members of the other

side can do the same thing. By having the accounts scrutinised openly it will put a check on the patronage system and it will have a tendency to do away with extravagance and wrong doing. The recommendation of the Auditor General is contained in these words:

(Reads)

Now that notice has been given of amendments to the Rules of the House I think it would be a good time to take up his recommendation and I would recommend it to the Hon. Colonial Secretary to take the matter up with the gentleman in charge of the Bill, because no matter what Government is in power this innovation will serve as a check on patronage seekers and will be beneficial to the people of the country who have to find the money to pay the bills. Now here is what the Auditor General says in his report about the way the various departments were conducted last year.

(Reads from Auditor General's Report.)

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. gentleman be good enough to state that the overdraft in the Colonial Secretary's Department was due to General Contingencies?

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, the General Contingency Vote was overdrawn?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. gentleman knows that the General Contingency Vote is not under the control of the Colonial Secretary's Department; it is merely listed there.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, who controls General Contingencies?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, the Government as a whole.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the Colonial Secretary's Department up to two years ago voted \$8,000 to be paid out of General Contingencies for street lights in Conception Bay. For the past two years you have not paid that \$8,000. You have tried to get it out of the district grants of the members. I know that the General Contingency account is listed in the Colonial Secretary's Department. If I were Colonial Secretary and that Contingency account was listed under my control, I would control it, or it would not be listed there.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, wait until you become Colonial Secretary.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I hope to do so some day, Sir.

"Dole is degradation; work is independence." Of the sum of \$193,837.18 spent under section 33 of the Audit Act, \$109,000 was for able bodied relief.

(Reads)

With no authoriy from this Legislature the sum of \$1,071,000 was spent on able bodied relief since 1922; \$413,000 of that sum has been expended since the present Government came into power; yet we were told that dole was degradation and that work was independence. I thought there was going to be no more dole, and yet you have only spent \$413,000 in dole; that is only a flea bite.

(Reads)

"It is needless to point out that this large expenditure was not authorized under the Audit Act."

You have been voting money all last summer; you have been voting it since this year closed; \$20,000 a month in the months of July, August, September

and October, \$20,000 a month for able bodied pauper relief; we are told there is no destitution, yet in the summer months you voted \$20,000 a month for able bodied pauper relief. Might I ask the question if authority has been taken since November 24th, when the last authority was taken. I have not got any reply; I am waiting to find out what authority was taken to cover the bills since November 24th.

(Reads)

"This expenditure now is becoming a regular vote and should be provided for in the Estimates."

The Auditor General draws attention to the fact that Departmental heads have been paying overtime and all other kinds of time for work done in contravention of the Civil Service Act passed in 1926. There are certain rules and regulations if the Departments want to pay overtime; they must ask for an Order in Council if they want to pay overtime with the exception of the Posts and Telegraphs. That has not been done, and the Auditor General calls the Government to strict account for allowing overtime to be paid without carrying out the law of the land. If there is anyone that should be carrying out the law who is it if it is not the Executive Council of the Colony.

I shall not go into the long report on the Railway further than to say this that we hope the present Government will, during their term of office introduce a new system whereby the railway expenditure will be in control of this House, as the Minister of Finance so often and so eloquently advocated when he was on this side of the House. We are going to have an annual deficit for a number of years yet; on June 30th, 1930, the deficit was \$380,000; at the end of June, 1929,

the deficit was \$387,000; there is only an improvement for the year of \$7,000. The Prime Minister on his gramophone record waxed eloquent of the splendid system of the railway and he was going to try if it were in his power to keep it from further interference with politics, and still that wailing cry went up during the past year that even the Prime Minister, even members of the Government were not allowed to interfere with politics on the railway. Everybody was blamed; the poor General Manager was hauled over the coals; other departmental heads were hauled over the coals; for what? Because they would not allow politics to be dragged into railway appointments. Appointments were not made on the recommendation of members; they were called everything. I would advise those gentlemen who are complaining not to blame the General Manager of the Railway; to blame the Railway Commission; two of them are sitting on the other side of the House; if they did not force the General Manager of the Railway to accept their recommendation and appoint these men, I give them credit for it; they did the right thing, but then don't be weak enough to allow everybody in connection with your party outside to be blaming officials of the railway for it —blame Hon. Mr. Bradley; blame Hon. Dr. Campbell; blame the five members of the Railway Commission; these are the men. I want to tell the men who work at the dock that if the promises made to them in the fall of 1928 are not carried into effect, these are the men to blame and not Mr. Russell, not Mr. Pittman, not Mr. Harvey, not Mr. Pike; the Railway Commissioners who are members of the Government are the right ones to blame.

Don't be carried away with things that are said about this one not being

able to give an appointment, about somebody else complaining that they can't get what they want; the men who are responsible for that are the men who are in control; the five Railway Commissioners. It is just as well to be square about it. I hope they know it now if they did not know it before. It was only foolishness to talk about it before because railway men well knew that the Railway Commissioners if they did their duty would do the right thing by the Manager. I am glad they have done so and please do not throw the responsibility over on people who are innocent of the matter.

The extract in the Auditor General's Report that I referred to a moment ago in connection with the Public Health Department is as follows:

(Reads)

"Humber constituency." May I say something about it? Perhaps I had better not while the Prime Minister is not here. \$20,000 was taken from the Bank of Montreal and placed to a Trust Account in the Bank of Commerce. Why? We have to find out the reason for the transfer when we find out the reason for the transfer of \$100,000 in connection with the Memorial College. That \$100,000 was not the first transfer; there was \$20,000 transferred from the Marine and Fisheries Department to the Bank of Commerce belonging to the Humber Constituency and afterwards there was another \$11,000 transferred from the Highroads Department, and from the Marine and Fisheries there was another large sum of money, \$10,000 that was voted for the building of Fortune Pier. Why these amounts were transferred from the Bank that was doing business with the Colony to the Bank of Commerce—I was going to say I don't know—but that

would be straining a bit. I think I do know. Afterwards the amount to the credit of Fortune Pier was paid out by cheque to the Government Engineer's Department and the pier was built. There is no record here as to the other amount \$31,000 being paid out to the Humber Constituency. It may be paid out and it may not. There is no report since June, 1930.

I trust that when the responsible Minister gives an explanation in connection with the \$100,000 regarding the Memorial College, somebody will be good enough to explain why these amounts were transferred almost a year before. I know there was a good row kicked up about it when the Finance Minister found out about it and that it was down there without his knowledge and he demanded the interest.

The membership of the House know that we have placed to our credit, most of us, at the Public Works Department, the sum of \$40 yearly to reimburse us for telegraph messages sent to our districts. These amounts are paid from the district grants. It will be news to some members on the other side of the House to learn that the Auditor General says some members of the House spent their \$40 in one month and owe the Postal Telegraphs the messages they sent covering the other eleven months.

The next thing I come to is the Reparations Account. The gentleman on this side of the House who asked that the question regarding it be tabled is at present confined to his home ill. The Prime Minister replied to the question by stating that he did not wish to table the answer as he was afraid that the beneficiaries of the fund would not like to have it published. What objection can there be to having the account published?

Only a few nights ago I was reading the Montreal Star and in it was an account of the millions paid out in Canada with the names of the men who had received money from the fund. The people who got the money aren't ashamed of getting the money, why would they be. They deserve it; it belongs to them and they should have had it long ago and we don't begrudge it to them.

But do yon know, Gentlemen, that in the past two years someone has drawn \$12,162.00 for looking after this fund? Yes, in the past two years someone has received more than \$12,000.00 for running the account. This money is not the property of the Commissioner, it is the property of the Colony, it belongs to Newfoundland, it was given her in compensation for brutish acts done her during the war, yet someone has received \$12,000.00 for looking after this account and we're going to find out who this someone is. We want this information and we're going to get it, we're going to find out why someone got \$12,000.00 for looking after this account. There is still \$156,000.00 in the bank which should have been paid to these people long ago.

The Highroads Commission; I think that I may say that the Hon. the Colonial Secretary and others who agreed with him made an awful blunder, a terrible blunder when they decided to put the Highroads under the control of a political head, for the Commission has spent the money which was voted last session and the loan of \$1,000,000.00 was also exhausted and in the end the Governor-in-Council had to authorize a loan of \$500,000.00 which was obtained from the Bank of Montreal. That's what happened.

The Government has in the past year spent over \$1,750,000.00 on the

Highroads. The money voted and the loan did not prove enough and they had to go to the Bank of Montreal and get another \$500,000.00 and the excuse they give us is that the money has to be spent as there was so much destitution in the country and still the Prime Minister says that there is no depression in the country, no depression—but there is a stringency. Yet the Government spent one and three-quarter million dollars in relief work on Highroads. Yes, \$1,750,000.00 spent on the Highroads. I remember when we were on the other side of the House when we were in power in 1925 and we spent a quarter of a million dollars on the Highroads and we were called scoundrels because we spent so much money to make the roads fit for cars to drive over. In those days we got nearly all of the money back by the duty we received on news cars, but this year there won't be enough new cars to pay for the million and three-quarter dollars spent and next year there won't be enough and you'll never get enough to pay for the amount spent.

In December they had a wonderful balance of \$9,000.00 left. It's criminal, it's terrible. Thousands of dollars spent on the Terrenceville-Goobie road utterly unnecessary. The road from Fortune to Goobies; what's the use of it. The people don't need it. What are they going to use it for. Are they going to cross Fortune Bay in boats, ferrying their cars with them and come on in their cars? The people of the Burin Peninsula don't want these roads, what they want are good connecting roads and utility roads and that's what they deserve and what they should have.

I remember when we were in power in 1925 one of our party had a program of roads and there was such a fuss kicked up in the House that the

Colonial Secretary had to stand up in that corner over there and repudiate the idea.

The road from Holyrood to Witless Bay cost \$45,000.00. What was that built for? It's not needed and only three miles of it done. And there's a road down in Trinity that cost \$51,000.00 for three miles. Three miles of it went this way and that way and that way and this way until it would seem they got the right angle on it and at last it cost \$51,000.00 for the three miles.

And the road down in Burin cost us \$13,000.00 and the road in Fogo cost \$10,000.00 and the road in Trinity cost \$13,000.00 and the roads in Lewisporte cost \$37,000.00 and the roads in Port au Port cost \$20,000.00 and the Witless Bay road, three miles of it, cost \$45,000.00. This, Gentlemen, is a terrible waste and an account of it should be published in the public press. The money was not spent, just thrown away, and there does not seem to have been any question as to whether any value was received for the money. Three miles of road costing \$51,000.00.

Commissioner Hibbs was in charge and I don't know how much he was supposed to receive. I think, however, that he must have got paid according to the amount he spent, the more he spent the more he got.

That remark brings me to the Public Charities where something of the same occurred. I understand that the relieving officers got a bonus on the grounds that, as they put it, there was so much relief given and that they accordingly had to work so hard that they had to be given a bonus.

Here is another serious matter, small, but oh! if the members of the

Government were sitting on this side of the House they would be the very people to condemn such actions. "I note says the Auditor General that when certain members of the House were travelling through their districts visiting their constituents they had their expenses paid by the Departments," despite the fact that they all had railway passes.

"It has also come under my observation that work has been authorized on certain parts of the Highroads by other persons than the Chief Commissioner and his Deputies," and I would like to know who the person is who authorized that such work should be done. I know it is done on some occasions by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I can quite see that if the session of the House is a late one and it is necessary that wharves, landing stages etc. be repaired so that people can proceed with the fishery the members of the districts concerned say the work must be done and the Minister says all right go ahead with it and it will be fixed up later.

There is food enough in the Auditor General's Report for me to entertain the House with for the next fortnight, but I will wait until the estimates come down when we will know all the votes and be in a position to deal with them in the manner in which they ought to be dealt with.

Under Section 33b of the Audit Act we find listed the amount spent for able bodied pauper relief. Dole, Dole and Degradation from January right up to the present time. We find the following amounts voted to relieve destitution in the outports: January, \$18,000; March, \$20,000; April, \$20,000; July, \$20,000; August, \$30,000; September, \$20,000; October, \$10,000, and

January \$50,000, spent on ablebodied relief in the outports during the last twelve months.

In addition to this we find that the sum of \$50,000.00 was spent in St. John's for the same purpose during last winter making a grand total of \$193,000.00 for able bodied pauper relief and I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the greater proportion of this money was spent during the summer months when it should not be necessary at all, and despite all this the Prime Minister states publicly in the House that the country is in an excellent state and that there is no destitution. I further state that the members of this House will have to be prepared to come back to it next year and find that the amount of money expended to relieve the destitution will at least be doubled and probably trebled and this country cannot stand the strain.

A further amount of \$150,000 was spent to repair damage done by storm in Fortune, Burin and Burgeo and in September, 1929 when we were assured that there was no unemployment we note that \$5,000 was allocated to Sir W. F. Coaker to relieve the destitution in Bonavista East and an amount of \$5,000 was allocated to the Government Engineers Department for relief. There was also a special warrant of \$100,000.00 to meet the needs of the destitute people of the South and West Coast. (Then we are told there was no destitution) in these places.

I will now read the full section of the Auditor General's Report dealing with these allocations and loans:

(Reads)

Dr. Anderson took the job that Dr. Parsons had. Dr. Parsons got \$3,200, and Dr. Anderson got \$6,000; besides

his practise. He got \$2,800 more than Dr. Parsons got and he has an assistant who gets \$3,000. The Insane Asylum this year is costing us \$9,000, while last year it cost us only \$3,200.

(Reads)

Mr. Speaker, I think I have demonstrated to this House that the record of the Government now in power is anything but creditable to themselves and beneficial to the country at large which they promised to govern well and in a manner befitting it. As time goes on, we, the members of the Opposition shall have more to say in connection with the Budget and Estimates. We intend to tell this House and the country the true state of affairs at the present time,—the financial condition. We intend to help the Government all we can to reduce expenditure. It can be reduced without bearing on the common people of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank all the members opposite who sat in their seats and listened to what I had to say in my criticism of the Government's policy.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the Speech, may I ask the Prime Minister if it will be necessary to proceed if we get an adjournment at six o'clock.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, we were hoping to get a night session, I was talking the matter over with Mr. Alderdice but it seems that this is impossible so I think that we should get ahead with the Address in Reply now.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to go ahead but I am hoping for a special reason that would be able to leave the House at six o'clock.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—In all probability we shall be able to accomodate you.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to make my few remarks on the Address in Reply, I would first like to personally express my deepest sympathy to the relatives of the victims of the recent tragedy in the loss of the Viking. I am sure, Sir, that we all feel confident that on that Sunday night, Newfoundlanders proved themselves to be true Newfoundlanders. No one can describe or imagine the horrors of that explosion, but I am sure that we all feel confident that whatever could possibly be done was done and the men had this comfort to bring home to their loved ones.

In this connection the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund has been added to by a very heavy burden and I trust that some effort will be made to help them out in this trying time when they are trying to help and finance those unfortunate men who lost everything following their precarious livelihood.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Bindon who so ably proposed and Mr. Strong who so ably seconded the Motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I congratulate them because their task was not an easy one, in fact it was a very difficult one considering that they had so little matter to speak on. Coming to the Speech itself, Sir, I think that it will be admitted by everyone who has read it that there is practically nothing in it of consequence to this country.

I think, Sir, that is a deplorable state of affairs that in the third year of the life of this Parliament we should have submitted to us such a

Speech as was read on opening day. Is it fully realized what this self-styled Liberal Government has given us? Do we realize that numbers of people, fishermen and farmers and tradesmen looked forward anxiously to see what hope for the future was contained in this opening Address, and that these people were doomed to grievous disappointment?

To hear the Prime Minister on opening day one would think that everything was beautiful. That there was no depression, no unemployment. If the Prime Minister says so, of course it must be so, for didn't he say in 1929 that "he would breathe the breath of life into the industries of this country," and one should think that depression would be impossible with such a leader. But in spite of this, Mr. Speaker, I say that there is depression, there is unemployment, and what's more that it is widespread.

We must further remember that at present there are fourteen Commissions advising the Government, that no less than nineteen members of the Government are being paid salaries in addition to the regular vote for parliamentary work. Surely with fourteen Commissions, with nineteen members of the House receiving remuneration and with the Leader who was going "to breathe the breath of life into the industries of the country," things ought to look better in the country, and it should look like a little paradise. Surely it ought to be run efficiently, and there ought, at any rate, be no cause for worry. Surely with all this expert advice they should have been able to put the country on the road to prosperity. But when the Prime Minister said on opening day that there was no depression in this country he could not have said what was in his heart. When he said things

were not so bad it was merely an evasion. Would it not have been better to have said that things are critical but that he hoped to remedy them by beneficial legislation?

Now, Sir, as against the statement that there is no depression, what is the actual truth? At the present moment I assert, Sir, that there is island wide unemployment and depression and this despite what the Government press and the Prime Minister has to say. Take the City first, and for reference I shall refer to an article in the "Watch Dog," the personal organ of the Prime Minister himself. In the "Watch Dog" of March 7th we have the following—but before I go on I must say that these figures do not and cannot give the ordinary person any idea of the real situation. For example the compiler takes the position of comparing this year's unemployment with last year's. But let us take the figures themselves:

(Reads from "Watch Dog")

In this he leaves out the figures for 1931 and takes those for 1930 when there was more unemployment so this is no criterion.

(Reads again)

But this percentage does not represent fully the total amount of unemployment. In 1930 with everything taken into account we had a vast amount of unemployment all over the country and particularly on this side of it. (Reads again) Later on he says we have 7% less unemployed as compared with last year.

I say, Sir, that that article is most misleading, and, starting with the City I shall endeavour to prove that it is so. This article states that there are 800 registered unemployed, but the truth is that there is 879, and out of

that, 800 have only got temporary employment. It has to be remembered that what they got was only temporary employment as far as St. John's East and St. John's West was concerned and the work was allocated by weekly allotment.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I wish to point out that there is no quorum present and might I ask the Clerk of the House to read the Rules of the House to the absent members?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I might say, Mr. Speaker, that there are nine members considering some amendments for the Upper House.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that work in St. John's East and West was given out on weekly allowance. After one week's employment a gang of men were paid off and another gang taken on and so they went on going through the 800, but the statement in the Government press that 800 men were employed was positively misleading, because it must be remembered that these 800 men who got temporary relief are householders and these represented on an average on four in a family. Take a householder who registered for one week's employment, and broken time at that, he might have a couple of young men and young women home unemployed, so that if you multiply that 800 by four it will put a different and more serious phase on the situation. In other words the number out of work in St. John's would be about 3,000.

Then again some poor men when they did get their turn to go to work for a week struck bad weather and consequently a considerable amount of broken time. Still no matter how small their pittance came to these unfortunate men were paid off when their week was up.

Now, Sir, the fact is that the men of St. John's East and West have not got a square deal and the proof of that assertion is contained in the Auditor General's Report and in other reports regarding huge expenditures in other parts of the country. When we find that one million dollars was spent since last November on relief and \$143,000 on highroad work, then we find it hard to understand why it was necessary this winter to give one week's work out of several to householders in St. John's who were in need. It shows that so far as the Government is concerned they care very little for the needs of the families in the city.

Talking of unemployment, why there was lots of it last midsummer. In June the Government spent \$20,000 on relief work and in July they spent \$25,000; but what saved the situation for the St. John's men was the fact that the per capita grants were available and they were used in connection with the laying of sewerage and water lines and other such useful and necessary work.

So far as St. John's East was concerned 115 men altogether were provided with work for twelve weeks, not a week with broken time such as they were treated by the Government this winter. Why, Sir, the thing is ridiculous. And then we hear a lot of talk from the Government against dole. Let me tell you, Sir, that the common man of this town was three times better off under the dole system when he got relief for his family to the extent of \$8 or \$10 worth of goods than he has been for the past two and a half years.

Now we come to take the country in general. I remarked at the outset of my remarks that unemployment and depression was Island-wide and I now

reiterate that statement and with the exception possibly of the districts of St George and Port au Port distress is general throughout the country. Yesterday we had tabled a report from Sir William Lloyd and Mr. H. J. Brownrigg, Commissioner of Public Charities, who visited the South West and South coasts to report on conditions there and for the information of the House I shall read a few extracts from this report in order to show what these gentlemen, who took evidence under oath, reported. They first visited Burin East and this is what they found:

(Reads)

They next called at Burin West and this is their report of that section:

(Reads)

Then they visited Placentia West and Argentia. The report reads:

(Reads)

Now, Sir, I think I have quoted enough from this report to show that in those three districts there could not be anything but direct poverty and the most pronounced depression, because when everybody is hungry, when nobody could go for any more supplies, everybody was head over heels in debt, there is bound to be depression and there is bound to be destitution, and that is only three settlements. I think I am safe in saying that had a Commission of Enquiry been sent around the Island, sent down north, we would have found the same conditions pertaining; we would have found that fishermen, after striving hard all the summer, had made no pay, had not made enough to pay for supplies, and it was necessary that assistance should be immediately given and assistance could only come from the Treasury of this country.

Yes, Sir, there is no doubt about the fact that we were quite correct in the Opposition and the Opposition press was quite correct when they pointed out long before this that destitution was going to be rampant. And then we take even the industrial centres here. We have Bell Island working half time; we have Corner Brook with a curtailment of work; we have Grand Falls with a curtailment of work; we even have destitution in such an industrial centre as Corner Brook. The Prime Minister well knows that he has referred to it time and again as a hive of industry. I admit that it was a hive of industry, but I am saying that because of the Island-wide destitution and because of the depression, we claim that even Corner Brook suffered, and I think it will be admitted that that was proven thoroughly by the fact that some of the leading citizens of Corner Brook had to convene a meeting and through their Chairman had to write the Prime Minister and request that he take immediate steps to relieve the destitute circumstances of a large number of families in that town.

Well, Mr Speaker, as it is drawing past six o'clock, and as I intimated before there are several members in the House besides myself who would like to get clear before 6.30, I will now move, Sir, that the debate adjourn.

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

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, the 30th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 30, 1931.

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

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the electors of the settlement of Openhall in the District of Bonavista South, asking for the sum of \$300.00 to replace a bridge that has broken down the road system there. The fact is that these people rarely ask for money from the Government, and as they ask for it now it shows that they really need it very badly and that it is very necessary.

I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates, with the request that it be attended to at the earliest opportunity.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table statement of the Public Debt for the year 1930; statement of Current Account 1930; the balance sheet of Treasury Account; the public accounts for the year ending June 30th, 1930. While I am on my feet I would like to table reply to question No. 95 by Mr. Emerson, on the Order Paper of March 26th, and answers to questions Nos. 131, 76, 63. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Puddester for the courtesy at any rate of reprinting that answer the other day in the Daily News which was incorrectly printed by the Daily News in the first instance.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of H. M. Penitentiary for the year 1930.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Speaker, I was not privileged to be in the House when the Prime Minister explained the

answer to the question asked by me the other day and I would like to make it clear that the information asked for was not so much for publication as for the information of the members of the House.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Rt. Hon the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Amendments to the Rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I move that this Committee rise and report that they have considered the Resolution referred to them and recommend that the matter be referred to a Select Committee consisting of His Honor the Speaker, all the practising barristers of the House, Mr. Smith, the Deputy Speaker and Mr. Puddester, a former Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter referred to them, and recommended that further consideration of the subject be referred to the attention of a Select Committee.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was so ordered.

Mr. Speaker, appointed the following to be such Select Committee: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Smith, Mr. Puddester, Hon. F. G. Bradley, Hon. P. J. Lewis, Mr. Emerson and Mr. Winter.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, on grounds of public policy, opinions or advice furnished to the Governor in Council by his legal

advisers cannot be tabled. The reasons are obvious. These advices are given as private documents, and advisers cannot be expected to give private advices or opinions on the ground that these may become public documents and matters of controversy. Honorable members are well aware that advice given by a Solicitor to his client in private matters is privileged, and it is the same in Government matters. The Governor in Council, not the adviser, is responsible for making decisions, and may take advice where it pleases, and act in accordance with or against that advice as it deems best.

That is not a new principle, but has always been recognized. For example, in 1927 an Opposition member asked for the tabling of advice received on the International Contract and this was refused. The question and answer do not appear in Hansard but the facts are indicated by the remarks of Hon. Mr. Bradley, then a member of the Opposition, on page 1169 of Hansard for 1927, second column, where he states that he has asked for the names and opinions of Counsel consulted, and has been refused on grounds of public policy.

Address in Reply

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned last Friday, I was addressing my remarks to the general unsatisfactory conditions prevailing throughout the Island and the large amount of unemployment. I pointed out that contrary to the statement made by the Prime Minister that there is, if anything, a decrease in the unemployed and a betterment in conditions in general, such is not the case. I hold in proof of my contention that when you consider that \$220,000.00 was spent last year on able bodied poor relief and \$193,000.00 spent this

year on the same thing making a total in two years of \$413,000.00, that huge sum was devoted to nothing but dole and in 1928 the present Government denounced "dole" as nothing but degradation. Then, too, the sum of \$1,000,000.00 was voted last October by the Government and \$800,000.00 of this is spent; I do not think that this shows that conditions are better and unemployment is not so prevalent as it was for a good many years back.

The fact is that things are really going from bad to worse and it is essential that some scheme for the relief of unemployment is inaugurated for the people during the coming summer and fall. In connection with the statement made by the authorities that all is well and on opening day the Prime Minister informed us that there was nothing to complain about, that a lot of capital was made by the Opposition of existing conditions. He said conditions were exaggerated, that it was petty party politics undertaken to ruin the Government in the eyes of the people.

Remembering that attitude, Sir, I think I might be pardoned if we referred back to 1928 to the Hon. Prime Minister's message of inspiration, more famous as the "Victor Record." I don't think that it is necessary to inform the members of this House as to what that message contained, but I do think that it is only just that I should refer to it in a brief manner.

You will remember, Sir, that message covered many points. In the first part of that message, you will remember that the Prime Minister referred to everything of any importance that was accomplished for the Government of the country, industrial, commercial, betterment of health conditions, public utilities, in fact everything done or accomplished during the

past fifty years and, Sir, it must be admitted in giving credit for these things the Prime Minister was very good to himself.

It is what he so confidently, so absolutely confidently said and promised about the future that I propose to deal with. He promised many things, and, for my purpose, I intend only to refer to four of them and briefly at that. He has been talking of what he termed the Tory Government as being responsible for, and then, he said, Sir, as follows as to the future:

(Reads)

There is no doubt expressed in either of those as to the statement, the direct statement, confident statement apparently, but Sir, we will be pardoned for asking where is there a little to be found of that program that has been accomplished since 1928 since the people gave him the opportunity to carry out his promises; since they put him with a majority in charge of the affairs of this country, what has he done to justify his promises before this country to-day?

As far as industrial development goes, Sir, we do know that the Government and their Leader promised to establish a vast industry on the north east coast of our island; we know that that industry was to be a large pulp mill that was to call for an expenditure of millions, and that it would take care of thousands of men during the construction period, and a great many men in the later period with the establishment of a new centre and a new town, but, Sir, in remembering the Prime Minister's promises in 1928, we cannot help but wonder why it was that, having the opportunity come to him so quickly that he did not immediately avail of it, and therefore prove to the people that in his confidence he was justified.

As to the million and a half dollar investment we have heard nothing, and as to the agricultural policy we can only say that unfortunately for himself the only move, the one move that we know of, was the creation of a Commission which called for a very large outlay and which, in no way, has brought a cent's return to the country.

In fact, Sir, nothing has been accomplished on the promises made by the Prime Minister and I must say, Sir, that, having read this message of inspiration and hope, it brings to my mind the writing, or a reference from the writings of the great American humorist whose writings and articles under the headings of Mr. Dooley in the papers of the United States, for many years, were always eagerly read. Mr. Dooley, as the pen name was, took particular delight in criticising wittily and satirically public questions of the day and public men at the time of the Spanish American War, and he was referring to a certain admiral who, at that time, was in charge of the fleet of the United States, and this admiral had made a statement about his intended operations, and this is the way Mr. Dooley referred to it in the press. He says "Admiral So and So says he is going to sink the Spanish fleet with one blow, and he is the boy to blow." Now, Sir, this is very apt here and may well be applied to the Prime Minister and his message of inspiration.

And to continue about the Gander Deal; I have remarked that in spite of the definite and confident promise that was contained in the Prime Minister's message, the wonderful opportunity of putting through this big proposition came to him very quickly; we must only marvel that he saw fit to let this pass, but, Sir, we may also be pardoned for being somewhat suspici-

ous of the cause of this proposition not being unavailed of. We also may be pardoned for not understanding why the report that was last provided, the proposition that was submitted to the Government, why that was not tabled in this House and why the people of the country as well as members of the Opposition should not know all the details of that proposition as submitted to the Government by the Reid-Hearst combine. We were told that it was advisable that we should know—all the country—should know the secret arrangements between the Hearsts and the Reids. I am sure nobody wished to know that which was of no interest, but what is of present interest that this huge proposition that was going to bring in, would bring in some \$4,000,000 a year to our working people, was not availed of.

I would not stress the Gander point, because, no doubt, there are members of the Opposition following me who will, very thoroughly, treat of this subject and deal with it in greater detail, but I must again make this observation that had you availed of the Gander proposition and started construction work, it would be unnecessary for the Governor in Council to have to sit down last October and vote the sum of \$1,000,000 to the Highroad Commission and for that body to have expended over \$800,000.

I shall briefly refer to another item that we find in the Speech from the Throne. It is true that it is just barely mentioned, but in view of the fact that much to do was made about this question when it was first mooted about by the Government press and in view of the fact that great things were to be expected by the Prime Minister's initiation of this policy, I deem it but right to comment, and that is Standardization. The Government press en-

larged upon this subject, gave it great prominence, but I have to say on the matter, Sir, that Standardization means and entails much more than most of us are aware of.

I do not know the terms of the Standardization that is decided to be brought into this country, but I do know this, that whether it is in the matter of fish, whatever kind of standardization is done the fishermen are bound to suffer hardship for some time. Standardization will take some years; if it is brought into force it will take some years to get it going thoroughly, and for the three or four years the fisherman is bound to feel it.

If we standardize at the point of export or on the importer's premises, it is bound to come back, to react on the fisherman; he is bound to have a loss, and I have only this point to make, that if it proves the fact that the Government will bring a standardization scheme into this session or next session, and if they go ahead with the operation, I would suggest, Sir, that some scheme be also worked out whereby the fisherman for the period when he is going to suffer, for the period when he is going to be subject to cull, because he will be subject to cull, if the buying and exporting is going to be standardized — some scheme will be worked out whereby the fishermen will be paid either a bonus or a subsidy or some other means whereby he will be protected and helped and assisted, so that he won't suffer hardship up to the time when the wheels of standardization will be running smoothly and it will be an accomplished fact.

Now, Sir, dealing with the Auditor General's Report: When we remember, and having considered the attitude of the present Government with

regard to the sale of liquor in Newfoundland and particularly the attitude for years past of Sir William Coaker and the members of the Coaker section of the present party, we are no less than appalled that they are today satisfied to represent the country in the ranks of a Government who have gone out to sell liquor.

I say it is surprising how the members, particularly of the Coaker section, could have sat over there last year, and can sit there this year, read reports, hear comments, and then think what Coaker and they stood for; what they preached throughout the country; how they can stand to take it is a marvel. I will refer to the Advocate of October, 1925. In an editorial in that paper, Sir William's personal organ, the following occurred:

(Reads)

"The greatest cursecurse of liquor."

Well, Sir, that was 1925, and in 1928 this present Government, with Sir William Coaker, with the man responsible for that editorial writing, came into power, and it is true, Sir, we got early notice of a new Liquor Bill; we were told it was to be an amendment of the bottle a day; we were told that too much rum, too much spirits were being consumed, and that the underlying idea of introducing this new Bill was to curb the consumption, to save the working man, to protect him from loss of income, loss of earnings, loss of health, and to protect in a measure his wife and children; that was really the underlying principle, as we were told, but, Sir, reading the Auditor General's Report, it certainly cannot be contended that is how it worked. Much opprobrium was cast upon the Mon-

roe Liquor Bill, but now we find that that article was not sincere, and the people who wrote the article must have known it was not sincere. However, it served the purpose, and we have good reason to know that the women particularly fell for that propaganda made about this question.

How it was ever contended or could be contended that the privilege of buying a bottle a day was being availed of by every man in this country I can't say, but I do know this, that with the privilege of buying three bottles a week, we are now buying more than when we had the privilege to buy it every day, and the answer is to be found, Sir, in the Auditor General's Report.

We find that for last year the total sales were \$1,000,000, and that out of that they made three hundred and some odd thousand sales profit; made four hundred and some odd thousand dollars Customs duty, so that out of the million the Government took in \$738,765, and that was a net increase of the year before of \$18,752 over 1929, and 1929 was over 1928, and still we are told that the intention was and is to decrease the consumption of alcohol in Newfoundland and to better conditions.

The plain proof of the matter is, Sir, that there is no attempt being made to decrease the consumption of alcohol, but the hope is openly expressed that there will be an increase in the consumption of alcohol, and nobody cares as long as thousands of dollars roll into the Customs. That is the true state of affairs and there is no need to resort to camouflage.

I think it is only fair to the people of the country to refer to one matter, and that is the brand of liquor sold by the Controller's Department.

It is common knowledge that last year for quite a period there was liquor being sold by the Controller's Department that was unfit for human consumption. It is true that the badness was confined only to rum, but that, to my mind, was the worst part of it, because it is rum that is mostly consumed; it is what might be termed the poor man's drink.

To the man who can buy choice wines, choice whisky, and who has the money to avail of that luxury, this did not matter, although he might have felt badly enough that any man's money should be taken for poison, for stuff that could not be consumed, he still was not hurt himself, but, Sir, we must remember that this is the people's Government, and that all the rich and all the blue bloods were turned out, but that the great bulk of working men are now represented and represented by a workingman's Government and represented by men who told them that they were being ridden, were just underdogs, and after the 1928 election they would be looked after in future.

That is what I am talking about, because that is the man who has not been considered in this business of rum selling. As I say it was common knowledge; even the labouring man who went and purchased his rum had to bring it back to the Controller's; day by day men marched back with their bottles; what did the Government do? They took the money, and I contend that any man who goes down and pays \$1.50 to that Controller's Department for a bottle of rum is entitled to the best bottle of rum that can be imported into the country. I refer to this particularly because I think it is a scandal.

It must be remembered that this country is paying a high priced Liquor

Control Commission, but they in turn have the benefit of an Advisory Board consisting of the Hon. Mr. Cashin, Hon. Mr. Bradley and Hon. Dr. Barnes, and I say, Sir, that it is about time for the people of this country to go into the matter when it is written about publicly in the press, and they were notified personally, and they did not think enough about it, and, mind you, these three Commissioners are receiving some thousands of dollars a year as salary. I think it is \$13,000; costing the country \$13,000, and in that respect I state here that in my opinion there is one place, as the previous leader in this debate, Mr. Puddester, pointed out that with the state of our finances and the way we are now heading, it is going to be essential, absolutely essential that economy be practised, and that curtailment will have to be undertaken by this Government; that is quite true, and there really seems to be absolute necessity for having curtailment in all our Departments of the Civil Service to weather the great depression and the financial difficulties in which we are involved.

I think that the necessity for three high priced men to run this business of liquor selling in Newfoundland is ridiculous, and, in my opinion, any man, any common sense competent man could act as Manager of that Department and run it efficiently for one salary.

Then, Sir, we come to another part of the Auditor General's Report, to which I wish to make reference.

We have had extra payments made for services rendered to Civil Servants from the Deputy Heads of the Departments to the firemen of these institutions and ranging from over \$3,000 to a few paltry dollars. I am sure, Sir, that the very member of this House

who heard the Auditor General's Report for the first time in the House the other day must have been astounded.

I don't think in the whole history of the country there has ever before been such a riotous throwing away of money. I hope, and I am sure there will be, the closest enquiry made by the Opposition as to how this money was spent and that a detailed statement will be obtained as to how it was spent. Apart from this particular matter these seems to be a looseness all round.

I am sure the Hon. Minister of Finance must now be a most unhappy man and a most disillusioned man when he sees how little he can accomplish, when surrounded by those who seem to have no conception whatever of living within the estimates, which they themselves have helped to prepare, and who now seem to throw money around lavishly.

I say, Sir, what must a man's sense of duty and responsibility be, and particularly when a man happens to be head of a Department when he allows such things to go on? When we find emoluments and fees being paid out to all and sundry apparently on any excuse at all. To sum up, looking at the enormous amount of money that has been paid out for emoluments and for commissions, it can only be called what in the U. S. would be called a racket. In the U. S. that's what it would be called and nothing else, and for the size of this country I must say it is a "swell racket."

I remember also that the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs called on the heads of the different departments last year to do their best to try and stop the squandering and to economise to the best of their ability. He stated last year that his "door was

"knocked down" with applicants looking for jobs. There must have been a falling down here too, he probably had to, but he did, at any rate, make new appointments.

Then the Auditor General refers to Reparations. Now as we all know the idea of the Reparation Fund was that it was the sum allocated to Newfoundland from Germany under the Young Plan. First of all under it, civilians who had suffered in the Great War were to be reimbursed and afterwards claimants of the Royal Naval Reserve and the prisoners of War. As far as I know there are only one or two outstanding claimants in respect of the Merchant Marine. What I want to know is, with such a small number why are the rewards so long in being made? \$500 or \$600 would have meant a little fortune to some of these claimants and still they have had to wait for it over a period of years. As regards the prisoners of war the Prime Minister says that these claims have been paid. I must accept the Prime Minister's word for it, but if it is so it must have been within the last 24 hours. I am delighted to hear so, and I am sure every returned sailor and soldier must be jubilated, but still it is only tardy justice. But the pertinent question is to whom has this \$12,162.14 been paid. It has been paid within the last two years. Now everybody knows that when this award was first made the Prime Minister appointed three Commissioners to act in an advisory capacity. Their duties solely consisted in grading the amounts to be paid to individual claimants. They have performed their work but that amount of remuneration does not account for the \$12,162.14 which has been paid. And as I say it is the duty of the Opposition to ask that details of this amount should be laid on the table of the House.

Before concluding my remarks I feel it my duty to refer again to the deplorable conditions existing in the country, especially in St. John's. There is no use blindfolding ourselves to the plain facts. There is a great lack of employment, there is a great deal of destitution, and there is no outlook for the future.

Those people have put a hard winter over them and it is very difficult for those who are in close touch with them to know that their conditions are hopeless for the present. I say that we in this House should drop the attitude of pooh poohing the idea that there is any destitution, and if members of the Government were in touch with those people they would have a different opinion.

Conditions in the country are bad, gentlemen, and that is why I pointed out an objection to the Prime Minister's speech when he stated in the House after pointing out the percentage of unemployment for the past ten years that conditions were now better and that we were on the upgrade.

As regards the past conditions as compared to the present let us look to the various charitable organizations. Let us take the Great War Veterans Association for example. In the past years the Great War Veterans gave only 186 grants for relief and this year they gave out 300 grants per month and this may be taken as an indication, a strong indication, of the conditions which endure in the city today, this association alone giving out 300 grants of relief per month ever since September. And the other organizations still St. Vincent-de-Paul, the Dorcas Society and the Salvation Army, what of these? You may say we had these before. Yes we did, but never before in their histories have they been so pressed and this year they have been financed to the limit.

Never before have conditions been as bad as they are now; the people have just got over a hard winter and now in the early spring and summer later on, they have nothing to look forward to other than the few dollars they may gain by a day's work and I sincerely trust something better than this will be done for them.

I feel that I would not be doing my duty as the junior member for the district of St. John's East if, before I took my seat, I did not ask the government, before the House closes, that they find some certain and productive work or industry to keep the people occupied.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about the motion put this afternoon, but first of all, I would like to make a reference to the disaster which has so lately occurred to the sealers on the North East coast of our country. I would like to extend a message of sympathy to the relatives and dependents of those who did not return.

I would like to congratulate the Government for the magnificent manner in which they responded to the call for assistance.

I would also like to congratulate those heroes of Horse Island for the heroism they displayed at their posts of duty. Men have received decorations from the hands of His Majesty the King for which they were not as, or at least, not more deserving than these men, such as Otis Bartlett and Johnston.

I would like to take this opportunity of suggesting that the Government take this opportunity of making some tangible form of recognition other than the usual form as recorded in the records of this House.

Last year I stated that the Government should purchase and equip some ship and have it always in readiness for occasions such as these when such a ship becomes a dire necessity. We have an efficient fire-fighting apparatus and we have many patrols for the protection for our forests but we have not yet got a ship which would be necessary when such ships as the Sagona and the Beothic are not at hand to give assistance in the saving of lives such as was necessitated by the disaster.

I would like to congratulate the Hon. member for White Bay for asking and seeing that the Government installed a Wireless Station at White Bay, as but for the Hon. member's actions in this regard the result of the disaster would most probably have been very much worse.

I would now like to suggest that the Government install broadcasting stations in St John's and other stations at strategic points along the coasts. I do not like to criticize the Government but I consider it my duty to do so and I think I may say that if the Government were on this side of the House and we were on the other side they would be just as ready, if not more ready to criticize us; it is not pleasant to be criticized, neither is it pleasant to criticize. I think that the only virtue that party politics, as we know it, or as it is known in other countries, is that it permits the Opposition to question and expose if necessary to the public the actions of the Government.

As regards the Speech from the Throne, all I can say about the Hon. members of the Government is that they seem to be wonderful gentlemen as they seem to be able to make bricks without straw. I may say that after their three sessions in power they

seem to have very little to show us; I may be blind, but I can't see it. I cannot see that anything outstanding has been done by the Government. The Prime Minister has informed us that the Imperial Conference which he attended was a success but we hear from other sources that it was a most dismal failure. All it seems to have done was to undermine Empire stability, the Empire stability for which much blood has been shed.

Didn't he try to tell (the Prime Minister) that there was no depression when we know what conditions obtain here in our midst.

Don't think that there is no depression. Only the other night I was roused from my bed by two men knocking at the door of my house at 2 a.m. and I dressed because it was my duty in the common interests of humanity to go with them, and if these, driven by such condition, were forced to do this how many others must there be in actual want, and I say that after three years of power this state of things is not creditable to the Government.

Now if they were courageous enough to come and seek some friends to help them put it off a little longer it would be different, but these were not the kind of men who wanted dole. Conditions in my district and in every other district for that matter are very bad indeed and the people are in bad circumstances, despite what the Government state to the contrary.

The one redeemable feature about the emergency is that a large proportion of our people who are in need hide their troubles and try to get along the best way they can. Every representative in this House must know—and it is no use in their trying to camouflage it—that with a shrinkage of five million dollars in the value of

the staple industry of the country there must be serious consequences as a result and that there must be a lot of destitution amongst the fishermen and working class of people generally, and if the other industries of the country suffered in a similar manner it would probably cause their disappearance altogether.

It is idle to be comparing the earning power of the people of Newfoundland with those of Canada, the United States or the United Kingdom, and if I may say it there is only one good reason why many of our people get along at all and that is because to a great extent our women work like men to try and eke out an existence for themselves and their families.

Now, Sir, as far as I can see the only persons who seem to be in clover at the present time in this country are those who are friendly disposed to the Government. It may be perhaps tiresome to members of the Government to have Section 33b of the Audit Act talked over so much, but it is equally tiresome to the people of this country who have to pay the bills.

No one disputes the right of a man who has earned money to receive it; but there are people listed in the Auditor General's Report who could not earn the moneys they received for extra services with what they get in a regular way, no matter what employment they were engaged in in this country.

This, Sir, I submit, is a scandalous condition of affairs, and it is very poor taste for the Government to scatter moneys broadcast to people—moneys they did not earn—especially at a time like this when thousands of our hard working men and women of the country are so hard up against it to live, and I consider that the Executive

Government, in permitting such a terrible waste of public funds are disloyal to public interests. It is a sad picture to look at when a Government is supposed to be representative of the working people of the country swells the coffers of the monied interests of the rich by exploiting the interests of the poor.

The late Government were bitterly assailed in season and out of season for catering to "blue bloods," but, if the present Government carries on paying out money in the way they have been doing the past two and a half years, everybody connected with the present Government, directly or indirectly, will be in the "blue blood" class.

Now, Sir, this sort of administration of the country's affairs is not alone unjustifiable, but a disgrace to self-Government. It seems that plums are ripe for the plucking for special parties and friends of the Government and starvation by degrees for the masses of our people. If there was any one decent bit of legislation that passed this House within recent years it was the Pensions Act passed by the Monroe Government because if that was not done there would be more scandal to hear about under Section 33b of the Audit Act.

I notice that the new Superintendent of the Poor Asylum gets \$3,000 a year, almost as much as a professional man in charge of a Hospital. Last year I asked the Government to consider a small pension for a poor worn out mail courier in my district. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs did not answer me but the Minister of Finance assured me that the pension would be granted. The man died a short while after. He did not get the pension because he was not a friend of the Government. Now if that is Liberalism, give me liberty.

I say, Sir, that the public funds of this country are in grave danger of total extinction through the existence of party Government that we know of today. If the people of the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States who loan us money knew how this money was wasted they would cease accommodating us with loans.

We are moving in the direction of slavery and a few more years of honest-to-goodness hard times and of waste, extravagance and of drowsy inaction on the part of the present Government and all in the country will starve.

Every member of this House knows of the compromising position in which Australia finds herself and we are heading that way today. Even the Finance Minister admitted here in his Budget last year that the Civil Service was overmanned, and, if rumour counts for anything, the Government proposed to bring in a Bill at this session to reduce the membership of the House.

Now I am going to offer a suggestion. As the Estimates are not yet handed down I would ask the Finance Minister to consult with the heads of the various departments with a view to reduce expenditures for the coming year by 25 per cent and to cut out the payments of moneys by Order-in-Council—moneys not voted by the House. Within the past six years the Highroads Commission spent six million dollars on roads and bridges. The point I wish to make is that whilst we agree that at times there was need to relieve unemployment and alleviate distress, yet the borrowing and spending of such huge sums of money for carrying out this highroad policy is not a panacea for our ills and will not solve the problem that is confronting the working people of this

country today. One thing it is doing, it is helping to reduce the railway earnings and besides commensurate returns are not given for the work done. In a few years you will not be able to get sufficient money to repair these roads and what is worse than anything else we have taken away our men from productive work and disorganized the fishing industry. That is another thing the Highroads Commission should study. I do not want it thought that I have socialistic tendencies; but if that six million dollars that was spent on highroads was devoted to provide facilities for men to prosecute the fisheries we would have more tangible results; and then again even if it is necessary to spend road money why not use it on the local roads in the various districts instead of improving roads in the back woods that lead from nowhere to nowhere.

Another crying shame is the improper way that disbursements were made in regard to the Reparation accounts. I am glad to have heard the Prime Minister say that payments have been made to prisoners of war; but, Sir, I know of cases where men who were captured by the enemy in time of war and the treatment they have received is positively disgraceful. Our Government, I might say, has not acted a bit too quickly because I notice in a report of the Reparation Commissioners of Canada that payments had been made to deserving claimants in Canada in December, 1927 and it was only the disputed ones that had been left over until now. I find here also a statement showing payments made in 1927 in respect to a shipment of codfish made by various Halifax firms on the S. S. Serinac which was sunk by a submarine. I do not know what the firms in this country are getting and am not much con-

cerned. The chief interest I have in this matter is the question of prisoners of war and veterans of the mercantile marine and who are members of the association that I have the privilege to be a member of.

Now almost everybody is talking about commissions which have been appointed within the past two years; but I find that only one of the commissions had the courage to bring in a report and I am glad to know that the Public Utilities Commission saw the necessity for reduction in the price of bread and milk. Now there is where the Government can function properly by protecting the interests of the common people of the country.

I cannot see how if profit on bread could be made when flour was \$8.75 a barrel it could not be made when flour is \$5.75 a barrel. But what surprises me most is that the Commission finds now that it has no power to enforce its recommendations and make those bread and milk dealers bring their prices down with the result that the Government has to bring in another Act here to give the Commission power and by the time this Act is enacted into law the price of flour may probably have advanced again in the foreign market.

Last year the Government voted considerable sums of money from unappropriated loans for railway purposes. I presume it is to the credit of railway account. The Auditor General's Report states that the money was available for spending in June of last year. What I would like to know is did the railway management or did the railway commission control the money that was spent. The report shows that only 25 box cars at \$62,500; \$2500 for a house for a section foreman and \$130,000 on the new freight sheds was all that was constructed or built. For

the benefit of the Railway Commissioners I would point out to them the necessity for refrigerating cars and cold storage chambers in the steamers, as such facilities in these times are of more importance and more advantageous than the building of high class sleeping and dining cars.

Now, Sir, I want to refer to the Free List. The report of the Blue Book shows that \$12,000,000 worth of goods comes into the country duty free. Of course, most of this is imported for the use of big companies operating in Newfoundland, but nevertheless there is a considerable amount of material which is imported at the time of construction but which has become decreased after the companies have started operations. I have summed up here what the poor man gets in on the Free List and it amounts to \$5,000,000 as against \$7,213,941 for privileged parties and surely this should be a lesson to us in the future when companies come in here looking for concessions in the way of duty free entries; whilst on the other hand there are various items used by the fishermen of the country which could very well be reduced.

For instance, rubber boots on which 44 per cent ad valorem is paid; oil clothes, 20 per cent is paid and there could be a reduction on tins for packing lobsters and salmon as well as corkwood and other supplies; but a high tariff wall should be placed around the importation of vegetables to this country. I think we can produce sufficient vegetables to prevent a sum of \$294,000 going out of this country and if our people are unpatriotic enough to want to purchase the imported article they should be made pay for them.

Since this government came into office some dicker was made with the

Hudson's Bay Company in connection with services formerly performed on the Labrador coast by the Moravian Mission. I do not know if the terms of the new arrangement were tabled in the House, but there are many disquieting rumors of discrimination in this respect, but I feel that the people on the Labrador who are unrepresented in this House should be given the benefit of the doubt and an investigation taken up in regard to the matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't see why the Hudson's Bay Co. should obtain an advantage like that or why the people of the Labrador should be discriminated against. I suppose the time will come when the Labrador will have a member of its own, and for my part I don't see why it can't now be attached to some other district and the people there given some representation. There are quite a lot of people there.

I am informed that the Government are contemplating an increase on butter in pails, and I don't know whether the idea is to protect the mill man or the tub factories. One thing is obvious to the people that use them, and that is that pails are more usable after they are empty, but I think it is not unlikely that when three cents a pound tax is put on butter in pails, it will only be giving the tub man a chance to put another three cents on to his.

Speaking of the mill act passed last year, all I can say, Sir, is that it is most unsatisfactory and most unpopular, and that fifty cents a thousand on lumber is a severe handicap. We are always only too ready in this country to jump on the small producer, while big companies come here from abroad and obtain all sorts of concessions.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr Speaker, those duties have been reduced by \$1.50.

MR. QUINTON—Mr Speaker, yes, but surely you will admit that in a great many cases the foreign company gets off scot free. This matter effects my district as well as a great many other districts in the country, and speaking of my own district, I have, in the common vernacular, a bone to pick with the Hon. Colonial Secretary, who is shortly to be the Secretary of State. I don't know what I, in particular have ever done to the Government, but they are certainly trying to turn my district against me. I think it is a rather extraordinary position for the member to have all the affairs of the district taken entirely out of his hands. A lighthouse was built there last year and the first I heard of it was when I received a letter from a man asking to be recommended as lighthouse keeper. In this particular case if I had been consulted I would have recommended a fog alarm. At any rate things are in a terrible mess there at present, and if the Government are contemplating spending any money there I would ask them to do it now, and not to wait until a couple of weeks before the elections. In this connection I wrote the Hon. Colonial Secretary as follows:

(Reads)

The Hon. gentleman did me the courtesy of speaking to me about the matter some time afterwards, and on the 25th of September this letter was addressed to the same source:

(Reads)

Now, Mr Speaker, these were reasonable suggestions. The Government has seen fit in the past to expend money on roads leading from nowhere

to nowhere, and yet on the 1st of October several days afterwards I got the following reply:

(Reads)

These two bridges in my district would require three times the amount of the special grant, and \$10,000 was a comparatively small amount. But the irony of it is that the Report of the Auditor General says that the \$10,000 was actually spent, yet the Government on the same date said it had no money to spend there. This is my reply and as I have read the others I might as well read this:

(Reads)

Mr Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for any party whether Government or Opposition that plays the game, but I have absolutely none for one that can act as meanly as that. They are firing everybody all over the district, simply because they did not vote for the Government. Old men over sixty are being discarded and young men put in their places. I could fill another Auditor General's Report, if I wanted to, with the sins of commission of the Government. A time will come, Sir, when those who sit in the seats of the mighty in this country will have a better idea of playing the game.

Last year it was my privilege to compliment the Chairman of the Board of Health on his good work in connection with his Department. If there is one man more than another in the Government who merits praise it is he, and I want to give credit where credit is due, to the Chairman of the Board of Health. The Health problem in this community requires deeper thought and closer study than the average man realizes but I am glad to see that a real effort is being

made towards solving this complicated problem. A Bill, I understand is shortly to come before this House and although it may have its faults and shortcomings side by side with its advantages, it is, however, a serious attempt to do something in a practical way for the people of the country. Its adoption will create many new features and I think that everyone will agree that the Chairman of the Board of Health deserves the support and assistance of every member of this House. It is a pity that every thinking man and woman was not privileged to read the first interim report of that Commission. If we are not going to save money in one direction we must save it in another, but, not under any circumstances should it be saved at the expense of the sick poor of the country but at the expense of those who endeavor to get the better of the Department of Public Health by imposition.

There is a great need for a laboratory at the General Hospital. There are thousands of people throughout the Island and elsewhere who do not know that we have not got one. In a country such as this with such a large area of sparsely populated land a laboratory is an absolute necessity. The best medical services and equipment that money can buy should be available to minister to the needs of the sick and infirm, money spent in buying such necessities is money well invested.

For many years the cry has been raised for fire escape facilities at the Insane Asylum. I do not know if steps have been taken to have this need attended to but it is time that some action was taken to ensure the inmates of this Institution every possible chance to save themselves from a horrible death in the event of a fire there.

I do not know if representatives in other districts find the same conditions as I do in mine, but I say, without prejudice to those Relieving Officers who are trying to do their best, that the appointment should not be at the discretion of the district representative, and I tell you here now, Sir, that if I am ever elected as the representative of a district in a Government party, some of them will have to go.

The most difficult problem that confronts a political representative of a district in this country is to have some poor unfortunate admitted to hospital. The fault is everybody's, I don't know who should take the blame but I do know that if somebody writes the member that they are in a very serious condition you would have to know how to do cross-word puzzles in order to ascertain the proper procedure necessary to get that poor unfortunate medical assistance.

Last year I advocated that the Old Age Pension law be changed and now I would like to add a word or two to what I said last year. If we did not have the frame of mind which causes the expenditure of huge sums for this and that—take up a newspaper and you will see people getting all kinds of money—perhaps it would not be necessary to ask this, but surely we can change this law so that old people of 65 or at the very most 70 should get a little relief. There are so many poor old dependent fishermen, who have spent a lifetime in bringing wealth into the country and who, now, too old and infirm to work, are now dependent on the charity of the country which is not forthcoming. Surely we can afford to give these poor old men a few comforts before they leave us. And, for God's sake, Mr. Speaker, let us make some proper provision so

that the sick poor and infirm shall not be without sustenance.

I may say that letters of a heart rending nature come to me, and, Sir, these people who write them have to pocket their pride to do so. They are not people who are in the habit of asking favours. To my mind there is no greater blot on this country than this matter of withholding assistance to these people I described. It is obvious that when we are spending so much money, consideration should be given to these people who cannot help themselves. In Canada, widows receive as much as \$25.00 or \$30.00 per month, according to the particular law applying in the province and in England there are numerous schemes, many subsidized by the Government to help out those poor unfortunates who have had the misfortune to depend upon the charity of the people for their very existence. It is true that the Government allocated \$20,000.00 last year for Old Age Pensions but what was that? That would go only a very short ways towards relieving the situation in any way.

Now, the question has been mooted, particularly in the press of the Government, that some form of standardization is necessary to save our diminishing industries. It is a big word and a big proposition. There are men who will disagree with the position which will attain under standardization and the party who is responsible for introducing a Standardization Bill and the proper administration of it will suffer much criticism, just and unjust, but sooner or later it will have to be done.

Conditions in this country to-day will have to be fixed. There is grave danger in a Bill of this sort, if it were not properly handled it would do a great deal of harm, but what use are

the people who are elected to administer the affairs of the people if they have not the courage to govern properly. This problem of Standardization is a matter that requires deep thought and trained minds in order to bring it to a proper basis. It is obvious that we do not produce the goods of the quality required that we will not get markets and the worst of it is that we talk about it but do nothing else.

The late A. W. Piccott in a report of the Department of Fisheries, deplored to the Morris Government, that if Newfoundland was to hold on as a fishing country, we would have to adopt methods in line with those employed by the Norwegians. That was in 1915, it is now 1931. We have been talking ever since, some of us, at any rate, and as he very aptly said that there was nothing done in the past and he means back past 1915, but talk. It is difficult to anticipate just what the Government has in view when it says 'Standardization' but I hope that it will consider the question very carefully before anything is mooted.

I would like to say to the Government right now, that if this question is brought into the limelight for political purposes, I say that it is a crying shame. We have played politics with our resources long enough and no Government should take a position of that kind, camouflage it, and paint a paradise that will be opened to the country if they are returned to power.

There are people who think that production in this country should be standardized, that the various fishing industries should be merged, our exports pooled and various other efforts should be made to improve our position. This is obviously not so much a question for this House as for the trade of the country in the aggregate

and I do not mean the exporters more than the hardworking, intelligent fishermen who have the greatest interest in this position and who realize that even with the assistance of the Government the path is very stony. I would like to see the Government spend some money on a conference to be held in this town and bring in people from all over the country who are interested in this question.

I feel that this question is not one entirely for the House, but chiefly for the trade, and I would suggest that some money could be spent in arranging a conference between the trade and the producers and the Government so that all together would be able to develop some arrangement in which the gospel of good goods would be preached, and that to my mind must necessarily precede standardization. Everybody recognizes that something is wanted, but what I propose is that we should organize to discover a remedy. Hitherto we've been only running away from our problems. We have only been, so to speak, offering bribes to our difficulties, by stalling them off for the present.

I think it is high time that our politicians should become imbued with the same ideas as doctors when they are trying to diagnose a case, and as is were, to put our problems on an operating table, and at least give them a chance of being solved. As it is we are only fighting a rear guard action all the time.

The Government has now been in office for over two and a half years and we are hearing the same old story all the time. They have evolved a grand Highroads policy, a grand Railroad policy and still apparently they have not a dollar to spend on the basic industry of the country.

I believe, Sir, that all our mills and all our mines could be taken away, and if a Government could put a good fish policy in operation, things in this country would be just as well off as they are now. I say, Sir, that we can't begin to fathom what an immense source of revenue our fisheries are. The Board of Trade is just as much to blame in this matter as anybody else, and I say this with all due deference to the member for Trinity South who happens to be a Councillor. I was one myself at one time, but I resigned. Why not bring together the people interested and talk the matter over? It is not because the Government happens to be on one side and the merchants on the other that this should not be done.

There are men on this side of the House both broad enough and big enough to realize the difficulties of the problems the Government are up against at present and to offer them every assistance in their power. My own district is essentially a fishing one, and if it were not for the salmon fishery and the squid fishery last year it would have gone very hard with them. The cod fishery alone was not enough to support one settlement. The whole truth is that people are not fishing now. They have lost their desire to do so. It is not so much the fault of the markets and everything can't be blamed on that. If the Government persist in their policy of scattering money about, I say, Sir, its going to kill the fisheries.

As regards the markets, though, there is no doubt that our position is indeed a perilous one, and the trade is as much to blame as the politicians for that. The sellers abroad who are representing the firms can sell Iceland and Norwegian fish as well as our own whenever it suits them to do

so. Why should any business man consider doing business with a firm when he knows that he is being double crossed. I think that our local firms are not big enough financially or administratively to realize that our trouble is just as much a sales problem as anything else.

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the Bill entitled "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips" 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.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, that year we got about 19,000 barrels of potatoes, a large quantity of cabbage and of other vegetables, however, later on due perhaps to lack of proper supervision or some other cause the quality of the vegetable deteriorated greatly, I had some sent in for my own private inspection and I may say that the potatoes were practically worthless and the other vegetables of no value and consequently sales fell off. That has happened so often that it is necessary to take steps for the standardization of the produce. The Act has been compiled with very much care and ought to prove satisfactory if, however, it turns out that certain amendments are needed to meet any new state of things, then these amendments can be introduced whenever necessary. The Act should be of real value as it will encourage the growth of home products.

The reading of it by the members will, I think, clarify everything as well as though I discussed it section by section.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, is it intended to have the produce sent to a central grading station or something of that sort.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, that is not intended, the different grades will be sold as such by the producers and those not up to the grades will be returned.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, is it possible to know if the heart of a large potato is hollow?

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, that is, of course, impossible.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, we are not financially strong enough as yet to afford the purchasing of an X-ray equipment for that purpose.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, some time ago, for my own private interest, I calculated the amount drawn from the sale of our own products such as hay, vegetables, milk and eggs and to the total I added the amount spent on the imported eggs and butter, etc., and I was astounded to find the total was over \$150,000.00. It is really astounding the value of such things when you go into them. I think I may say that it would be possible to realize as much from this source as from our sealfishery and as far as the standardization is concerned I think the local merchants would only be too glad to give the project their support if only they could be assured of the quality. It is humiliating to see our ships putting out and going to Canada in order to take on provisions, even the West Coast steamer, I understand, gets its vegetables from Prince Edward Island, as is, I think, the practice of the Government steamers.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 31, 1931.

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

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, I was asked by the residents of Collier's East to present to this House a petition asking for a special grant for the extension of a road in that place. Last year a similar petition was presented and subsequent to the closing of the House I succeeded in getting a small grant. The road in question was extended two or three miles and this petition asks for a further extension to the same road.

The object of getting a special grant for this road is to enable the people in that particular section to gain access to the country-side where they are accustomed to pick blueberries. The blueberry industry has grown to large proportions in that section of the district in recent years. It is a great source of income to our people and I have great pleasure in endorsing the prayer of this petition, and I ask that it be referred to the Public Works Department, and I hope that in the not far distant future something tangible will be done.

There has been no demand for relief from these people, even though the fishery in this section has been a complete failure, and this is because of this industry, that is, picking blueberries, which during the month of

July, August and September has yielded such profitable returns. Mr Speaker, I support this petition and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Red Head Cove asking for a small sum of money to repair the road from Red Head Cove to Bay de Verde. This stretch of road is about three and a half miles long and is a utility or by-road. This road has an unfortunate location inasmuch as it runs over very boggy ground and is very hard to keep up and a grant of \$120.00 is not by any means adequate especially now as there are so many trucks and horses passing over it.

This petition is signed by Rev. Fr. Mackey of Bay de Verde and Rev. Mr. Sullivan, Church of England minister, and by many prominent residents of that section. I will do the best I can to allocate as much as possible for the repair of this road. It is very very necessary, indeed, and I give this petition my heartiest support and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted to take this moment to say that up to the moment we have received donations to the Viking Disaster Fund amounting in all to \$2,105.00. These donations are very general and are not so specific as to be transferred to the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund.

During the course of the next week or so there is \$25,000.00 coming from the South Coast Disaster Fund which I trust will be transferred with or without the authority of this House to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund. I would like to assure this House and those identified with the

handling of this fund that it will receive every support from the Government, and we will assist them in every possible way. I feel that the donations coming in from the public and those already received will be abundant to provide immediate relief at any rate.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question

Mr. Moore gave notice of question

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Address in Reply

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Speaker, continuing my speech on the Address in Reply I would like to emphasize the point I have already made respecting a suggestion that an embargo be placed on foreign agricultural products and I believe that such a thing would bring justifiable results.

Last year there was imported into the country salted pork with its by-products of spare ribs, lard, sausages, ham and bacon with an aggregate value of \$1,050,000. I am convinced that given proper encouragement we could produce our own agricultural requirements and many items of farm produce could be produced at home thus distributing among our people many thousands of dollars now being sent out of the country.

Newfoundland was never properly examined as to its far reaching possibilities in the way of agricultural development. I say that as far as the fisheries are concerned there are plenty of room for a sound policy of standardization and in this connection I can see fully the benefits of a bonus. A bonus could particularly be made

applicable in conjunction with a standardization scheme. A profitable voyage for the fishermen makes work for everybody.

Our past governments have subsidized everything that is foreign but there is never any care for the workmen these companies exploit. We are allowing foreign steamers to take away our produce to the foreign markets, a very short-sighted policy and we are allowing our coastal trade to be harassed by the same means. The time has come when Newfoundland must assert herself and protect her own industries. Every quintal of fish is going to the markets in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish steamers and Halifax steamers are taking away all our coastal trade decreasing our railway earnings and starving our coasting crews.

The United States consumes 15 lbs of fish per head per annum; Germany, 18 lbs; Egypt, 6½ lbs; Argentine 10 lbs. Other South American countries average 14 lbs; Japan, 58 lbs and the United Kingdom 56 lbs. With the small consumption per head in the United States it can be seen that the American fishermen have not penetrated far into their own markets and I can not see why the government could not see fit to make an experimental shipment of a few hundred thousand pounds of fresh codfish and endeavor to introduce it into the populous cities of the U. S. These are things which could not very well be done by the merchants and experiments are expensive but pioneering work has to be done in all paths of endeavor.

The question of cull will be a difficult one to handle. It is true that fish intended for one market sometimes gets into another but the government should have the right to say by law

whether inferior or superior fish should go to certain markets. Bad fish should be destroyed wherever it is and there is no excuse for the man who pawns off an inferior article. The man, whether an exporter or fisherman, who ships abroad knowingly an inferior article, is a menace to the trade and to the best interests of the country.

Last year I recommended amendments to the War Pensions Act. I hoped that when the estimates came in this year provision would be made to place the pension bonus to be paid to ex-service men on the same basis as in Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express the hope that the government would try and take some steps to remedy the conditions which are prevailing unless they are prepared to see things go from bad to worse in which case there would be no means of knowing where we are going to end. All of the people cannot go out of the country to seek a living and there is no reason why any should go out of their own country but be encouraged to stay here and earn a decent livelihood at productive employment. The only cure for unemployment is profitable work and it is to that end legislators and all others must eagerly strive.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted to make a few observations in reference to the motion now before the Chair. I was unavoidably absent from the House when the news of the terrible Viking disaster came in, and consequently was only in a position to gather garbled accounts from foreign papers as to what happened. There was one particular thing that struck me after the disaster was reported. American organizations got together and chartered a plane and provisioned it and fitted

it with medical supplies and in a very short time it took off on a long flight to render assistance to a little steamer of which they could have known very little, and only because there was one or two Americans concerned in the disaster. .

Now I think that if this plane was of such use, would not our own little plane have rendered much assistance at Horse Island at the time of this disaster and I understand that it has at other times been chartered by the Government for the purpose of carrying mails. It would in a large way have been the means of relieving much distress and suffering. I am not in a position to say what the trouble was, but its lack of use is inexcusable. I would also like to say a word of condolence to the friends and relatives of those who did not return. I should also like to extend a word of sympathy to those who are at present under treatment in the various places in the city, and I hope that in a short while they will have fully recovered their health.

I understand that everything possible was done by the Government. I am told the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stood on his feet like a little man and did his best. He sent steamer after steamer off, and left no stone unturned to keep those at home informed at to what was happening.

I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the proposer and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. On my return I read the speeches made and even if unsuccessful, their efforts to locate a little life into that dead document is deserving of congratulation. In the Speech some reference was made to the fact that the depression of the fishery in the country was such just now as to cause the expenditure

of an appreciable amount; now the appreciable amount referred to is quite a sum of money, in my opinion, and when I find other expenditures are referred to as minor and lesser accounts, I am lead to believe the Government have a strange idea of a large sum of money. The appreciable sum referred to is five millions of dollars. Imagine; almost half the treasury takes annually is calmly referred to as only an appreciable amount.

The Speech from the Throne reiterated as usual its reference to the fisheries. In this, my third session in attendance, the same old reference, even a commission has been functioning from the time of the first session and with falling markets annually, not one thing of material benefit has been done. No matter what industries start in the country, paper mills, mines or manufactures, the fisheries remain paramount. Once they fail then we fail; once they decline, we decline.

Newfoundland is the most backward country in the world today in progress, vision and development, and especially in the handling of her natural resources. We still export fish as we did years and years ago. In 1900 we had ample markets, but in this age of progress, pure food laws, sanitation, packing and shipping, we can't apply ancient methods and succeed. Yet we compete with up-to-date countries in the same old way, and what is the result? Greece, where our fish found a ready market, has delivered its ultimatum. Better fish, or we will not buy your goods. Norway has stepped into the Brazilian market, a market we had solely to ourselves for many years, and the Brazilian market situation today is very insecure. In Italy and Portugal sales are made with difficulty. I am not a fish-

erman, but one needs but to read to realize we are slipping in the world trade, and slipping fast. It ought to be obvious to any Government with our interests at heart, unless some strong action is taken to protect and advance our great industry the economic structure of the land might eventually collapse.

My friend, Mr. Quinton, suggests we might approach other markets, such as America, where there is virgin ground for development. We who once held the main markets of the world have lost them by obsolete methods. I fear we have little chance in new markets when we lost old ones. We are backward, the most backward country there is now; even the blacks have gone forward under white control, while we stand still. Adopt new methods and hold and increase in the markets we know and understand. It isn't that I am knocking Newfoundland. Immediately anyone starts a line of criticism, constructive criticism, all say: Oh! he's knocking the country before the whole world. But we have reached a point where we need a good kick to wake up, and playing politics and indifference won't do it. Why, if anyone puts up a new building he is day-dreaming; so we run along in the same old rut and stagnate.

The Government has spent in the past year one and three quarter millions in highroad building and general road programme. It must stop. The Monroe Government spent a lot, but nothing in proportion. It is obviously unremunerative. Take the millions spent and foster the fishery. Build, if necessary, curing centres, and squid depots and other modern methods; at least try it for a year, and the results would be astounding. Let the fishermen fish, and you find a way to make

it profitable for them. Make them independent as in the past, and not kill their independence by useless work on the highroads, paid out to them from borrowed capital.

When you come to think that the sum of \$261,000 was spent on able-bodied relief, and \$1,233,000 on the highroads last year in a country with only a revenue of \$11,000,000 and with a population of only 260,000 people One and three quarter million dollars was spent on poor relief to keep the people alive. An economic collapse if this state of affairs continues, will be the result, and the responsibility would be the Government's; and although this Government must take the responsibility of past governments upon their shoulders, yet if the Government continues as they are going they will have to keep a strong lookout; eventually there will be another bombshell, and a suddenly enlightened people will say we have the Labrador we have this and we have that. We have nothing, and now exist on borrowed monies.

A road was built last from Goobie's Siding to Terenceville which cost \$588,000—\$588,000 for a road away out there, back of the hills, for the rabbits to play on in the moonlight. After a few years it will be a place for rabbit snares and blueberries. To use your motor car you would want to be absolutely made of money, the road in some parts is in such poor condition. This Goobies-Terenceville road will cost thousands of dollars to keep in repair. We can't stand that. What we want to do is cut out this highroad business altogether. There is not a half dozen good roads in any district or in the whole country. There are no connecting links of roads with the railroad, and then people wonder why the railway shows a deficit. This highroads business is killing the fish-

cries and the independence of the fishermen. What the men want is honest work, a remunerative work, a work that will bring outside money in.

There is another road I would like to refer to. Before doing so I will refer to the Carroll Cold Storage Co. instituted at Holyrood last year to procure squid bait and put them in cold storage for the use of bankers when they come to secure squid. This company was guaranteed by the Government to the extent of five per cent on its capital investment. This company will not leave comparatively a flip of a coin in Holyrood. In past years a big means of livelihood to the people of Holyrood was the selling of squid to the bankers and which they annually count on to exist. Now this company catches the squid and pays what it likes; puts it in cold storage to sell at what it likes and to make sure the bankers won't buy direct from the fishermen, what has happened? The Government are building a highroad out on the Witless Bay Line at the cost of \$100,000.00 so that the squid may be shipped to the Southern Shore by truck and sold there. This road was built out of public funds to ensure the life of the company at the expense of the Holyrood fishermen and Hon. Mr. Cashin and Hon. Mr. Lewis are its incorporators, and I suppose largest shareholders.

At the first session of the Legislature Hon. Mr. Lewis stood on his feet then, his chest out half an inch and said the fishermen were tired of feeding some older politicians who had been returned to this House time and time again in the past and now two and a half years later we find him profiteering off the same fishermen and exposed to such an extent that I doubt if he will ever show his nose in Holyrood again or even stop his car there .

Has anyone in this House ever been on board the "Swile" operating on the Labrador? A dirty stinking hulk with an old auxiliary engine hired by the Government at \$95.00 a day. Last year 104 days costing \$9,880.00. The smell of bilge water, engine oil and cooking fighting for supremacy. The berths open to all need a shoe horn to get in and out. The toilet arrangements impossible for women and tolerated by men a disgrace to the whole country, yet an up-to-date steel steamer is and has been available at \$45.00 a day, a saving of \$50.00 a day. Yet the Government hires the "Swile" and robs the treasury of \$50.00 a day for political expediency.

We still await news from the Agricultural Commission. Why are the imports of potatoes and cabbage going up annually? 180,000 bushels of potatoes and 855,000 pounds of cabbage imported last year and the farmers in my district find it next to impossible to market their produce. I know people who are starving because they cannot sell in competition with the imported article. P. E. I. dumps potatoes and cabbage here from the surplus on hand, has made their profit at home and can afford to dump here to clean out. They operate on large scales and can undersell. Why doesn't the Commission do something here? The farmers are willing to do anything to co-operate, they want to sell in the worst way. Take a grant and hold annual agricultural exhibitions in the main centres. Show them how others operate, give them a lead and they will gladly follow. Secure them markets when their produce is ripe until disposed of to a great extent, control the imports and if necessary stabilize prices locally and you will soon learn whether the country is a farming country or not. In my district hundreds of acres lie unused. They

can supply St. John's the year round. Do something in the line I refer to and the farmers will increase in both numbers and clear more land.

The next thing I find in the Speech from the Throne is the Alan Butler proposals in reference to the Gander. I do not pretend to know what the outcome may be, but this I do know that the Hearsts and the Government had reached solid ground for familiar discussion. Further the Government were in a position for open discussion of details with the Opposition but fell down on the job. I blame not the Prime Minister alone, not the Executive alone, but every individual member of the Government, because they did not even try to make themselves familiar with the details or what was going on. You know less today than we know. The Prime Minister said he was going to breathe the breath of industrial life in the Gander. The results so far lead me to believe he is suffering from halitosis. It is no longer a Gander proposition. Forget it. What you are confronted with today by your blundering is a Gander problem and you'll soon know it.

The terrific expenditure now before the House shows to the members of the Government and to the public in general, what a terrible state of affairs confronts us. I ask the serious view of the Government members, it means as much to you as anyone else. If we go to the wall you will suffer as much as I, and your children who hope to follow their fathers footsteps will suffer as well as mine.

The Speech makes reference to placing Newfoundland under a Dominion Status. From the figures available and the way we govern ourselves proves further wandering from the side of our mother country would lead to disaster. Our only hope in our dis-

tress is to cling to the apron strings of our home Government as a child to its mother. A little country with a population of only 260,000 people should desire no greater freedom than we have. We show ourselves unfit to govern and we have but ourselves to blame and I trust we ever hold to our dependency, to our motherland, wherein at least lies some degree of financial safety.

MR. TOBIN—Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few things in connection with the Speech from the Throne it is not my intention to delay the House in any way. It is true the House has been in session now very nearly three weeks and very little business has been done, but this was as we all know caused through the terrible disaster to the Viking, consequently it was thought by both sides of the House that matters of a contentious nature should not be discussed during a time of mourning. The country as a whole deeply sympathizes with the relatives of the victims of this terrible disaster. On the other hand I want to congratulate the members of the different crews for the manner in which they have done their duty in the face of tremendous obstacles. Like the Hon. member for Bay de Verde, I want to extend my congratulations to a friend of mine, Nicholas Roche, of Middle Cove, whom I understand was with William G. Johnston practically the whole time as he was one of the last survivors to reach Horse Island and I am glad to have the honor to represent a district which produces men of the type of Mr Roache and those other men from St. John's East (Extern) who were members of the Viking crew. I cannot let the opportunity pass without publicly offering my congratulations to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the way in which he handled the situation. There will be

some who will criticize, but I feel sure he did all that was possible.

I want to extend my congratulations to the mover of the Address in Reply, Mr. Bindon, and the seconder, Mr. Strong, who I understand acquitted themselves well. I am sorry I had not the pleasure of hearing them as I was unwell, but I read their speeches in the daily papers and having read them I was at a loss to know what they spoke on as the Speech contained absolutely nothing; an Opposition is supposed to criticize constructively but when they have to review a Speech with nothing constructive in it, their task indeed is very difficult.

The member for St. Mary's, Mr. Bindon, extends his congratulations to those gentlemen who had received New Year's honors. Whilst we of this side offer the same congratulations the country as a whole, especially the underdog we hear so much about from the other side, are more concerned as to what this champion of theirs is going to do for the them in the shape of employment. We were told some time ago at a function in the Newfoundland Hotel that there was no unemployment in the country but we now find in the Speech from the Throne that there has been distress in the country which "my ministers have had to provide for." Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General has told us under section 33b of the Audit Act that the sum of \$193,000 had been spent last year and despite this we are told there is no destitution. The truth of the matter is that there is destitution on all sides.

I wish at this stage to refer to a situation which prevailed in the district I have the honor to represent. A delegation came to me from Pouch Cove last October which stated the

conditions as they existed at that time in Pouch Cove. I immediately made an appointment with the acting Prime Minister, Hon. Sir Tasker Cook, at his office. This Committee consisted of Messrs. Grouchy, John C. Noseworthy and Mr. Evans. They told of the situation as best they could. After they had stated their case we were told to write him a letter and he would place it before the Executive. Two letters were written, one signed by the three gentlemen above, the other by myself, dated Oct. 6th, 1930. I have yet to receive a reply to that letter. As to whether the Acting Prime Minister replied to that of the delegation I am unable to answer. The request was for a sum of money to finish a road which runs to Biscaynan's Cove. The request, I am sorry to say, was refused.

What has the Government done in the meantime but give out dole, a thing no man wants. If the work had been undertaken we would now have something to show for the money expended. Just another case of spending money and getting no returns. The Report of the Auditor General states that every department of the Government was overdrawn with only four exceptions. The Hon. member for Bay de Verde a few days ago gave you what was contained in the Auditor General's Report for 1930. I propose now to add to some of those amounts already quoted by Mr. Puddester what they received in 1929.

(Reads list)

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder the common man is saying to himself when is this kind of thing going to stop, my answer to him is this; by using his franchise when the opportunity arises. We have heard a lot about the poor man and what this government was going to do for him. Work was going to be in abundance;

look at conditions as they are in St. John's to-day, some factories closed, others working only on part time. Tomorrow or the next day I will be told I am preaching blue ruin or crying wolf, wolf, when there is no wolf, but take the position of the clothing factories to-day and what do we find. The Nfld. Clothing So., Ltd. at this time last year were employing 135 people, to-day only 75 are at work and only on half time. What applies there applies to the other concerns of similar origin. I don't care what industry you refer to the same conditions prevail, and despite this we have to listen to such stuff as this put in the Speech from the Throne.

I am glad to see that something is about to be done for the fisheries. The fisheries as we all know are our chief resources, but year after year we hear the same thing being told. We have been told in the Speech from the Throne that the Government had the advantage last year of getting the expert opinion of Dr. Harold Thompson of the Fishery Board of Scotland. I often wonder why it is that we ourselves can't select a suitable man here in Newfoundland. I feel sure that if we sent a local man to the countries who are our greatest competitors and let him see if their methods of curing fish differs in any way from the way in which our fishermen cure we would then probably find out where some of our difficulties rest. It is all very well for this Government or any Government to pay this or that one a large sum of money and in the end all we get in return is that a report has been sent and very often that is all is ever heard of it until we go in session again and will be told that such and such a person has been engaged to go into the fishery question extensively. We, of course, realize that some men make better fish than others, but to my mind

the weather last year was the main obstacle as far as making good fish was concerned.

The Speech also made reference to the wonderful work which had been done at the Imperial Conference. Now Mr. Speaker, what was done was of no benefit to Newfoundland. What did the Leader of the Opposition party in the Canadian House of Commons say regarding it. He said it was a fiasco and nothing had been done except to confirm what had already been done in 1926; but here is what the conference cost the taxpayers of Newfoundland; \$9,595.00 despite the fact that the Home Government were hosts to the delegates and had paid the expenses of the Prime Minister and staff. We were also asked to go into Dominion Status. Mr. Speaker, I think personally there is no need for us to adopt it; we have been treated well by the mother Colony and I want to endorse the sentiments of Mr. Puddeste: when he stated that the Old Flag is still good enough for us. Are we in a position to be able to paddle our own canoe. It is no concern what other people want to do. Canada has made no decision but has summoned a conference of the Provinces to consider the matter; it will be time enough for us then to decide what steps we should take in the matter.

The same old story applies to agriculture. We see each steamer arrival from Canada and other countries bringing in large quantities of potatoes, cabbage, and other vegetables which can be grown in this country. I hope that the Minister will recommend to the Finance Minister the need of doing something to protect the farmer. I feel sure that in all parts of this island thousands of barrels of potatoes each year are thrown in the manure heap for the want of an outlet.

Now as regards the Public Utilities Commission:

This was formed in 1929 and as far as we know the only thing they have discovered is that the price of bread is too high, and after discovering that this Commission writes the Governor as follows:

(Reads letter)

The Finance Minister in a speech made in this assembly said that he disagreed with the Hon. member for Placentia East that this Commission was a joke. Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently Mr. Emerson's opinion was correct. The Finance Minister stated in his speech that his Government represents 80% of the common people of Newfoundland and he says it is our job to see that these people are not robbed as they have been for some years.

I am surprised to see that no reference whatever is made to the Gander. The Prime Minister informed the House on opening day that the reason there was no Gander deal was on account of the Reids wanting a guarantee of \$15,000,000 but when we read the correspondence from Mr. C. O'N Conroy which speaks for itself we find this is not so and I propose now to read one section of Mr. Conroy's letter, as follows:

(Reads)

It is just as good to look the matter straight in the face. The Finance Minister stated, I think last year, that when we reach the \$100,000,000 mark our borrowing power will be at an end; well, using their own slogan, "it won't be long now," so I ask every man and every woman who realizes the situation to decide what is his work, her work, to insist upon the remedy being applied. Let them get together

in all places in the country, hold their meetings, pass resolutions calling upon parliament to make an end to our island being used.

The Prime Minister, in answer to a question asked by Mr. Quinton, informed the House that it would not be in the interests of the public to publish the names of those who had received amounts out of the Reparation Fund. The Federal Government of Canada saw no reason why they could not be published. The Montreal Star newspaper published that list a few days ago. I can't see why the same can't be done in Newfoundland. I feel that nobody begrimed those poor sufferers their money. It was a good thing for some of us here that they went across. The Hon. member for Bay de Verde stated in his speech a few days ago that at present in the Bank is a sum of \$156,000 which should be paid to those men as it justly belongs to them; he also stated that there was something else which needed an explanation. A sum of \$12,102.14 had been paid out of that account to some one as fees for looking after this Reparation account.

Next take the Highroads. What is happening there is appalling. Some members opposite severely criticised the doings of the Monroe Government. What is the position now? The total spent in 1930 was \$1,756,599.82 and up to June, 1929, \$1,156,701.60, or a grand total of \$2,913,301.52. It is common knowledge that a temporary loan of \$500,000 had to be secured from the Bank of Montreal to square the account. The reason given was that owing to so much unemployment and destitution something had to be done, and despite this the Prime Minister said in January, I think, there was no destitution. We heard a lot about Monroe spending money, what are you

doing? Take the road leading from the top of Robinson's Hill to the Portugal Cove Road, considerably less than a mile, and it has cost almost \$40,000. Now, I ask you seriously, what have you done in the three years you have been in power that has been of benefit to Newfoundland?

It was very regrettable to see no reference whatever made to agriculture in the Speech from the Throne. There is no reason why we in Newfoundland should have to eat American and Canadian potatoes and cabbage. The Minister of Agriculture knows very well that the same articles can be grown to the same degree of success as those of our next door neighbors. It is not good enough to see our men each fall and spring trying to dispose of their crops, but they don't seem to care, we simply take a hold of the outside article in preference to the local article.

Concluding my speech I wish to congratulate the Chairman of the Public Health Commission and thank him for the assistance given to the people of my district. I also wish to thank the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for his co-operation, as far as district matters are concerned.

On motion the Debate on the Address in Reply was deferred.

Hon. the Solicitor General, on behalf of the Select Committee, presented the following Report:

To the Honourable the House of Assembly:

Your Select Committee upon the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in Connection with the Sale of Securities" have the honour to report that they have considered the Bill to them referred and have made a number of amendments thereto; and

they now report the Bill in the form of the reprinted draft hereto annexed.

The 31st day of March, 1931.

(Sgd.) A. J. WALSH,
P. J. LEWIS,
F. C. ALDERDICE,
E. J. GODDEN,
J. A. WINTER,
F. G. BRADLEY.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in Relation to the Sale of Securities."

Mr Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

The House moved into a Committee of the Whole for reading of the Bill.

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL—Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to present the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill, many changes have been made, and, in fact we were compelled to almost entirely redraft the Bill.

(Reads)

Certain technical changes which would only be understood by the legal members of the House and perhaps not by them, were necessary as in section 26 where we cut out the fine of \$25,000.00 and substituted fines of \$100.00 and \$200.00. The report is signed by every member of the Committee except the Hon. member for Placetian who was not present thru illness but who has seen and concurred with the redraft of the Bill.

As the Bill is highly technical and is not contentious I do not see why it is necessary for the members to go

into it section by section. I think it would be sufficient if we passed it en bloc.

HON. THE SPEAKER, Mr. Chairman, Section 10 has been stricken out and also Section 11 whereby the Attorney General was empowered to arrest a stock broker on suspicion without specifically charging him.

Section 27. Under the proposed Act the Magistrate was empowered to inflict a fine of \$25,000.00 but under the new draft the fine has been cut down to \$100.00 or \$200.00 and under the Act it brings the case to the Supreme Court instead of the Magistrates Court it makes it less stringent and less likely to interfere with legitimate business.

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL—Mr. Chairman, one point was just brought to my notice by Mr. Dunfield and I took authority to change it as there was no opportunity to get in touch with the other members of the Committee. The Section I refer to is Sub-section (f) of Section 9 but as Section 9 has been deleted Sub-section (f) is nonsensical and I cut it out.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to prevent a man selling false securities all around the coast until we hear about him.

HON. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL—Mr. Chairman, there is no way of preventing a person committing a crime and this Act won't make any difference that way.

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 as amended.

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in Relation to the Sale of Securities" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Caning of Rabbits, Bird and Shell Fish."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, has the Minister any objection to add-

ing a section to the Bill whereby a sliding scale of duty may be imposed on the foreign article so that there will be no competition. Foreign producers can market their produce cheaper and in larger quantities and I think our farmers should be protected so that they can dispose of their crop. This Bill is not for the purpose of doing the foreign producer good, but for the purpose of getting protection for our farmers so that the people will have to buy the local article when available and then afterwards we can throw our market open to all the world; but while we have sufficient crops here let our farmers get an opportunity to dispose of them.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—That is quite agreeable to me.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, speaking of protection, I think that an ad valorem duty is inadvisable and also a specific duty is inadvisable, because when a specific duty is applied and the price of potatoes is high, Prince Edward Island would get the highest price for their crop, but such is not always the case and I would suggest that a sliding scale of duty should be affixed so that in this manner the cost of foreign potatoes plus freight and duty could be fixed at \$2.50 per barrel, at which price I am told by many farmers potatoes could be sold. When the price of potatoes is low the scale of duty could be reduced accordingly, so that our farmers would be protected to the extent of at least \$2.50 per barrel. If we were to have an ad valorem duty or a specific duty I think that it would be very dangerous.

Our farmers should be protected and if the price were kept up to \$2.50 I think they would be satisfied, they

think that this is a fair price and this would also prevent the dumping of foreign produce on our markets.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 1st, 1931.

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

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that on to-morrow he would move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill for the Amendment and Consolidation of the Law relating to Public Health and Public Charities.

Address in Reply

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I desire to go on record as being in accord with the vote of sympathy passed to the relatives of those who suffered in the Viking disaster. I am glad to learn that the other survivors are progressing on the road to health. I also extend congratulations to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries thru whose efforts the disaster had a far brighter ending than it looked for some time it would have had. Mr. Strong, the member for White Bay, is also deserving of congratulation for his foresight in having a wireless station placed at Horse Islands. It is only after an accident of this sort that the benefit of such utilities as this is seen. The splendid work of Otis Bartlett is also deserving of the highest commendation and recognition from this House and the people.

Whilst I did not have the pleasure of being in the House on the day the session was opened and therefore did not have the opportunity of hearing the speeches of the mover and seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply, from what I have read and heard I know they had done well, and I congratulate them on their speeches.

Everyone knows that conditions in the country are bad; people did not have to go around the country to learn these things. All one need to do is to take into consideration that the value of the fisheries was depleted by five million dollars last year and that is sufficient to show that the present is one of the most uninviting situations the country has ever had to deal with. Something must be done to cope with unemployment because the problem is going to be a serious one this year.

As far as can be learned merchants are not going to supply for the Labra-

dor fishery this year and other men who usually go to the Labrador in the summer time can get no guarantee now that if they go this year, their fish will be bought when they return. A few days ago I was speaking to a gentleman prominent in the whaling industry of this country and he stated that his company was not going to operate the whaling factories this year because of the low price of whale oil. This will mean at least 200 more men out of employment. In St. John's, as far as the factories are concerned, only half the staffs are employed and these only on half time. Bell Island is on half time; Corner Brook operations are down, and taking it altogether the outlook is a very serious one indeed. In the past year conditions in the District of Port au Port were not too bad, but a couple of hundred men there have in the past been getting a living out of the woods and if the operations at Corner Brook are to be curtailed it will be serious for these people. As far as the fishermen of the district are concerned they will not need dole as they will all be supplied.

But in speaking of District matters I would like once again to refer to the condition of the roads over there. Last year I made a recommendation for a sum of money to be devoted to the road from Port au Port to Stephenville and a sum was allocated from which it was possible to attend to nine miles of the road. This work was done in first class style for \$1200 a mile; but there is still about seven miles of the road to be done and I hope that this year sufficient money will be allocated to permit of its completion.

I would crave the indulgence of the House to be permitted briefly to take them through Port au Port District so that they could visualise the dif-

ficulties that have to be contended with, in the confident hope that members on both sides would appreciate how the residents are handicapped in the pursuit of their daily avocations through the lack of decent transportation facilities. Starting at Port au Port and going through to Cape George, a distance of 40 miles, one finds a territory composed almost entirely of bogland, quagmires, marshes, with occasional ledges of rock. There is another so-called road branching off this, connecting Abraham's Cove with Clam Bank Cove, measuring 15 miles. A few days ago I received a letter regarding the road at Abraham's Cove that borders most dangerously along a cliff that directly overhangs the sea. This will have to be diverted back this year and cannot cost less than \$1,000.00. Going east from there is another dirt track of 12 miles to Long Point, and another of 12 miles going west to the mainland. The physical conditions of these shorter trails are even worse than those of the first mentioned ones. From Port au Port there is a 6-mile road to Boswarlos. Also from Port au Port is another road leading to Fox Island River—a prosperous little community where from five to six thousand dollars are earned each season by the people who prosecute the smelt fishery. This track (it cannot by any stretch of imagination be called a road) is in a terrible condition, and there is not even telegraph communication in case of illness or accident. At Stephenville there are five or six miles of local roads. In addition there is the important Stephenville Crossing, and further along the famous salmon resort known as Harry's Brook, and then on to Main River Bridge five miles distant. It is unnecessary to point out the importance of this section as the most promising farming district in the country, and the upkeep

of roads here must be maintained if the community is to survive—much less to flourish. The main road has several important arteries to the farm-lands and they must be kept in order at all costs. I feel sure I have the sympathy of the whole House when I state the fact that the 120 miles of road in this district, none of which are in good condition, had to be maintained with the district grant of only \$2,200.00, and with the special added only \$4,000.00. It was obvious that the amount voted was totally inadequate. The bridges in the district are all gone to decay, and especially is this true of Stephenville River, where Spring freshets last year played havoc with the bridges. The road from Abraham's Cove to West Bay alone contains 7 bridges, all of which are dilapidated and unfit for human travel. Considering all this, I ask for tangible and sympathetic support of the request for an increased grant.

As far as the standardization of fish is concerned, I hope that when the bill is introduced it will be a good one and that it will not mean one set of regulations for St. John's and another for the outports. There are many ways in which the fish situation may be looked at, and some valuable suggestions have been made by members in the House. One that strikes me is that in connection with salt. It is well known that salt comes here from Cadiz, Turk's Island and Torrevieja, and all being of different qualities, it often results in bad fish being made by people who used salt one year of a different kind than that which they had hitherto used. I would recommend that some one kind of salt be used universally.

As far as agriculture is concerned in the district of Port au Port, it is a matter of how good the roads were made. It is only by the roads

that the people have an opportunity of disposing of their products and the situation in the past has been that once September comes it is impossible to get around. There are people on the peninsula who have excellent land and if they had a means of getting clear of their crops they would be induced to utilize it; at the present time, however, they grow only enough for their own use. Vegetables cannot be shipped in the bay boats because it often happens that it is too stormy for the boats to make calls, and without the roads it is impossible to do anything. It depends on what is done in this direction, and until something of a tangible nature is done to give the district good means of transportation nothing can prosper..

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the government at the present session will do everything possible to get the people back to the fishery, as after all, that is the mainstay.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention this afternoon to delay the House at any great length with any unnecessary remarks from me. The honorable member from Bay de Verde has so exhaustively dealt with the Speech from the Throne and matters in connection with it that it has put speakers who have to follow in rather a poor position. He has left them very little to say unless by way of repetition of what he has already said. I think, however, that the honorable member is deserving of the warmest congratulations for the very thorough way in which he has dealt with the situation as it exists in this country today, particularly in dealing with the Auditor General's report, which, I am afraid, does not afford very palatable food for the public. As far as I can gather, it is the talk of the town today. Now, before dealing with the Speech from the Throne, I

should like, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with previous speakers in remarks made with regard to the deplorable Viking Disaster which occurred shortly after the opening of this Legislature and which has cast such a gloom over the country today.

I join with previous speakers, Sir, in extending to the sufferers and to the bereaved my warmest sympathy, not only personal sympathy, but I am sure I can speak for every member of the constituency which I represent. Scarcely more than a year ago my constituency was visited with a catastrophe which took a toll of practically a similar number of lives and, of course, a great deal more in the way of property. Fortunately in the present instance, there has been very little loss of property, but I well remember the expressions of practical as well as verbal sympathy which came at that time from all quarters of this country towards the sufferers in that disaster, and I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents when I say how deeply they regret the calamity which has befallen some of the other districts.

However, this calamity, like every other calamity, has its silver lining. Deeds of heroism have been told in the press and in this House which I am sure will go down in history as equalling any heretofore recorded. The hon. member for Bay de Verde has told us of the bravery of one of his constituents, one William Johnson, who has been a personal friend of his all his life. That story will go down in the history of this country and also the devotion to duty of Mr. Otis Bartlett, the operator at Horse Islands, and incidentally, I may say, the operators in other places who had to keep in touch with him, whose names I don't remember, but who are equally deserving of praise for their devo-

tion to service; all day and all night, apparently, they were at their post of duty, and are deserving equally of the praise of this House.

I should also like to add my meed of praise to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for his indefatigable work throughout the whole situation. Nor must we forget the owners, masters and crews of the other sealing vessels who voluntarily abandoned as it were the work in which they were engaged and rushed to the assistance of their fellow-sealers in distress, and had it not been, Mr. Speaker, for the fact that they responded as they could under the circumstances to the call, there probably would have been a holocaust today very much greater in magnitude than to the one to which I am referring. Now such disasters as these emphasise greatly the necessity for communication.

Last year when I referred to the tidal wave disaster in Burin, I pointed out to the government the necessity for these communications. We all recollect, Sir; how we got the news of the tidal wave disaster, not less than three days after it had happened. In this particular case we are more fortunate, thanks to the good work of the honorable member for White Bay, to whose foresight was due the wireless station on Horse Islands today. Had it not been for that, one hesitates to think what might have happened. We need as, has already been suggested, an up-to-date broadcasting outfit, an up-to-date receiving station which can send out and receive messages throughout the length and breadth of this Island, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this community owes a tremendous debt of gratitude today to Station 8WMC for the wonderful help and assistance which they were able to give under the circumstances. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fish-

eries will endorse what I say in this respect. Had it not been for this Station it would have been impossible to assimilate the news as it came in from this catastrophe. I think the thanks of this House are due to this Station for the wonderful services which they rendered. I am glad to see that the Government has so promptly undertaken an inquiry into this disaster, so that if there is any blame, if there has been any neglect, it can be ascertained as soon as possible and steps taken to remedy the recurrence of this state of affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Government on the early meeting of the Legislature this year. That, I think, is a step in the right direction, and I am only sorry that they did not see fit to call the Legislature together earlier than they did, and no doubt they would have done so had they been ready with their legislation, and I trust that this proceeding will be followed in the years of meeting in the late spring and early summer. Last year this House, if you remember, sat up until the middle of July, when everyone should have been at their daily avocations elsewhere. Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the previous speakers on this side of the House in tendering to the mover and seconder of the motion to the Address in Reply, my congratulations.

As has been already said, they acquitted themselves on opening day in a manner which would do credit to experienced statesmen. The speeches showed evidences of very deep thought, were well expressed, and, I am quite safe in saying, created a very favorable impression, and I trust that we will be favored with further speeches from them during this and sessions to come. We don't hear enough, Mr.

Speaker, from the junior members of the Government on the other side of the House. With the text of this Speech, or with this Speech as their text, I think their performance was all the more remarkable, for what they could find to say in its defense, I cannot see.

Now, as I say, they did their best in their speeches, but, as I say, they had a very bad case, and as a lawyer of some experience, I know what that is. I contend, nevertheless, that the honorable members on the other side of the House should be congratulated. It was not right for the Government to give them such a bad case; it was an insult to be expected to speak on such a case.

It is plain to me, and I think it should be plain to anyone in this House, that the fishery in a deplorable state. We have been told in the Speech from the Throne that the fishery this year yielded less than fifty per cent than that of other years, and yet we are supposed to be a fishing country; a fishing country, Mr. Speaker, though lately turning into another kind of country—a pulp and paper country. The fisheries are, however, in a deplorable state. I am very glad that the Government are taking steps to enquire into the condition of things, but we have had so many enquiries, gentlemen—too many enquiries. Still, I hope and pray that some results are obtained, and I feel that with the Empire Marketing Board behind the scheme results will be obtained.

I expect, and I hope and pray that we get back to the fisheries, and I think that we should adopt as our slogan "back to the fisheries."

Now, the honorable member for St. Mary's, in his speech, referred to the matter of establishing bait deposits, and I wish to lend my support to such

a scheme. As an illustration, let me tell the House that last year there was any amount of fish in Placentia Bay but the fishermen were powerless to catch it because of lack of bait.

Mr. Speaker, it was one of the pledges of the present administration that immediately upon being returned they would take steps to bring about the establishing of bait depots. It is referred to in the speech of the Prime Minister, that he would establish bait depots on the South West Coast. His first message states as follows:

(Read)

The very first thing, the establishing of bait depots. And what have they done? Nothing. There is no shortage of fish this year. It is the want of bait that causes the poor state of the fishery, and the establishment of bait depots on the South West Coast would cure this. I say on the South West Coast, because that is the chief centre of the fishery.

There is a depression; I realise that there is no use in trying to get away from this fact. It is terrible, Mr. Speaker, to have people writing in daily, people who have never before been unemployed, all because they are tired of sitting around day after day doing nothing because of lack of bait. Everyone knows what happened because of the lack of bait last year. Crews deserted from the bankers. Something must be done by the Government for the establishment of bait depots.

The hon. member for St. Mary's in his speech referred to the dogfish pest, and I would like to give this project my support, for unless something is done to eradicate this pest, the cod-fishery is done for. That is obvious to me, and I expect it is equally obvious to the other members of the

House, and unless some steps are taken to eradicate this pest the fishery is done for, and it is necessary that these steps be taken immediately. If necessary a bounty should be given. That was what was done in Australia. Out there the pest was the rabbits, but bunny had to go, and the proper steps were taken and the rabbits went.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Speech from the Throne, we all know the circumstances under which the Speech was delivered. This is the Government's third term. For two years we have listened to speeches from them. Last year no less than 66 bills were introduced. Two years and nothing of any value in the way of industrial development in the country has been done. Now, it is admitted by the Prime Minister that times are bad. What a wonderful speech, and how proud the Government must have felt when they heard it, and how their hearts must have thrilled when the Governor read it. And how about the people? For two years they have waited and then they thronged here in their numbers—and how disappointed they must have been.

What was contained in the Speech? To my mind, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing.

Then there was a Bill for the organization of the public health and charities board. It is my belief this is the only Bill of any real value, and I trust that it will not suffer the fate it suffered last year. I shall have more to say about this Bill when it comes before the House. Then we had the Bill concerning the sale of bonds. Then there is the Life Insurance Act, being an attempt to conform our Act with Canadian legislation. And I almost forgot, a Bill to provide a National flag and colors to be worn by vessels of our mercantile service. What a joke; what a stupendous joke!

The first two Speeches were bad enough, but this one caps the climax. Now, Mr. Speaker, what of the thousand and one pre-election promises made to the country? What of the agricultural developments; not one word, Mr. Speaker. Not a word to inspire the country with any hope. There is only one redeeming feature in that whole Speech and that is there is not a single commission. We have today, I think, thirteen commissioners, and I am going to suggest another. We have first of all, the now famous Agricultural Commission. Why does everybody on both sides of the House smile when it is mentioned? If I were an agricultural commissioner I would resent it. Surely it is not a joke. And then there is the Railway Commission, the Lunacy Commission, the Fresh Fish Commission, Salt Fish Commission, Public Health Commission, Fishery Research Commission, Public Utilities Commission, Economic or Unemployment Commission, Consolidated Statutes Commission, High-roads Commission, Liquor Purchasing Commission, and Tourist Commission. Thirteen Commissions. Now I am going to suggest another—a commission for the suppression of superfluous Commissions, and I think that both sides of the House should agree with this suggestion. Thirteen Commissions! I say it is nothing short of a public scandal. There are sixty or seventy Commissioners at least who are highly paid, and what for? The only work they are doing should be done in the various departments of the public services today. They were instituted, Mr. Speaker, to give certain members of the Government jobs. What have they done? What have they accomplished? Absolutely nothing. Most of their jobs had to be created to assume the functions of the various departments, nothing more nor less. It is up to the members of

the Government to see that the pledges made are carried out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what of the Prime Minister's gramaphone Record which you have heard so much about; that dreadful record, as I say, which we have all heard so much about—his guaranteed Progressive Programme. What of that programme, and what of those pledges, and in what manner have they been carried out? In the light of this programme, I intend, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the Speech from the Throne. In this document the Government has a self-imposed task to carry out and also a duty to perform in connection with this work, and to see that some effort is made very shortly to carry them out, or else get out themselves. I have said also that this is the Government's third session. In the first session not much was expected, but something was hoped for in the second session; but we got nothing. Now what hope have we got for this session?

Now I would like to refer briefly to this Progressive Programme, but have no intention of hurting anybody's feelings. The country was supplied with phonograph records. It was an insult to the people's intelligence. I am reading it now (the Progressive Programme) not, as I said, to hurt anybody's feelings, but that the barrenness of this document may be realized in the House.

Then comes the clarion call.

(Reads)

The banner of industrial development. Ye gods! The banner of health, education, prosperity, education, progress. What a joke! It would be a joke were it not so serious. These are solemn pledges. The members opposite have a duty to perform and

It is up to them to see that these pledges are carried out. I leave it to the judgment of this House to say how these pledges have been carried out, and I leave it to the members opposite to see they are carried out in the short time left at their disposal. Last year the Colonial Secretary, on behalf of the Prime Minister, commented on the fact that he had been a member of the House of Assembly for many years and it had been the custom for the Opposition to refer to the Speech from the Throne as being an empty speech, and that we manage to waste a lot of time in discussing a speech which has nothing in it; wasting time when we should all be somewhere else, instead of talking about a Speech from the Throne that contained nothing. Mr. Speaker, my point is that it is precisely because that there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne that we have got to criticise it. If we were to criticise it for what it contains it would not take five minutes. Apart from the Bill dealing with Public Health, the others are nothing. As the member for Bay de Verde said, if we cannot offer criticism of a constructive nature we will not criticise at all; but now it seems that the Government expects us to lay down a policy. Do they expect us to tell them how the country should be run?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor as briefly as I can to refer to some of the paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne. First of all, I shall refer to the other end, and take the climax and that is the reference to the Gander. I think that everyone will admit that it was the Gander, the pledges in connection with the Gander, that was responsible more than any other thing in that record for the election of the Government to power at the last election. It was "the gang on the Gander." I submit, in all seriousness, that in view of what transpired since,

and the way that the Gander proposals have been made a football of, is nothing short of disgusting. What is its history? First we heard the catch-cry, "The gang on the Gander." We heard it everywhere. Blotters were sent throughout the country with "Who will put the Gang on the Gander?" The next thing was the gramophone record—

(Reads)

In spite of these catch-cries and these manifestoes, in the first session that followed the election, there was not a single reference to the Gander in the Speech from the Throne. The Prime Minister was urged to put through this plan by every member on this side of the House, but the session passed and no reference was made to it. It was shelved for the time being.

Next comes the by-elections last spring, and again the Gander was rooted up from the pigeon-hole where it had been shoved and the public were again reminded of the Gander, in spite of the fact that a whole session had passed and nothing was done, and I venture to say that if there was an election tomorrow, the Gander would be trotted out again. That is a wonderful bird, that Gander. I would like to read to the House what the member for Bonavista North told his constituents. For greater accuracy I have secured a copy of what he told them.

(Reads)

I don't know if the Gander has got an awful boost since he has been elected. He has been here in the House two years and has not raised his voice to get the gang on the Gander. It is one thing to say things outside and another to say them in here. In here

their lips are sealed. It now goes on to say what it will mean to the country.

(Reads)

Talk of castles in the air.

(Reads)

What, I ask, is the honorable member going to say to his constituents?

MR. WINSOR.—Only what is on that paper.

MR. WINTER.—You used that?

MR. WINSOR.—I didn't use it.

MR. WINTER.—You took advantage of it and you took no steps to support it. Are you opposed to it?

MR. WINSOR.—Why should I be opposed to it? Why should I be opposed to anything good?

MR. WINTER.—It would seem that you are, but, however, as I was saying, last session, less than a month later than the by-elections, we looked for the Speech from the Throne eagerly. We hought that we would have the Gander for sure now, and we were told that negotiations were still "engaging the attention of my Ministers." What a lot of sleep they were losing over it, Mr. Speaker.

(Reads)

That was the promise in the last Speech from the Throne. What happened? What happened prior to that? We know the result of the correspondence tabled last year. That negotiation was choked off before the House opened and then it was said that it was still engaging the attention of the Ministers. I would like to refer to the Reid Company report tabled last year. I just said that it was choked off by issuing these writs

on the Reid holdings. Here is what Mr. R. G. Reid says in his letter of May 31st, 1930:

(Reads)

Mr. Speaker, that seems to me like a deliberate attempt on somebody's part to choke all Gander negotiations, and yet the Speech from the Throne said different. Those writs were at the time laid on the Gander properties and they are still lying there. The Reids are now retaliating with a demand for ten million dollars, and it seems as if a checkmate has been reached. It is as if a gigantic game of checkers were going on between the Government and the Reids. Now you'll remember, Mr. Speaker, that last year an amendment was moved by the Leader of the Opposition in the hope that some explanation would be forthcoming. I'll venture to say that at that time the members on the other side of the House, outside the members of the Executive Council were just as much in the dark about this matter as we were, and just as anxious to know why it was stifled. Can the honorable member for Bonavista North tell us why it was stifled a month or so after the pamphlet I have just read was circulated through his district?

As I said before, an amendment was moved and the Prime Minister happened to be ill at the time. In the course of time it became known that he was not very seriously indisposed, and I moved an adjournment so that the Prime Minister would be able to come to the House and give an explanation, and what happened? The motion was voted down by the members of the Government to a man. I said at the time that I considered it a vote of want of confidence by the Government in their Leader.

I can only consider now that it was done at his orders, because if it were

not so, I believe the Hon. the Colonial Secretary would have acted otherwise. And why was that done, Mr. Speaker? Because, I submit, he had no explanation. And on the opening day of this session, what did he say? The Leader of the Opposition asked the Prime Minister what was his explanation, and in his usual way, the Prime Minister made some ill-considered statements, and said the reason was because the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars for themselves. In that statement the Prime Minister evidently wanted to create an anti-Reid atmosphere by saying that the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars for themselves. But what are the actual facts? On the next day the Leader of the Opposition asked the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House all correspondence and documents showing why the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars. What happened? (Reads letter from the Prime Minister to Mr. C. O'N. Conroy). That, Mr. Speaker, I submit, is nothing more or less than deliberate misrepresentation.

The Prime Minister is asked in this House why the Gander proposal does not go through, and in answer he says it is because the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars for themselves. He now writes to Mr. Conroy and says "in relation to the requested guarantee."

(Reads again)

That is the letter from the Prime Minister to Mr. Conroy, after he had plainly stated in the House that the Reids wanted fifteen millions for themselves—not as a guarantee. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is the correspondence. Will the Prime Minister now explain why he made that statement on opening day? Is it because he thinks a fifteen million dollar guarantee is too much? for there must be a nigger in the woodpile somewhere.

The Government don't have to purchase the properties. They have not to pay out the actual money; they have merely to guarantee it for fifteen million dollars.

Now if the Gander is going to mean all to the country as the pamphlet I have previously read said it would, would it not be worth that much? Obviously there has been some attempt on the part of the Prime Minister to discredit the Reids. Personally, I hold no brief for the Reids, but I do say that the public who were misled in 1928 and 1929 by the Government are entitled to some explanation other than the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars for themselves. What had the Prime Minister in mind when he penned this message of inspiration? Does he know himself; and if so, why does he not say? I suppose only time will tell that, as it will tell a great many other things. But I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that the way the Government have treated the people is disgusting. The people were fooled and the Government is in power because they were fooled. It is no wonder that everywhere we go we hear, "Goosey, Goosey, Gander, where do you wander?" Upstairs and downstairs and everywhere except in this Chamber, and that's where we want to get it—in this Chamber.

The next paragraph in the Speech from the Throne deals with distress. Why, it's distressing to have to refer to it. Here is what this paragraph says:

(Reads)

What a joke! And there is nobody enjoys it better than the Prime Minister. What employment did our people have for the past couple of years? The Prime Minister certainly loves the words "industrial employment." What difference does it make to our

people to know that the people in other countries are suffering through unemployment?

The Prime Minister tells us about the percentage of people in other countries who are out of employment. How ridiculous? What would some of our people do today if they were not getting the dole? Will it do any good to our common people who are up against it hard to tell them that there are twenty-seven million dollars in the Savings Bank, or will it appease their hungry appetites to know that there was one million dollars paid out in life insurance premiums?

The Prime Minister tries to tell us that everything is rosy and that we are not suffering the same as the people in other countries are. The answer to that statement is told in the report of the Auditor General who states that destitution is widespread and who says:

(Reads)

I say, Sir, that conditions have become worse since last October. And yet we are told there is some distress in the country. I wonder what can be the object of the Prime Minister in making a statement of that sort. I venture to say that the Prime Minister would not go on a public platform and make a statement to that effect today. Now what has happened in that direction. Dole has been given out right and left, and it won't be long before the Government will get a shock in that direction. The country was told that dole was degradation and that work was independence. Well, here is what the Prime Minister said in his speech:

(Reads)

How easy it is for the Prime Minister to get that kind of stuff off; and what is the actual story today. Why, thou-

sands of our people are being subjected to dole, not because they want to accept dole, but because our Government want to give them dole. Why does not the Government be honest and frank about the situation; why misrepresent, and why not make some effort to deal with the contingency. Where is the Unemployed Commission that was heralded here two years ago with a great flourish of trumpets? What have they been doing, and what have they done? Here is what happened in my district last year. On July 29th, 1930, I wrote the Colonial Secretary as follows:

(Reads)

Again on August 2nd I wrote him thus:

Not receiving any satisfactory answer for the benefit of my constituents, I communicated with the Colonial Secretary on August 22nd, 1930, in this fashion:

(Reads)

New, Mr. Speaker, eventually as a result of these letters some \$10,000 was sent to the district to relieve the situation. I wired the Relieving Officer on August 26th.

(Reads Wire)

To which I received the following reply:

(Reads Reply)

That was the Relieving Officer as I say. Eventually the sum of \$30,000 was sent down there for work in that district and I am told, Mr Speaker, by members not of the Commission but by inspectors in charge of the work that it was deplorable to see the condition of the people. Some of them were half starving, unable to work, actually fainting on the road.

That was the condition of affairs in August when this \$30,000 was sent down to relieve. Subsequent to that, Mr. Speaker, a petition was sent to the Government as follows:

(Reads)

That, Mr. Speaker, was September 3rd. Now as a result of that petition what happens? The Government sent out a Commission of inquiry immediately to inquire into the causes and see that the situation as represented by the petitioners—all men of repute and the majority of them supporters of the Government—to see if what they had said is correct, and I should like to quote briefly one or two paragraphs from that report.

(Reads)

That, Mr. Speaker, was in October, October 6th, and how have conditions improved since then? Now what was done as a result of that recommendation? Nothing whatever. The people were immediately put on dole in spite of the recommendation of the Commission of inquiry. This was in October. What earthly reason was there for putting these people on the dole that time of the year? They wanted to earn an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. They were told they could not get it. I have tried to get these men in the lumber woods, tried to get them employment anywhere; but no sooner did they get into the lumber woods than they had to come back. Logging was closed down, they could hardly get there before Christmas, it took one month to pay their passage..

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say here that it is a perfect scandal that these men who were trying to get an honest day's work somewhere are compelled to pay travelling expenses.

They are prepared to go on freight cars and would do anything, and would travel anyhow as long as they could get there. They were compelled to pay their passages. When the sealers were coming here in the spring to carry on operations they again were asked to pay their passages, that provision be made to see that their passages were paid., Ye Gods and Little Fishes! These men had to pay their passages; provision has got to be made to see that they are paid. They did pay it; as the Prime Minister said on the opening day they paid it.

How much travelling expenses are paid by members of the Government when they go abroad or anywhere? Not one cent. Travelling expenses! Why read some of this and see what travelling expenses have cost this Colony and then the wretched men going to look for work in lumber woods have to pay their travelling expenses, the wretched sealer coming here to go to the seal fishery hardly earns enough to get him home again has to pay his passage. Great care, every precaution is taken to see that it is paid, and this Government claims to be the champions of the underdog.

Some days ago I was passing down Duckworth Street and found a number of unemployed endeavoring to get a job. I go a little further and see a photograph of a banquet showing conspicuously a number of members of the Government banqueting there while these poor wretches are looking for work. Talking about Nero fiddling when Rome was burning! These people are wining and dining while the poor wretches are looking for work. Why is not employment found for these poor wretches?

Some reference has been made to agriculture and I would like briefly to

say a few words on this question of agriculture. I am interested in the subject for the reason that, as the Prime Minister tells us, the South West coast is the garden of Newfoundland, and in that I heartily confer. I have already spoken in this House on previous occasions about the opportunities for the raising of vegetables in the District of Burin East. In the vicinity of Marystow there is excellent soil and it has been proven beyond doubt that vegetables can be grown there at very little cost. Now, the message of the Prime Minister for this section of the country is as follows:

(Reads)

Now that is another promise, and what has been done? What steps have been taken to carry it out? I was glad to see yesterday, Mr. Speaker, to hear discussed in this House a measure for the standardization of potatoes and turnips. I think the Minister of Agriculture is deserving of every credit for that measure. It is at least a step forward. What is the use of bringing in Bills for the standardization of potatoes and turnips if they are not grown in sufficient quantities. What we want to do is encourage the growth of potatoes and turnips and not make it more difficult to sell them.

I agree with standardization, but before we have standardization we must have encouragement. Why have we got five commissioners sitting down there doing nothing? Can they not formulate some program to bolster up this promise of the Prime Minister. Industrial development is what the Government promises. Here is one outlet. Surely those commissioners; can they not get busy and do something instead of discussing why a white hen lays brown eggs, or some-

thing to that effect. I don't care what their discussions are but I see no results beyond an odd trip abroad or an odd trip to their districts to see whether some of the animals are properly functioning. That is all, as far as I can see, that these agricultural commissioners have done to date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in this House about the financial situation. Our public debt, it has been stated is now fast approaching one hundred million dollars.

Another Loan Bill which I nearly forgot to mention is to be raised from which we have to pay the English War Loan Bill the balance to be used for capital expenditure and for public service.

Year after year, Mr. Speaker, we are told that the revenue exceeds our expenditure and we are presented with balanced budgets yet every year, still another loan is borrowed in order to pay off the interest on another loan.

There are only two things which can be done to stop us in our headlong rush to destruction, that is to curtail expenditure, if possible, by fostering some industrial developments, if possible both certainly, I should suggest curtailing expenditure. If a private individual finds his expenses are exceeding his income what does he do? He cuts his overhead and that is the country's one hope.

Two years ago the Minister of Finance and Customs came down to this House and in his Budget Speech warned the Government that the expenditure must be stopped. He told us that the Public Service was grossly overmanned and appealed to the Government to cut down the expenses. We believed him, we thought that here at last was the right man, a man ready to do his best and try to run the coun-

try as it should be run. But I am afraid he too, has gone to way of all flesh; he has fallen from grace. Yet every year we get balanced budgets and still the cost of running has increased, this little country of ours has gone beyond all limits and still new appointments are being made daily and increases in salaries and bonuses are given until the figures before me are such that I blush to see them. They are disgraceful, there is no question about it, simply disgraceful.

In no department has there been any attempt made to curtail expenses. And I regret to say the Justice is as bad as the rest. I don't really know which is the worst.

We were told when the office of the Solicitor General was made that this gentleman was going to save the country thousands of dollars in the way of Civil and Criminal proceedings; he was going to save the country more than \$20,000.00 a year, besides his own salary, yet what is the position to-day? This gentleman is pulling down a salary more than double that of the Judges of the Supreme Court, yet the figures for fees paid members of the Government of the legal profession are really disgraceful. I blush when I look at them. These are the figures since July last: One firm has received \$9,724.36, another gentleman has received \$8,017.00, another firm \$6,811.00, others \$5,356.00, in all more than \$50,000.00. The Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General and Deputy Minister of Justice should be able to take care of the most of this work. I do not say these fees are exorbitant, but they should be saved by the Ministry to Justice.

With regard to the Deputy Minister of Justice the situation is disgraceful he has to go to this one and that one to collect bills, it is not fair to this

gentleman. Surely we can make this position one for a permanent official.

I submit that the Minister of Justice should see that the position is filled and I think it only fair that the Deputy Minister of Justice receive a good salary. I think he is deserving of a salary equal to that of a Judge of the Supreme Court; a salary good enough to make it worth his while.

There is one case in connection with the Labrador boundary which has already cost the Government over \$7,000.00, and if it goes to the Privy Council, as it will, goodness knows what it will cost the country. I blush to have to say these things about the Justice Department. "Justice thou art fled to the brutish beasts and men have lost their reason."

The other Departments are the same; take cases where goods are supplied by the people. The Public Works Department:

Here, over \$170,000.00 was spent, and my attention was drawn to the numbers of people among whom the supplies were drawn, hundreds of people with small accounts, some as low as \$5 or \$6, and I say that certain members of the House have received contracts from the Government and I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is a Breach of the Legislative Disability Act for any member of the Government to enter into any contract whatsoever with the Government.

The suggestion made by the Hon. members from this side of the House and by the member for Bonavista South that a reduction of 25% be made in expenditure of each Department and that the Ministers try and live up to it. That suggestion I think, Mr. Speaker, was an excellent one and a suggestion that could be carried

out. It is quite possible and no one in this House can say that it isn't. I do not know where we are drifting. It is terrible to see it in cold print every day. Another suggestion has been made, that of an expense committee and I think an excellent one to enquire into prices and see that the best goods are bought at the cheapest prices possible, but unless an effort is made to do this we will find ourselves in the same position as another part of the Empire where a suggestion is being made that they should repudiate their debts. I think it would be a good idea for a Commissioner from the other side, if necessary, to enquire into our affairs. Out of one hundred million dollars, half of that amount from the Revenue will pay the interest on that amount. This is indeed a ridiculous situation and we are gradually waking up to the fact of the position in this country today. It is all right for the heelers and those in the Government, but the rest of us can go hang.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House any further except to refer to the question of Standardization of fish which has received a good deal of comment in the House, but I am afraid a bit premature. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that we will never see any Standardization of fish this session. There has been no suggestion of a Bill so far and I doubt if there will be one.

(Reads Bill)

What is the Government going to do about it. Why not bring in a Bill and discuss it.

I trust the members of the other side of the House will not take unkindly to my remarks as my sole object is to get them to realize, if they can, where we are in this country and

where we are tending. We are on the downward path and it is time we began to realize it and make some effort to check our progress in this direction. It is time to try and create a better public spirit and public opinion in this country. We sing "We Love Thee, Newfoundland" in all seriousness let us show by all means that we mean what we say. I apologize for delaying the House.

On motion the Debate on the Address in Reply was deferred.

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 relating to the Canning of Rabbits, Birds and Wild Fruit."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, this Bill is made to conform with the Public Health Bill and provide machinery for governing the cannings of rabbits, birds, and wild fruit, etc.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Canning of Rabbits and Wild Fruit" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the

Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Introducer if he would hold this Bill over till to-morrow. I have had a number of enquiries from farmers in the West End and we would like a little time to consider one of the sections and I would ask that it would be held over till tomorrow?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Certainly.

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.

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 7th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 7th, 1931.

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

MR. MURPHY—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of South East Bight in the District of Placentia West and which petition I will ask your permission to read.

(Reads Petition)

Mr. Speaker, this petition is only one of about 50 that have been recently received and others were forwarded to the Marine and Fisheries Department. The present Minister of that Department is a fisherman both in practice and theory, and I feel that my humble petitioners will have his earnest and hearty support. Dog fish in previous years were not the menace that they are today. Up to four years ago the dog fish would not visit our waters until about the second week in August. Today they do not leave our waters at all. By a recent mail I have received a box containing two or three dozen of dog fish tails. These are only the tails of a few that have come to the shore. Even the herring fishery of 1930 and the early part of 1931 was seriously hampered owing to destruction caused by these pests.

For your information, Mr. Speaker, and that of honourable members of this House I have here two samples of twine, one from a cod trap and the other from a herring net. On examination you will see what destruction these pests cause to herring nets and trawls. I also attribute the bait shortage during 1930 to the abundance of this pest of dog fish as caplin, squid or no other fish will come to the shores while the waters are so infested with dog fish.

Two years ago in Placentia Bay I was arranging for a cargo of fish. One morning I went out to the trap with a crew of men. As we neared the trap I said to the skipper "You have a good haul of fish." He said "Yes, I hope it is codfish." That trap was full of dogfish. That trap had to be taken on shore and mended. They also lost three days of good fishing. This is a conclusive proof what a menace the dogfish are in our Bay. It was Mr. R. T. McGrath who, through his untiring efforts on the floors of this Assembly was successful in getting a bounty. That bounty was granted to him by a Liberal Government. I hope and pray that the Liberal Government of today led by Sir Richard Anderson Squires will be equally partial to me as that of a former day was to Mr. R. T. McGrath.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think these are conclusive proofs of what a menace these dogfish are, and I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of every fisherman. I do not know conditions in other districts west, but the honorable members for the other districts will be able to express their views. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask you to forward this petition to the Department to which it relates.

MR. FUDGE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to place myself on record as being a strong supporter of the petition presented by Mr. Murphy. As to those members who are living in the districts we can see that when the time comes around when the people are preparing for the fishery that they are in dread of that menace which we call the dogfish. The only means of exterminating these pestilential creatures is by means of catching them and I am in accord with all Mr. Murphy has said. I think it is time we should make a deadly war. Let every man,

fisherman and fisherman's son in this country catch all they possibly can, and thereby bring about the extermination of these creatures which are such a menace to our fishery.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker as a representative of a district which also suffers very materially from this terrible pest, I give my most hearty support to the petition. As the Hon. member for Hermitage just said, the only way to get rid of these dogfish is by waging war upon them, and while they are deadly enemies of the fishermen, there does not seem to be that activity which there should be in connection with the waging of the war, consequently some slight inducement will have to be offered in order to destroy them.

I am not one who can speak with any authority upon matters of this kind. Having heard Mr. Murphy, having heard Mr. Fudge who is even more familiar with the subject, and having also during the last few months, with the knowledge of this petition and a number of other petitions, I have made some enquiries, it seems to be quite clear that the only way in which the dogfish menace can be controlled and possibly ultimately ended is by this killing them off. The cost, as was pointed out some months ago in one of our papers, will not be very heavy for the Government. It was pointed out if a million of these fish were killed at half a cent each, it would only cost the Government \$5,000; to that I would add another \$5,000. There would have to be somebody who would see to their destruction. A matter of \$10,000 expended this year might result in a very large increase in the catch of fish, and in a very large saving to the fishermen in connection with the saving of their gear.

I trust the petition will be considered by the Government and in particular considered with a view to what we know to be the precarious condition of our fishery today.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, the House knows my view in connection with this matter; I had something to say about it on the Address in Reply. Coming, as I do, and almost exclusively from a fishery district, I can do no other than support the petition presented by my Hon. friend the member for Placentia West. I have not studied the method whereby the dogfish pest could be eliminated. That is the responsibility of the Government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, together with the experts that he possesses in that Department. I have come to the conclusion that if we are to preserve our fisheries, especially the codfishery, we must do something with the dogfish pest, and that very shortly.

Years ago they were very plentiful in my district; they were a menace to the men using trawls; it seems that they have now become a menace to the men using traps. They have become so numerous that when they come in schools about the first week in August, it is useless for the fishermen to try to procure squid to bait their trawls, because every morning when they haul their trawls there will be no hooks left.

The Government can do something to make these pests less numerous than they are at present. I am sure they will have the thanks of the whole country. I give the petition my hearty support and I trust that the Government will give it careful study; if they can't do something this year, something should be done in 1932. Mr. Speaker, I give the petition my hearty support.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word in favor of the petition. I suppose as a manufacturer I ought to look upon the dogfish as a friendly fish destroying gear, but my better sense comes to the rescue. I think it is a most unfriendly fish destroying the gear of the fishermen. The member for Placentia West showed that it is a nuisance. It must be very heartrending to fishermen to see their trawls taken away by dogfish. Perhaps in a trawl there would be nothing left of a codfish but a head. It is high time we got together and designed some means so that this menace may be effaced. They have had the same trouble on the Atlantic sea board down south; on the coast of Maine I don't know how they managed to get rid of them. I think they simply left and came up here.

I think it is discouraging to learn from the member for Placentia West that this pest is becoming acclimatised and are staying all the year round. They were visitors once, now they have become residents, which makes the matter all the more serious. I would suggest to the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that perhaps when Dr. Thompson, the Marine Biologist comes, he might be of assistance in this connection. It is a very great loss for our fishermen, and there is nothing I think of any greater moment that can come before this House than this dogfish menace, and this petition has my hearty support.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—

Mr. Speaker, as the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I might say that during the past six months we have had no less than 50 petitions, all of them dealing with the one question of dogfish. The

members of this House may not know that 20 years ago dogfish was a very small matter; they usually visited our coast during the summer season in warm weather; they were a great pest in those days on the coast of Maine. Since that time, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, they have become acclimatised; they are here now all the year.

I was glad that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition pointed out that Mr. Thomson, of the Empire Marketing Scheme, and the members of that Board hoped to be able to cope with the situation.

I think I may say that this pest has also been prevalent in Europe. I would like to assure everyone that the Department which I am the head of is deeply sympathetic and anything that we can do will be done. We are prepared to do all in our power to mitigate the nuisance.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my support to the prayer of this petition, as member for the district of Burin. I am not myself a practical fisherman, but I realise that something must be done to eradicate this menace to the fishery, especially this year when the fishery is so bad. I would like to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for his activities in this respect.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Howley, in the Humber constituency, for a public building at Howley. The petition is signed by 125 residents of the locality. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works for the personal consideration of the Minister:

To the Honourable House of Assembly in Legislative Session Convened:

"We, the undersigned voters of Howley in the District of Humber, Newfoundland, hereby petition your Honourable House for a grant of money to build and equip a postal telegraph building in this town, large enough and suitable to the requirements of this growing place. The present building and equipment is entirely inadequate for our requirements. We now number about one hundred and twenty resident voters and carry mail matter for an average of five hundred lumbermen all through the year.

"We hope that you will accede to our request in this matter, and as in duty bound we will ever pray."

(One hundred and twenty-five signatures).

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Humber Arm vicinity asking for an improved Ferry Service. This petition was evidently circulated before the petitioners had an opportunity of seeing the advertisement published by the Department of Public Works calling for tenders for a new and improved ferry service.

To the Honourable House of Assembly in Legislative Session Convened:

"The undersigned petitioners, who are residents of Bay of Islands, humbly sheweth:

"That for a number of years there was in operation on Humber Arm a Motor Ferry Service, which linked up the important settlements of Meadows and McCarthy's with Petries and Curling. The said Ferry Service was of inestimable benefit to the people of the North Side of Humber Arm, particularly those living at Meadows and places further out the Arm, as there was placed

within their reach a means of transportation whereby they could travel to Curling with small supplies of produce, do their shopping, visit the doctor and clergy, make connection with trains, and do other errands of business or mercy. For some unexplained reason the said Ferry Service between Meadows and Curling has been discontinued for some six years, thereby greatly inconveniencing the residents of Meadows and surrounding localities, who are deprived of their only means of daily communication with the principal business section of Bay of Islands. Your Petitioners, therefore, respectfully request that a sum of money be allocated by your Honourable House for the resumption of a suitable Motor Ferry Service between Meadows and Curling, that a suitable boat be placed on the route, and the Service maintained during the opening of navigation.

"And as in duty bound your Petitioners will ever pray."

(This petition is signed by one hundred and thirty-six residents of the locality.)

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Logy Bay in respect to a road connecting Logy Bay with the Marine Drive.

Also, from the residents of Middle Cove respecting a road connecting Middle Cove with the Marine Drive.

Both these roads are badly in need of repair. The first road, from Logy Bay to the Marine Drive, is about half a mile, and the other road is about a mile. They are both used by the fishermen and farmers, and these people ask that a sufficient amount of money be allocated for the purpose of repairing these roads.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

--Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present on behalf of the Solicitor General, who, due to pressure of work at the office is unable to be present here this afternoon, for the adoption of the report of the Special Committee appointed for the purpose of enquiring into the Resolution for the Amendments in the Rules of this House. The Committee recommend the adoption of the Resolution. The report is signed by all the members of the committee except the Solicitor General, who concurs.

I would move the House resolve itself into a committee of the Whole for the purpose of receiving the report, but owing to the paucity of our numbers, there being only about 25 members present, I move the House resolve itself into Committee of Whole for this purpose to morrow.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER presented the Report of the Select Committee on the proposed amendments to the Rules of the House, as follows:

The Select Committee appointed to consider certain Resolutions for the Amendment of the Rules of the House beg to report that they have considered these proposed Amendments and that they recommend their adoption.

(Sgd.) A. J. WALSH

ROBERT J. SMITH

P. J. LEWIS

L. E. EMERSON

J. C. PUDDESTER

J. A. WINTER

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, in reference to the question regarding the present position of the Newfoundland Hotel, which reads as follows:

"To ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing what is the present position in so far as the Government is concerned of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Company, Ltd., and what policy the Government has decided to follow in connection therewith, and what payments have been made by the Government since the First of January to date."

This question was addressed to the Hon. the Colonial Secretary and referred to the Department of Justice for an answer. I may say the present position of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Company, Limited, is that the company is in liquidation. The Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. F. Lloyd, Registrar of the Supreme Court, is liquidator. On the 21st day of March, 1931, Mr. Justice Kent, one of the judges of the Supreme Court, issued an order for the sale of the assets of the company. Copy of this order I table herewith. The liquidator can be depended upon to carry out promptly and accurately

this Supreme Court order. No payments have been made by the Government in this respect since the first day of January last.

1930 No. 668.

In the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, between

The Montreal Trust Company (on behalf of itself and the Holders of the Mortgage Debentures of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited) —Plaintiff,

and

The Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited (in liquidation), His Majesty's Attorney General, Lilian May Blandford, Executrix of the Will of Sydney D. Blandford, deceased, and Bennett B. Stafford—Defendants

Order

Upon reading the originating summons herein, the affidavit of John William Cameron sworn herein on the 27th day of September 1930, and the exhibits therein referred to, the affidavit of Peter Cashin sworn herein on the 30th day of September 1930, the affidavit of Alexander W. Mews sworn herein on the 30th day of September 1930, the affidavit of Earl S. Pinsent sworn herein on the 20th day of March 1931, and upon hearing Mr. Pinsent, of Counsel for the Plaintiff, Mr. Curtis, of Counsel for the Official Receiver and Liquidator of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited, and Dunfield, K.C., of Counsel for His Majesty's Attorney General, I DO ORDER that an account be taken of the amount now due under a certain Mortgage Deed of Trust made between the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited and the Montreal Trust Company and His Excellency Sir William Lamond Allardyce, G.C.M.G., Governor of the Colony of Newfoundland

and its dependencies in Council dated the Twentieth day of July 1927 with interest at the rate of Six dollars per centum per annum on the said sum from the 21st day of March 1931, together with the following sums to be taxed, fixed, determined and certified by the Registrar, who is hereby appointed a special referee for that purpose and which sums are hereinafter referred to as "The Taxed Disbursements."

- (a) The costs of these proceedings, as taxed, between party and party;
- (b) All costs, charges, outlays, expenses, payments, advances and liabilities made or incurred or to be incurred by the plaintiff in connection with the mortgaged premises and otherwise in connection with the trusts of the Mortgage Deed of Trust hereinbefore referred to, dated July 20th 1927;
- (c) Reasonable remuneration for Plaintiff's own services.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the sale of the said mortgaged premises and personal and mixed properties be made by the Plaintiff who is hereby authorised to make such sale, after advertising the property for tender by notice in "The Evening Telegram" and the "Daily News" newspapers published in St. John's, Newfoundland, by one insertion each week of the said newspapers during the five weeks immediately preceding the 14th day of May 1931; and in "The Montreal Star" published in Montreal in the Province of Quebec, "The Financial Post," a newspaper published in Toronto in the Province of Ontario, both in the Dominion of Canada, and in the "New York Times" a newspaper published in the City of New York, in the United States of America, by two

insertions a fortnight apart in each of the said newspapers during the five weeks immediately preceding the 14th day of May 1931, and the advertisement in the Schedule hereto annexed marked "A" is hereby approved as the advertisement to appear in the said newspapers; and on the said sale being made to execute to the Purchaser or Purchasers thereof at such sale a Deed or Deeds and Transfer or Transfers, conveying and transferring, and which shall transfer and convey to him or them the estate, right, title, interest, claim, property and demand of the Defendants the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Lillian May Blandford, Executrix of the Will of Sydney D. Blandford, deceased, and Bennett B. Stafford, at the time of the making of the said Mortgage Deed of Trust and at any time since, and of all persons firms and corporations claiming or entitled by, from or under the Defendants the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited, Lillian May Blandford, Executrix of the Will of Sydney D. Blandford, deceased, and Bennett B. Stafford, including (but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing) all the estate, right, title, interest, claim, property or demand conferred by virtue of the Act 15 George V (2nd Session) Cap 14 in the Acts of Newfoundland and Acts in amendment thereof. Provided that the Liquidator's cash, bank balances and accounts receivable of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited, from debts incurred during liquidation shall be excepted from such sale.

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all persons and corporations interested in the estate to be sold are bound by this order.

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the money to arise by such sale and any credit balance due on the filing of the sworn final accounts of

the liquidator be lodged in Court to the credit of these proceedings subject to further order.

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the said money so lodged in Court be applied in the following priorities in satisfying

- (1) The cost of the sale
- (2) All obligations, costs and expenses including remuneration of the Official Receiver and Liquidator, so far as they are not satisfied on the accounting of the Liquidator;
- (3) So much of the residue of the money lodged in Court, as may be necessary and so far as it will go, shall be paid as follows in the following priorities:
 - (a) The costs of these proceedings as between party and party;
 - (b) All costs, charges, outlays, expenses, payments, advances and liabilities made or incurred or to be made or incurred by the plaintiff in connection with the mortgage premises and otherwise in connection with the trust of the Mortgage Deed of Trust hereinbefore referred to, dated July 20th, 1927;
 - (c) The reasonable remuneration for the Plaintiff's own services, as taxed, fixed and determined and certified as hereinbefore provided;
 - (d) The payment of the principal and the accrued and unpaid interest on all of the bonds under the said Mortgage Deed of Trust which shall then be outstanding rateably and proportionately without prefer-
- (4) Any surplus remaining of the said money shall be applied next in the payment of any sums paid previous to the sale by the guarantor, the Government of Newfoundland, to the plaintiff, trustee in the way of interest on the debenture bonds.
- (5) And if any surplus remains the same shall be applied so far as may be necessary, in payment of the principal and the accrued and unpaid interest which may be found to be due to the Defendant Lillian May Blandford, Executrix of the Will of Sydney D. Blandford, deceased, and Bennett B. Stafford under an Indenture of Mortgage dated the Tenth day of December 1928 registered in the Registry of Deeds for Newfoundland in Volume 106, Folios 512 to 514, application having first been made for an order for the taking of accounts in respect of the same.
- (6) And the remaining balance, if any, be applied by the Liquidator in the distribution of the estate of the Defendant the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited (in Liquidation).

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that at the said sale it shall be lawful for any one or more of the bond holders alone or associated with the Plaintiff or for His Majesty's Attorney General to bid or tender and purchase the said premises and personal and mixed properties.

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the said purchaser do recover possession of the said property upon payment of the said purchase money.

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any party hereto have liberty to apply for such further order and direction as the Court may deem fit and proper.

Dated at St. John's, this 21st day of March, A.D. 1931.

(Sgd.) J. M. KENT,
Judge.

"A"

(Sgd.) J.M.K.
J.

SALE BY TENDER

NEWFOUNDLAND HOTEL,
ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND.

Pursuant to an order of Mr. Justice Kent dated the 21st day of March 1931, and made in a proceeding in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland wherein the Montreal Trust Company (on behalf of itself and the holders of the Mortgage Debentures of the Nfld. Hotel Facilities Limited) is Plaintiff, and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited (in Liquidation), His Majesty's Attorney General, Lillian May Blandford, Executrix of the Will of Sidney D. Blandford, deceased, and Bennett B. Stafford are defendants, the Montreal Trust Company, St. John's, Newfoundland, offers for sale by tender all the property and assets of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities (in liquidation) described in a Mortgage Deed of Trust dated the 20th day of July, 1927, and made between Nfld. Hotel Facilities Limited, and Montreal Trust Company, and the Governor of Newfoundland in Council and registered in Volume 100 of the Registry of Deeds of Newfoundland, folios 268 to 308, save and except as hereinafter mentioned.

The property to be sold consists of the Hotel, known as "The Newfoundland Hotel" opened in July 1926, together with the land on which the

Hotel is erected and the curtilage and all the assets except the Liquidators cash, bank balances and accounts receivable of debts incurred during the liquidation. The Hotel is being operated by the Liquidator for the more beneficial winding up of the Company and will be sold as a going concern as at the date of the conveyance to the purchaser.

The Hotel contains sixteen suites, each with a sitting room, a bedroom and a private bath; and fifty-one bedrooms each with a private bath; fifty-nine bedrooms with ten-guest bathrooms; all guest rooms are outside rooms.

The dining room will accommodate two hundred guests. The ball room used at times for banquets, will accommodate two hundred guests. There are also a Ladies' Beauty Parlour on the Mezzanine Floor, Barber's Shop on the ground floor. There are also six shops, four of which are let and there is also a grill room of the same size as the dining room, but at present let as an office.

The building consists of seven stories of fire proof construction throughout, with steel girders, the main walls, pillars and floors are of concrete reinforced with steel. The floors of the main stairway and lobby are surfaced with marble slabs and terrazzo finish. The mezzanine floor, a beautiful and attractive feature of the Hotel, is also surfaced with marble slabs and a terrazzo finish. The exterior is faced with Scotch brick relieved by stone trimmings.

The furnishing, including furniture, carpets and curtains are tasteful and of good quality.

The Hotel has a license to serve ales and wines with meals. Tenders will be received up to the 14th day

of May, 1931, and may be addressed to the Montreal Trust Company, St. John's, Nfld. Full particulars may be had from the said Montreal Trust Company at St. John's, or at its Head Office in Montreal, Canada. The highest or any tender will not necessarily be accepted.

The day of A. D. 1931.

MONTREAL TRUST COMPANY.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Reply to Question No. 194. This question, addressed to the Hon. the Colonial Secretary, has been referred to me for answer:—

To ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table a detailed statement of the amount of \$1,500.00 paid to Job Brothers & Co. Ltd., during the year 1929-30, charged to General Contingencies for Blueberry shipments.

This question was asked and answered at the last session of the Legislature. There is no detailed statement of account. The amount named was an agreed amount in settlement of all liabilities.

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

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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare" was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the Report of the Inspector of Weights and Measures, 1930.

Address in Reply

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I was unable to be present at the House to listen to the last three or four speakers dealing with the Speech from the Throne, but I was able to read very good reports of them in the newspapers and felt that already everything contained in the Speech from the Throne had been fully covered. In a sense, therefore, there would appear to be no necessity for my following them. I think, however, that you will agree with me that the affairs of this country are not as good as they might be and conditions in the outside countries and foreign markets are far from normal. Every member of this House, therefore, not only is invited but should, as a matter of duty, consider and discuss these affairs which are of such vital interest and importance to the country. Every Government is entitled to criticism or praise for the way they handle the affairs of the country over which they govern; criticism or praise depending entirely on the way their acts are performed and carried out. In cases where criticism should be given it is the duty of every member to express his opinion, because otherwise his silence might be taken for an acquiescence of the acts of the Government.

This year marks one material change in that the House opened at such an early date. Last year the House did not open until May, whereas this year it opened in the early part of March and all the members looked forward with pleasure to an early closing, but unfortunately this was delayed by the very unfortunate disaster which overtook the Viking, and we all naturally

sympathised with those people who suffered the loss of relatives near and dear to them, and also with those who through injuries sustained are today suffering as the result. I think that the manner in which the whole situation in connection with the disaster was carried out is worthy of special praise. The crews of the other sealing ships which were sent to the assistance of the Viking did their duty manfully and without demur, despite the fact that they knew they were doing it at a very great loss to themselves. The men on the Viking behaved themselves in a manner which is ever associated with our British mercantile marine, and those on shore carried out their arduous duties in a most praiseworthy and efficient manner. The people of Horse Islands did everything humanly possible for the survivors, giving up their homes and food supply to help others, while in St. John's the affairs were handled in such a way that their actions called for little or no criticism. At a time like that I think the burden cast on those far from the scene of the disaster is the most difficult to bear, and for this I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries deserves special praise. All in all I think the situation was as well handled as it was possible to do. I think also that Otis Bartlett deserves special recommendation. I trust, Sir, that only a reward of real value will be given to him, that those in authority will see that he receives promotion commensurate with the services he performed on that tragic occasion.

The Speech from the Throne was delivered on the 11th of March and the motion that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply was moved by Mr. Bindon and seconded by Mr. Strong. I listened with very close attention to what

these gentlemen had to say, and I may say that they delivered speeches that left no doubt in the minds of their hearers as to what they meant to say. They were consecutive and concise, clear and logical; they were pleasant and gave no offence. There is one criticism that I would like to make and that is that they dealt too much in generalities, but that is characteristic of those moving the appointment of a Select Committee under the existing Government. It seems to be a principle that the policy of the Government should not be disclosed to those who move the motion for a Select Committee and they had no more idea of what that policy was going to be than we had on this side of the House. I presume that this is the policy of the Government, and as I progress in my remarks I think that I will make it clear that on every occasion when we anticipated a declaration of policy so that the people of the country could know the condition of affairs, the Government was characteristically silent.

In speaking to the Address in Reply one has an opportunity, first, of reviewing the condition of the country, then the condition of its government, and then considering the relation of one to the other. There has been during the past eight or nine months a continuous stream of statements to show that there is considerable unemployment in St. John's and in some of the larger towns outside, and that there has been, and is, poverty and in some cases, destitution in the outports. In a large measure these conditions are due to the failure of the fisheries last year. There was a failure in the quantity, there was a failure in the quality due to a very hot sun splitting the fish as it lay drying, and there was a decline in the prices in the foreign markets and this meant a loss to the country of not less than

\$5,000,000, which, to a country of this size is colossal. This failure came, not in a year when the fisheries were "not so bad," but after a year which was less than a moderate year; it came on a country impoverished or semi-impoverished. The result of this loss is a reduction in those industries which are carried on locally.

Another factor was the great collapse which has taken place the world over. Where unemployment exists and exists in substantial numbers, poverty and destitution exist in the same way and cannot be winked out of sight. I have heard statements such as these described as "preaching blue ruin" and that we should send forth a message of optimism. To my mind it is well to be optimistic, but before we become foolishly optimistic we should find out where we stand. The doctor tells his patient who has pneumonia that he must be optimistic, and if he is not he dies, but that does not say that he hasn't got pneumonia. We have got to be optimistic, but that does not mean that we have to blind ourselves to the fact that there is unemployment, poverty and destitution. If there is one thing worse than picturing the country worse than it really is, it is to picture it better, and this is perfect folly.

It is not "preaching blue ruin" to face the facts; it means ruin to the country if you don't. What we have to do is to face the situation and apply the remedy. This condition of affairs was not a temporary one, because it existed before the Prime Minister left for the Imperial Conference. The early fishery was a failure. The men were leaving it and every member here knows that they were appealing for work on shore because the fishery was a failure. It was known in August, yet the Prime Minister left the country. That was the position in

Canada. The Prime Minister of Canada held a hurried session of the House and announced that if the Imperial Conference were not postponed he would not be able to attend. He passed emergency measures to deal with the depression in that country and the Conference was deferred until he had passed measures to carry that country through the winter.

The absence of the Prime Minister is always of grave importance when a national crisis is impending, more so in this country and this government, because the absence of the Prime Minister causes paralysis among his colleagues, with the result that when he is away nothing was done by the Executive with a view to alleviating conditions, and nothing was done after his return. It might be said that the Government had appointed a Commission to discuss the matter. It is always a Commission.

There is no subject that comes up for discussion but that some Commission is dealing with it. There is a Commission dealing with unemployment and other matters which I shall now deal with. That Commission consists of Sir William F. Lloyd, Sir P. T. McGrath and Mr. Hutchings. After Sir P. T. McGrath died, Mr. Fox took his place. That was the Unemployment Commission to consider unemployment in St. John's. With Mr. Gibbs in place of Mr. Fox that is the Economic Commission and the Public Utilities Commission and the Lunacy Commission. When you consider the subjects they have to tackle you wonder why the Executive exists at all. Just consider: At three o'clock there is a session of the Unemployment Commission consisting of Sir W. F. Lloyd, Mr. Hutchings and Mr. Fox; then at four o'clock Mr. Fox goes out and Mr. Gibbs comes in and they hold a session of the Economic Commis-

sion; then at five o'clock, if they still have time at five o'clock, Mr. Fox enters again and they sit in Lunacy.

These sessions are supposed to be held in public, but the public would have a difficult task in knowing and in following the different sittings and discovering which was which. They would have to wear rosettes of different colors to distinguish the different meetings. This Commission was first called on to find temporary relief for the unemployment and poverty in St. John's and the outports, and also asked to devise ways and means whereby it could be decreased. They were asked to deal with these questions to see if they could provide some permanent remedy so as to make them non-recurring. Imagine the scope they had. They were asked to deal with unemployment in St. John's and poverty in the outports with a view to devising some permanent remedy for their alleviation. And what did they do? They produced a perfectly wonderful report. I have it here. They dealt with the outports from two points of view; first Agriculture and secondly the Fisheries.

I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has seen the Report of the Agriculture Commission? If not, Sir, I would like to present you with a copy. Allow me to recommend it to your attention—as the Lenten season is over, I won't call it a penance, but I suggest you would read it from this angle. I would ask you to take your mind back to the period when you, as a remarkably young man of sixty, first took your place in the House as an Agricultural Commissioner. I would ask you to take your mind back to the subject of canker; you'll find it described here. The treatment of cankerous potatoes, the use of limes and phosphates as fertilisers are all dealt with in the same man-

ner. Advice is given with regard to the treatment of breed animals; you'll find it all here. Apart from taking your mind back a quarter of a century, you will derive very little benefit from the Commissioner's report. If you yourself had been asked to give an essay on the subject it would have been done better without evidence and without fee. And yet this Report takes up 24 pages. It ranges from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is particularly erudite on the subject of seed potatoes, and yet we imported 25,000 bushels last year for eating purposes.

I am sorry the Minister for Marine and Fisheries has left the House, or I would talk about what this hybrid Commission has done with regard to the fisheries. Its report might be termed the "Rise and Fall of the Piscatorial Empire." What does it recommend? Standardization. Standardization, Sir, is a very novel idea indeed. I remember a short time ago a paper called the "Watchdog" barking Standardization right across its pages, and it was not until I had read that that I could see the situation as a whole. I saw the Prime Minister tossing on his bed about four o'clock on a cold morning, worrying out his soul about the fisheries, and besides that he had the added trouble at outlined in his letter to Captain Peter Roberts, that his whole assets were wrapped up in the fisheries. So besides his worries as a statesman he had the added personal trouble of seeing bankruptcy staring him in the face. Then came the heaven-sent thought. The Prime Minister shouted "Eureka," rose from his bed, dashed down the word "Standardization" on a memorandum, and the next day the "Watchdog" barked. I am surprised at the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He has been for over twenty-five years personally connect-

ed with the fishery, as were his ancestors before him. He was a member of this House when the famous Coaker Regulations were introduced, and yet he now needs this hybrid Commission to tell him what to do. I should like to know if the Hon. Minister has seen the Report of the Commission. If not, let me introduce it to him. Mr. Speaker, one can realise the value of this Report when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not even seen it.

I shall now deal with the Report of the Economic Commission as regards temporary work. As this comes immediately under the purview of the Colonial Secretary, I would like to ask him could he not have written it himself between supper and bedtime and not lose ten minutes sleep. In order to provide temporary relief in St. John's the construction of certain roads was suggested, and the Minister of Public Works was called into the conference. In other words, when relief work was necessary Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Hall and Dr. Howlett had to be called in. That is proper enough, but I say, Sir, that they ought not to have been called in by the Economic Commission, but by the members themselves. The thing is a crying scandal.

It is a curious thing that all four of these men are lawyers. They are all eminent men in their own profession, but the complaint I make is that they should never have been appointed on these Commissions. They delay in submitting their reports. There is delay in the taking of evidence. And the evidence itself is no novelty. Not one novel statement or one novel recommendation has been made. It is simply a case of the Government burking its duty and passing the work over to a Commission. The unemployment could have been handled as it was in

the past, without passing it over to this hybrid Commission. In spite of the statements of the Prime Minister, in spite of the warning he gave at the Board of Trade dinner of raising the cry of "Wolf, Wolf!" there is unemployment in St. John's, and it is serious and has been for some months past. We are told that destitution is practically non-existent, that there are only 800 or 900 unemployed in St. John's. But when we come to consider that this 900 was only the registered family men, the situation is absolutely appalling.

What about the girls and boys that have been laid off from the factories within the last couple of months? Are not they unemployed? What about the unmarried men? Aren't they unemployed? Even with the Prime Minister's figures the situation is perfectly staggering. There are in the City of St. John's between 7000 and 8000 families, and of these, according to his own figures, between 800 and 900 are unemployed, or between 11 and 12%. We have all heard of the terrible unemployment situation in England with 2 million people out of work. But this is out of a population of 40 millions, or 5%, while in St. John's, as I have said, it is between 11 and 12%. And this is the situation which the Government passes over to an irresponsible Commission to dilly dally with as they like.

Give the question whatever thought you like and you will find that the only possible answer is, Government by Commissions and with nothing done for the people of the country except to hand out money to the privileged few. All that was done in and around St. John's was the reconditioning of some roads by the Highroads Commission. With regard to the outports, nothing was done except give the people their whack of

dole and put them in a state of degradation. Sir William Lloyd and Mr. Brownrigg, the Commissioner of Public Charities, made a trip to Placentia Bay to examine into the conditions of the people and to take evidence on the spot, in the face of the fact that we had already three highly-paid Commissioners taking evidence. Now why have a Commission to run the Poor Commissioner's office. This could have been dealt with through the Colonial Secretary's office as in the past. Through the various relieving officers throughout the country, the Poor Commissioner could have supplied all this information himself and so the need for a Commission has yet to appear. If there was any prospect of the Commission giving some work in the outports, then they would have justified their existence, but they did not even do as certain members of the Government did, and that was recommend work to be done and be refused.

In my district a considerable amount of dole was given out and quarter of it could have been saved if the Government had listened to me. I requested the Government to send a few of their Highroads officials to put men to work on the roads and bridges and to cut timber for marine works. The people I represent did not want dole; they wanted work. I wrote the Government and the heads of the various departments to that effect and the answer I got was that there was nothing doing but dole. To prevent people from being demoralised other similar suggestions were made, and I know that people were prepared to cut timber at a cheaper rate of pay than they ever did before, but the Commission never took any evidence on that point and the same policy of drift was followed throughout. There was no enquiry made as to what work was

available and no enquiry was made by the Government as to what the Commission were doing. The Government simply drifted along and they are going to put the blame upon the members of the Economic Commission. In the meantime the people are looking to the future and are wondering what is going to happen this year.

We all know of the tremendous losses met with in connection with the fisheries of last year and the merchants are not in a position to give out supplies to any great extent this year, whilst the fishermen are in a worse position than ever with regard to purchasing supplies. Right now is the time to know what is likely to be done. We do not know anything from the Government as to what their fishery or highroads policy is, and our fishermen are holding out their hands to know what the intentions of the Government are on that point. If the Government had shown any foresight and had displayed any interest for the producers of the country they would have foreshadowed their policy in the Speech from the Throne. That is the kind of thing the country wanted to hear, not a lot of stuff about defaulting brokers and insurance companies. But the Government said nothing, and I question if they have anything to say now along these lines. One would naturally expect, also, that in view of the obvious falling off in the earning power of the people with its consequent effect upon the revenue, the Government would have made some earnest effort towards retrenchment or economy.

Those of you who read the speech of Mr. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada, in the opening days of the present session of the Canadian Parliament, in speaking of supplemental supply, will have noticed that he issued a very serious straight-forward warning to the heads of the various Gov-

ernment departments when he said that they would have to live within their votes or lose their jobs. In this country the reverse is the case, and heads of departments are told that if they will only do what the Prime Minister wants them that he will give them bonuses. In England the other day, Mr. Snowden, Chancellor of the Exchequer, issued a warning so strong that it staggered the members of his own party. He advocated retrenchment in every department and he warned the heads of the different departments that the whole fiscal stability of England depended upon the carrying out of that warning. In this country no warning was issued by the Finance Minister or the Prime Minister, and not alone was no attempt made at economy or retrenchment in the Civil Service, but the extravagant conduct of affairs of the past was continued and further unnecessary expenditures embarked upon.

The Commissions which have already been criticised so severely and which have become so nauseating still continue when they are unnecessary and expensive, and if that money was taken and devoted to Old Age Pensions \$20,000 could be saved to prevent aged and worn-out fishermen from receiving poor relief. It seems that lawyers, doctors, merchants and certain civil servants who are friendly disposed to the Government are having moneys being spent on them lavishly, whilst the common people of the country have got to pay the piper. However, the people to be blamed for the perpetration of this raid upon the public treasury are the Government, because if you engage lawyers or doctors you got to pay their fees, but you are not bound to employ them if you find that they want more than you are able to pay them. The remedy rests with yourself. Do not employ them.

With regard to the Justice Department, Sir, I say that Department should have been re-organized long ago, as promised by the present Prime Minister. We now have an Attorney General, a Solicitor General and an Acting Deputy Minister. As the major portion of the Attorney General's time is taken up in other capacities, the Solicitor General was appointed to perform the duties of the Attorney General and his appointment was made for the express purpose of saving money for the country. That is what we were told in a flamboyant speech made by the Prime Minister in this House. We were going to save thousands of dollars by the appointment of Mr. Bradley. Thousands of dollars means that this year the C.P. account is overdrawn by \$7,000 and the cost of legal fees is in the vicinity of \$52,000 since the 30th of June last. Is that saving money? Every department in the service practically has been handing it out. The position of Mr. Dunfield is most anomalous. He is neither Deputy Minister nor an active practising barrister. He has been compelled to give up his practice; his services are apparently needed in the Department. Mr. Dunfield is a man who commands the highest respect in his profession and amongst the people. He is a hard-working, brilliant man. I am not blaming Mr. Dunfield; he does not know whether he is going to be a civil servant tomorrow or not; it would be impossible for him to work there upon a small salary. Naturally having to abandon his practice, he must charge fees for a certain class of work. If you don't want him, appoint a deputy minister and get rid of him.

I have asked several questions in regard to the prosecutions that were carried on by the Solicitor General and those that were not carried on by him, but they have not been answered.

The money saved by appointing him in his position as Solicitor General has resulted in his receiving \$14,000 to \$15,000 since the 30th June last.

Now we come to doctors. I am not going at the present time to comment on the anomalous positions in which Drs. Campbell and Mcsdell have placed themselves. That will be a matter for further consideration. I want to mention the question of the Asylum; here again I don't want to attack either Dr. Anderson or Dr. Cashin. Dr. Anderson is a man who stands at the top of his profession; he is, in my opinion—that is why I employ him—the best doctor in town. I think that if he is to be made Superintendent of the Asylum, to live there and be a real superintendent, you have to pay him a good sum; you can't expect him, even though these civil service positions carry with them a pension, you can't expect him to abandon a very lucrative practice in the prime of life and take a permanency in the civil service unless you pay him well. You must, if you are going to have these institutions properly run, you must get first-class man to run them. I think, therefore, if you are going to appoint Dr. Anderson as Superintendent of the Asylum, you will have to pay him a substantial fee, and he will repay you. I do object to a man who spends nine-tenths of his day in private practice—even if he is a hard-working industrious man. I say you have got no right to pay that man \$5,000 for giving a small portion of his time to the superintendency of the Asylum. Again, I don't blame Dr. Anderson. I blame the Government.

I mention, Sir, the civil servants. This was a matter of some considerable comment. Last year we found on every hand that civil servants were being treated to bonuses in sub-

stantial amounts for so-called extra services; in one instance there was \$3,000; and, if my memory serves me right, \$3,000 to one, \$1,000 to another and \$500 to another for services extending over a previous period of 16 years, given apparently voluntarily, without any claim being made, and for goodness knows what. Last year during the course of the Estimates we found that those bonuses had been given in the Postal Telegraph Department and then there were a number of increases and only two or three left out. When I questioned the Minister about it he said, "They got their increases last year; we have got to give the others increases this year." We find, again, bonuses being given in that Department. When it is not the Postal Department, it is some other department. We find it is put down to immigration. I did not know this country suffers the ills of immigration. The only immigration I know of is the return of our own nationals from foreign countries where they can't do as well. Immigration pays for all. Even a man who has been on a sick bed for two years got \$1,000 in connection with immigration.

Now, Sir, what does the Auditor General say about these payments. After all, one can hardly think that the Auditor General would deal with this matter except in a friendly spirit to the Government. On page 11 he says:

(Reads)

Postal Telegraph services are services which are not regular; it may be necessary to call them out at all hours; trains and boats arrive at all hours; it is necessary to call out the postal clerks to sort letters; it is not unreasonable to expect that certain payments should be made to these officials.

(Reads)

And it is going on in every department of the civil service under the present Government. It is come to the point now when it seems to be considered that the salary of a civil servant is to be looked upon as a purely retaining fee. Everything that he does outside of drawing his cheque must be paid for extra. I don't know what is behind it; whether it is an attempt to buy up the civil service or to demoralize it, but it is pernicious; it should be stopped. It is a scandal, that cannot be denied.

Then, Sir, in the midst of our troubles we have an Official Research. Is that a Commission? I was afraid it might be a committee.

HON. MR. SPEAKER.—I wish to draw the attention of the strangers here to the Rules of the House. While they may attend, they are not to make any noise or interfere with the deliberations of the House. If they do, I will order the galleries cleared.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I agree, if the rule will be enforced when the members on the Government side of the House speak as well.

In the midst of our troubles we have this official research board. I don't wish to take away from the value of scientific research in our fisheries. This should have been undertaken many years ago; years ago it probably could not be done so efficiently; in recent years more knowledge and better scientific apparatus have been placed at our service. There comes a time in every man's exchequer account, in every company's exchequer account and in every government's exchequer account when they have to stop and consider whether they can afford even a scientific research. I say the time is come when we can't

afford it. It is unfortunate that we are going through a period now when we can't afford to do this on an extravagant scale.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, £5,000 has been voted by the British Government and £5,000 by the Newfoundland Government..

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, in addition to the \$25,000 voted for this, the Government have purchased a steamer for \$40,000, and in the Ministry of Marine and Fisheries there has been opened an account for the running of that boat, permitting the Minister to draw and expend up to \$20,000. Now, I say, we can't afford that. I understand that the boat is to be used for certain purposes other than scientific research; it is to be used in connection with ice and bait and so on; but, Sir, I say we cannot afford it. It is a very excellent thing to have, but the only excuse that was given, the only reason that was given for purchasing it was because it was required for the fishery research, and upon an exchange of messages with Dr. Thomson.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to Mr. Emerson, I will state for the benefit of the House that the boat was bought for general purposes of the Department, particularly for the West Coast fishery, which was in need of a boat. This boat is to be used in Lighthouse repair work, for which we had to hire boats for \$20,000. This boat is to be used for the general purposes of the Department.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I am glad the honourable Minister stated that, because we asked for all correspondence, minutes of council and other documents in connection therewith, and the correspondence and

minutes of council, correspondence by the Minister with the Government, by the Government with the Minister, the authorisation in connection with it is based solely upon the Fishery Research Board. The messages I read only a couple of nights ago. If I am wrong I shall be glad if you will produce evidence to the contrary. The first move came from the Fishery Board; there was a wire sent by Mr. Noonan to Dr. Thomson, and a wire back. You wrote the Government in connection with the matter, and the Government authorised you to purchase a boat for that purpose. You wrote the Government asking for permission to expend \$20,000 and the Government gave you authority.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Maybe there is other correspondence which you have not seen.

MR. EMERSON.—I asked for it and that is what I have got; you can't blame me if you have misinformed me.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The correspondence was not asked from my department.

MR. EMERSON.—The correspondence given to me was from your department, and the replies.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I did not see it.

MR. EMERSON.—But the ship belongs to the Government, robbing Peter to pay Paul.

It is the same with everything else the Government has any connection with. No, Sir, there is no curtailment of the extravagance of the Government. It has gone on since the first year, the year of inoculation or incubation as it might be called. It has developed and developed until the Government department heads

seem to have no comprehension of what a few noughts placed after the digit means; they add a nought, and it doesn't seem to matter whether it makes \$1000.00 into \$10,000.00; it simply means an alteration on a bit of paper which is from one person to another. No steps have been taken to curtail the expenditure which has been criticised on all sides. And what steps have been taken this year? We all know that the only remedy is economy on the part of the Government; the only remedy. But there has been no attempt on the part of the Government to curtail, and that's why in a few short weeks we will be faced with a deficit of \$2,000,000 in the Revenue.

Now, everyone knows that work and employment could have been found on the Gander, Sir; Yet the Gander project was treated shamefully by the Government. If the Government had only given the Gander decent, not decent but merely honest treatment, if the Gander had only been treated and intelligently so by the Government, then for the next five years thousands of the people of this country would have steady employment.

Thousands would have been employed during the next five years, working on the construction of the mills, preparing timber, and on the shipping of supplies and machinery; thousands would have been employed over the next five years and the problem of unemployment with which we are faced would have been alleviated. What a difference to the revenue would the employment of these thousands of men have made.

You have, most of you, seen Grand Falls and Corner Brook, thriving towns of growing population, absorbing and providing work for people of all classes. The great objection to

providing work for the fishermen on the Highroads is that when the work is over and he has to return home, his capital is exhausted and his boats and nets spoiled. But if you could make a woodsman of him, or a paper-maker of him, providing him with steady employment throughout twelve months of the year, some real steps would have been taken towards relieving the condition of unemployment as it exists at present.

And, Sir, it is my contention that the matter should have been given the entire attention of everyone in the Government, to the abandonment of the Imperial Conference and trips abroad, to the abandonment of schemes for the Highroads Commission and to the abandonment of everything else, and take up the attention of the Government for the entire twelve months.

Imagine another Grand Falls establishment on the north-east coast. It is well known what a boon such an industry would be to the country. Imagine, if instead of two pulp and paper mills we had three, think of the thousands of people that would have steady employment.

MR. EARLE.—Do you know the condition of the paper market as it stands today?

MR. EMERSON.—The condition of the paper market is today as the rest of the industrial markets; it is down to the bottom. That is why I say now is the time to start construction,

Last year, I happen to know, there was a contract made between the Reid and Hearst interests whereby the Hearst people agreed to take the entire output of the Reids. Do you think that these people are fooled? These men knowing their business and having under their control the best minds

on the continent; men knowing all about the paper market.

MR. EARLE.—You say so, but the members of the Government do not. The Company were prepared to spend seventy-five million, but they wanted \$200,000,000.00 in concessions on the Labrador.

MR. EMERSON.—\$200,000,000.00 for the ten thousand miles of the Labrador? Well, I wish that when I have finished speaking the honorable member would address the House in reply to the points I wish to make.

MR. SPEAKER.—I wish to draw the attention of the House to the strangers present; they must not express their feelings in clapping, or any noise whatsoever. If it happens again I shall order the gallery cleared.

MR. EMERSON.—I quite agree. Of course this step would be taken if a Government member was speaking.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have previously drawn attention to this matter.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to make is that this matter is one of great importance and calls for the greatest efforts on the part of the Government to bring about its culmination. I may say that it calls for frank discussion and constructive thought.

It should be dealt with fairly and not juggled about like a football; not a political football, for it has never become a political matter; but as a football it has been kicked about by the Government ever since the election. And I say that now the prospects of a Gander within the next four or five years are very remote.

I think you all remember what the famous record said about the Gander in 1928.

Once again the Gramaphone record of 1928 must be referred to particularly that phrase "I know I can breathe the breath of industry into the Gander," that was the cry of the Prime Minister in 1928. "I know I can breathe the breath of industry into the Gander." In 1929 the Prime Minister introduced two Bills into the Legislature, in the introducing of which the same expression was used. The first Bill introduced was in reference to a Telephone Cable across the Atlantic, at that time he informed the House that he was Newfoundland's leading salesman and wasn't the type of man who stayed at Home waiting for orders. He very nearly spoiled this speech when, through what I shall term a slip of the tongue he quoted himself as the man who would sell Newfoundland. When introducing this Bill he further informed us that he worked day and night that he might be doing something that would be very beneficial to the country. That, I would term a very pretty speech but had he done anything very useful so far nothing whatever has been done regarding it and nothing is likely to be done.

The next Bill introduced by him was one in connection with the American Smelters. This also was to be of everlasting benefit but as in the case of the Telephone Bill nothing has been since heard of this one. I have no doubt in my mind that had Sir Richard introduced the Collishaw Bill he would have claimed credit for selling their Woolen Mills. During the sessions of the present Government we have heard various reports and rumours of the Gander Bill. At the first session of the House the Government had only been in office for six months and we didn't expect them to be in the position to bring in this Bill as they had other work on their hands

but at the second session which took place thirteen months later the Speech from the Throne gave us no specific statement as to what was being done in this connection or if anything was being done at all.

Everybody had hoped that the Gander Bill would have been brought in at the last session of the House but it was not until questions were asked by members of this side of the House had been answered was any daylight given to the matter. In May last year an answer was tabled by the Colonial Secretary in the form of a letter. This letter in the main so far as facts contained therein was hopelessly inaccurate, but it was the only document tabled and further was the only document published in the Liberal Press which is the Government Newspaper. This publication was false and published for no other purpose than to deceive the people who should read it. The amount of deceit and hiding of information by the Government in connection with the Gander has been disgraceful and has been so great that it leads one to come to the only available conclusion and that is that the Government was ashamed to let their actions in the matter become public and it was a vital necessity to them that the goings on should be a profound secret.

Prior to all this certain writs for areas licensed to Reids or I should say licensed to others and purchased by Reids were attacked by the Government. In a letter written to Mr. R. G. Reid by the Colonial Secretary he stated that the issuing of these writs was not aimed at the Gander but was in conformity with a policy affecting licenses laid down by the Government which would affect all holders of similar licenses in the same manner, and he furthermore stated that the

Government could withdraw these writs if not satisfactory. This I contend was ridiculous as it was quite evident to everybody that the Government could withdraw if they wanted to and furthermore if they got judgements they could have still withdrawn.

The statement that the issuing of these writs was in conformity with the policy of the Government is also ridiculous and unbelievable otherwise can the Colonial Secretary inform this House why, out of the 70 writs issued, only 10 have been served. Is that carrying out their policy? And of the 10 writs served why have nine of these been on the Reids when other holders of licenses in Canada and Newfoundland have not been served with any writs. No the idea of this was to hamper the Gander programme and the result is that instead of today having a mill on the Gander the country is faced with an action for Ten Million Dollars.

This year the House opened on March 11, and we all looked forward to seeing some promise of the legislature dealing with the Gander. In the Speech from the Throne and particularly when we say that there was a text from a memorandum of Alan S. Butler, our hopes were raised and again, but alas! the Prime Minister, at 5 o'clock, in course of reply to a question asked by Mr. Alderdice stated that the reason there was no Gander Bill to be introduced was because the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars in cash guaranteed for their interest in the Gander scheme.

The Prime Minister as usual, contradicted his declaration of the opening day when he tabled a reply to a question in connection with the Gander. The answer is as follows:

(Reads)

That was the answer to question No. 25, asked by Mr. Alderdice of the Prime Minister. Last year the same plea was put forward by the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary. There is no doubt in my mind or the minds of any body on this side of the House that when people in business matters discuss these matters confidentially (and documents and other correspondence are transferred from one party to another and are done in a confidential manner) then they should be treated as such.

The Prime Minister in this House stated that these documents were passed to him in the strictest confidence, and I say now, that that is untrue, and, Mr. Speaker, that is not by any means the worst. Sir Richard, despite the fact that he claims these documents were of a confidential nature, was party to a gross breach of confidence. I regret very much that the Prime Minister is not present to hear these statements but as usual he has left the House while I am speaking. However, that is his own funeral. On the opening day the Prime Minister tabled the full text of the letter from Alan S. Butler to the Colonial Secretary.

(Reads)

A document 'Without Prejudice' cannot be used and what is that? It was given the Government in the strictest confidence and should never have been published and we find it in the Speech from the Throne and talked with a flip of the hand as soon as it came from the printers. Now, Sir, what do we find after that? An answer given by the Prime Minister to a question asked by Mr. Alderdice, that is, what was the result of correspondence with Mr. Conroy. Mr. Conroy is

an eminent man in his profession, very honourable and holds a high place in the community and his word would be taken by any man in the country. He says in reply to Sir Richard's letter of March 19th:

(Reads)

I am going to leave out a paragraph now for a moment and I am going to deal with another aspect.

(Reads)

It was refused last year and we had to fight for it this year because we were told that it was a confidential document and Mr. Conroy says here that it was among the documents to be tabled and must have been 'Omitted by Accident.' Mr. Conroy is always very polite. Now what was in confidence was the Hearst-Reid agreement in which terms were settled, and as far as the Reids were concerned, what they were going to get for their lands. This was a confidential document and let us see what happened. The Reids refused to have that agreement between themselves and Hearst tabled. That document was given to the Prime Minister in such confidence and was of such grave importance that its contents were not even to be divulged to his own Executive Government and he respected this confidence by having ten copies made and showed one to Mr Dunfield. Is this keeping a confidence? Even yet we have not exhausted the enormity of the offence. Let us go back to what I quoted a few moments ago.

(Reads)

If the Reids wanted fifteen million dollars for their lands it was contained in the Hearst-Reid agreement which was given the Prime Minister in the strictest confidence and he vomits it forth in this House. That is

the man who puts up the plea that he cannot disclose documents because they were given to him in confidence. It so happens, Sir, that as frequently happens that statement was entirely untrue but that does not take away from the offence. The proof is in the letter from Mr. Conroy which I quoted you. The Prime Minister on the 18th of March wrote Mr. Conroy as follows:

(Reads)

That was the question No. 25 which was asked, it goes on:

(Reads)

What does Mr. Conroy say to that? "It looks to me" this is Mr. Conroy's reply to the Prime Minister:

(Reads)

The Reids, therefore, were to get considerably less than 40% of fifteen million dollars, and the balance of the consideration in shares, not even debentures, because they wanted that amount of money to reimburse them for what they had expended and to give them enough to carry on until the Gander began to pay dividends. They would therefore get considerably less than 40% of this fifteen million and the balance they were willing to take their chance on, and that, Sir, was not only a gross breach of confidence but more it was a glaring untruth. Why then, Mr. Speaker, all this deception, all this hiding of facts? Was there something the Government had to be ashamed of, or was it because they did not want the Gander?

My opinion is that they put every obstacle in the way of its consummation and I think that from the correspondence I have read and the evidence I have adduced that you will agree with me. As I said before, this is a project that calls for the assist-

ance of engineers, financiers, men familiar with paper market and expert corporation lawyers. Such a scheme would need assistance from many sources under these four heads. I understand that some would not be needed right away, corporation lawyers would not be needed until the outline is settled and they have to prepare the necessary legislation for Parliament but first it would have to be gone over by engineers to ascertain whether or not it was a feasible project and whether the paper market in its present state would justify its undertaking and from what financial sources the money would come. Nothing like this was done and one of the first things that should have been done was to submit the scheme to these three classes of people for a casual survey but they did nothing. As late as March 21st last year after having been negotiating with the Reids for six months the Colonial Secretary provided a delightful little diversion in a most delightful letter in which he says:

(Reads)

They had been dealing with that firm for six months and they had not even taken the trouble to ring up the manager of the Bank of Montreal and get a report on them, that was their excuse, the Government did not know the financial standing of the newsprint company. The Government had deliberately failed to take the matter into serious consideration and I think that they did not want the Gander.

Now what's wrong with the Gander? I've read the memorandum tabled and while I can't say I agree absolutely with everything the Reids ask for, I do say there is a basis of discussion, and in a proposition like this the parties always ask for considerably more than they expect to get. I say

the matter should have been fully discussed and apparently it never has been. If it had been perhaps the Reids would have been able to put up such a case that the Government would be prepared to give way, or perhaps they may have asked for substantially more than they expected to get. I say they put up a discussable proposition and all they got when they went to the Government was to have the door slammed in their faces. Mr. Speaker, there are other aspects of the Speech from the Throne which I intend dealing with when the occasion arises.

Today I intended dealing only with four or five aspects of it, chiefly those dealing with unemployment and increased revenue. I think I have said enough to show that the Government has lamentably failed, and the probabilities are that next year the revenue will be less than the expenditure by something over two million dollars, and that another loan will have to be raised. I say again that the people are in dire distress, and much could have been done to alleviate their condition by an honest and active government.

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

On motion the Bill entitled "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips" was recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 certain amendments.

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

Whereupon on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the Bill entitled "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to 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 tomorrow.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Speaker the Second Reading of this Bill was postponed on my account. I understood that the honourable introducer of the Bill was prepared to insert a clause in Committee to enable hunters in a district to keep dogs, as I have a number of requests from people in my district opposed to sportsmen being allowed to bring dogs in the district for hunting purposes, dogs which people living in the district are not allowed to keep even during the hunting season and particularly when they want to get something for their families for the Winter season.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Speaker, no reference is made in the Bill to the point raised by the honourable member and it can be settled in Committee stage.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 8th, 1931.

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

MR. FUDGE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the residents of Morrisville and Millville praying for an allocation to build a road. Last year I presented a similar petition though only signed by residents from Morrisville. It was, however, consigned to the waste-paper basket. This is a letter received from these people:

(Reads)

I hope this petition will meet with more sympathetic support and I beg that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition on behalf of the residents of the south side of Petty Harbor praying that a sum of money be allocated for the repair of roads and the bridge. Petty Harbor has been very unsuccessful with the fishery this year. Also the Harbor Gut is in a bad condition and an allocation is necessary from the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

I trust the Departments of Public Works and Marine and Fisheries will give them work immediately and thus a chance of earning a little money before the fishery starts and not wait until forced to give these people pauper relief.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition received from the residents of Famish Cove in the district of Placentia East. It appears that it is the intention to change the railway station at Tickle Harbour Crossing. Tickle Harbour Crossing is their nearest station and that is seven miles from them and it is there that all the freight must be brought and taken from and it can be seen a hardship would be inflicted on them if this station were removed. I beg that the railway authorities be asked to reconsider their decision.

I also beg to present a petition from 200 people from Long Harbor, Silbey's Cove and Crawley's Island asking that some money be allocated for the purpose of reconditioning a road at Long Harbor. This road is about five miles long and is in a shocking condition. They would also like to have the road continued to Chapel Arm, and as the Highroad passes there this would be a most opportune time. This would also benefit the district of Trinity Centre, as well as Placentia East. I beg to refer the petition to the Department of Public Works.

MR. SMITH—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from some 200 residents of North River Dock, Bereneed and Port-de-Grave praying for an extension of the road from the foot of Snows Pond to connect with Highroad at the head of the same pond. It is about six miles long. The extension of this road would be of great assistance to the people in getting their fire wood. It would also open up to sportsmen many ponds teeming with trout, and an area abounding with game. I beg to have the petition referred to the Department to which it relates.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, 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 introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Amendments to the Rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE SPEAKER—Mr. Chairman, the prepared Resolutions to be submitted to the House for the alteration of certain rules are in reality an Amendment and enlargement of Bills of a private nature that come before the House in connection with the taxing of people and the exemption of individuals from certain taxes. Sections 251 and 252 have been found to be very narrow and are amended by the new Sections.

Section 291 affects Private Bills and sets out the machinery whereby the particular section is dealt with by a Committee of the Whole House. If the

recommendations of the House are sent to His Excellency and he does not express his pleasure to all Sections then the Bill must go through without those particular Sections.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And there being twenty-nine members present in their places in the House (exclusive of Mr. Speaker) namely:

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister,
 Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
 Hon. Minister Finance and Customs,
 Hon. the Minister of Posts,
 Hon. Dr. Campbell,
 Hon. Dr. Mosdell,
 Hon. Mr. Lewis,
 Minister of Agriculture and Mines,
 Hon. Leader of the Opposition,
 Mr. Puddester,
 Mr. Emerson,
 Mr. Earle,
 Mr. Starkes,
 Mr. Moore,
 Mr. Winter,
 Mr. Fitzgibbon,
 Mr. Skanes,
 Lady Squires,
 Mr. Quinton,
 Mr. Scammell,
 Mr. Tobin,
 Mr. Bennett,
 Mr. Godden,
 Mr. Fudge,
 Mr. Bindon,
 Mr. Strong,
 Mr. Greene,
 Mr. Byrne,
 Mr. Smith,
 Mr. Murphy.

The Chairman reported that the Committee had passed certain Amend-

ments in the Rules of the House which he handed in at the Clerk's table where they were read.

And, the said twenty-nine members being present, it was ordered that the said report be adopted and that the said Rules as amended, or substituted, do pass.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, there was a rule in St. John's in years past that license money collected from dog owners would be paid to persons who had their poultry or cattle killed by their dogs. Is that rule still in force? Does it also apply outside the city limits. About three years ago I had 24 hens which I had bought about six months from a man who was leaving the country and I paid a high price for them and one night they were all killed by dogs. I put in a claim for compensation and was told that the claim could not be allowed because the rule had been changed and there would be no more compensation paid. Last year people again got compensation and I was wondering if the law had been changed within the last three years.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—You would come under the Municipal Act.

MR. STRONG—Mr. Chairman, in my district there were many sheep and poultry killed and under the old law steps were taken against the owners of the dogs and \$1.00 per dog was collected from the owners of same

and the people who owned the sheep, poultry, etc. were paid for their losses. Last year \$15.00 over and above the amount required was collected and I understand that this was sent to the Department of Justice at St. John's to reimburse people who might suffer such losses in the following year. This is sometimes a matter of dispute in my district as frequently the losses are very small and people feel that they should not be taxed more than sufficient to pay for immediate losses sustained in any one year.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the debate on the Address in Reply might I crave your indulgence, Sir, to make an explanation to a statement made in my speech of yesterday. I have been reported to have stated that "a member of the Civil Service who has been in bed for over two years has received one thousand dollars and that emigration pays for all." I understand that this statement has been inferentially taken to mean Mr. H. W. LeMessurier, the recently retired Deputy Minister of Customs.

I do not remember now the exact words that I used, and, consequently, cannot complain of the report as published; but I wish to be understood that I had no intention to refer to that gentleman, nor was his name in my mind when I was speaking. The

gentleman in question has reached very advanced years and has given forty years of his life in the public service of the country. He is now retired almost too late to get that well deserved rest which he is justly entitled to, and I would be very sorry, indeed to have his declining years or the eventide of his life made unhappy by any remark that would be so construed. I want, Sir, to be clearly understood that there was no such intention in my mind, and I hope that the daily papers will give the same publicity to this explanation as they did to my remarks of yesterday.

Address in Reply

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, Sir, I wish to make a few observations on the Motion now before the Chair. Before proceeding to do so I would like to first tender my sincere sympathy to the sufferers in the "Viking" disaster and in particular to those who lost their breadwinners. I would like to congratulate the Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the other officials who were instrumental in getting relief ships to the assistance to the survivors of that terrible disaster.

I would also like to congratulate the Prime Minister upon the honour conferred upon him and his associates, and to both the Mover and Seconder of the Motion for an Address in Reply. The Mover, especially, in his remarks referred to the question of standardization of certain commodities and in making a comparison as to what standardization did for certain other industries abroad and with what should be done with regard to the standardization of our fish, referred to beef packing industries of the United States and Canada. The Hon. member for St. Mary's could not have been conversant with the facts. The

fact is that the meat packing industry is in a worse condition today than is our fisheries and standardization has done very little for the meat industry. Anyone who has handled this class of goods is aware that canned beef imported into this country last year was unfit for human consumption, notwithstanding rules and regulations concerning standardization in the States. That, Sir, shows that standardization regarding this particular commodity is of very little use for the protection of the trade in this country.

My personal opinion is that standardization of fish to be effective in this country must be strict regarding those who catch fish. Anyone who ships fish knows the quality of fish that is required for the different markets abroad, as every market takes a different quality, and I question if it is possible to get ten men in the country who know the qualities of fish and who would be willing to act as inspectors under any Act that may be introduced in this Legislature.

Fish is exported under different brands and every exporter has his name branded on every package of fish that he ships and knows what is the genuine article. Now, Sir, I must admit that the member for White Bay (Mr. Strong) made an excellent speech on opening day on the material he had to work on, and, in my judgement, made the best of a bad defence.

The Speech from the Throne contained nothing for the rank and file of the people of this country, and there has been so much said in criticism of it that there is very little left for me to say.

Regarding the depression that is being so seriously felt in this country, I do not know that it is felt in St. John's as much as it is felt in Con-

ception Bay, Trinity Bay and the West Coast; but I know that when the Prime Minister of this country broadcasted on a couple of occasions that there was little depression here he could not have known of our present existing conditions. He could not have been aware of the destitution and poverty that is so evident in the different districts throughout the country. He might have been sincere when he made those statements, but he has failed miserably to carry out his promises.

Twenty years ago ninety per cent of our exports was fish; today only twenty per cent is fish and I claim that is not as it should be. In calculating the relative values of the various industries it is necessary to find out how much certain commodities cost to produce and what they represent in labour.

With regard to Bell Island ore, I got an answer the other day to a question I put to the Finance Minister and in which he stated that we got \$2.75 per ton in value. Now what does that represent to the people of this country in labour, I ask? If you will go into the details as to what it cost in labour to load a steamer on Bell Island you will find that it does not cost more than a dollar a ton to export ore from Bell Island.

I have been told that there is no necessity of any further expenditure for re-railing the railroad to Port aux Basques, including the branch lines. That is not the case, because there is a branch line of railway from Carbonear to Grate's Cove and there has not been a wheel-barrow full of clay put on it since it was built. That part of the railroad is in very bad shape, and especially so at this particular season of the year, and sooner or

later money has to be spent to improve it and the sooner the better for the safety of the travelling public.

Now there are several Commissions appointed by the Government, one of which is an Agricultural Commission, comprising five members of the Government, who are each getting \$2,700 a year and who have been doing nothing except drawing their salaries.

I would suggest that the Minister of Finance and Customs, in bringing in his Loan Bill, make provision for \$150,000 for the encouragement of Agriculture, and I think it would be money well spent. I would suggest that, without employing any other men —we have five already getting paid for doing nothing—that we build railway stations on land already owned by the Government in centres where they grow large quantities of potatoes—in Trinity South, they grow some there, and in Conception Bay two or three, and the potatoes and turnips and produce could be stored in these and placed in charge of the Agricultural Commissioners. Pay the producers \$1.50 a barrel for them when they first come in, and the balance of their value when they are all sold, such as is done in the wheat centres in Canada. Take men down in Western Bay; they grow quite a lot of potatoes and they can't sell enough potatoes to buy a quintal of fish for the winter. If we had these district centres where potatoes could be sent and \$1.50 paid to these men, it would be an encouragement, and anyone distributing potatoes would come to the Agricultural Board. Then the potatoes and turnips Bill would be in force. I hope the Minister of Finance will concur with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I know he is ready to fall in line. If you get a suggestion that will remedy these things when you come

back here next year we expect you to have something better. If you don't act on the suggestion, then you must be prepared to accept the criticisms.

Regarding the Gander, the industry promised last year in the Speech from the Throne which stated that a Gander proposition would be considered by this House and the Minister of Finance last year also promised a Gander proposition, and I think the right and proper place for a Gander proposition to be considered is before this House. I don't see why five, six, seven or eight men should take a matter like this into their own hands. Last year as far as I could learn writs were put on the property owned by the Reids; the reason for putting them on was current around, and it was that Reids had not paid their rentals.

The Prime Minister now says the reason the Gander proposition was not brought up is because Reids wanted \$15,000,000 for themselves. First there was no deal, secondly writs were put on because Reids had not paid their rentals, and thirdly it was because Reids wanted \$15,000,000 for themselves, and that is why it did not come before the House.

Now, Sir, I consider that if the Gander deal had gone through last session we would not have the conditions we have to-day. I know four or five districts to Bay de Verde and up around Trinity Bay where conditions are disgraceful. Only Monday two men were in my store, one from our Bay, another from Mr. Puddester's district. We got talking about the distribution of the dole; it is disgraceful. One made a remark to the other, he said "There is neither man in our place getting it." The other said "In the harbour where I live there are two men not getting the dole. Two men! Imagine! A place that never received a dollar;

it has always been a good fishing station, and today every man is getting the dole. I asked him why—ask any man today why it is accepted and they will tell you "I am praying for what others are getting; I am praying for what they are getting in St John's; why should not I get my share; Why talk about my barrel of flour or half gallon of molasses?" Twenty years ago the same men would not think about it, but now it is being handed out to everybody, and they want their share. They have to pay for what the others are getting; they are producers; the fishermen of this country; there are the men who are paying for it.

There are so many Commissions; I did not calculate to talk on more than one or two; there are so many Commissions that have been gone over well by different members on this side of the House, but there is one of which I have a word to say in favour. Every outport representative is called in some time or other, even before you are a representative, somebody talks to you about getting some one to the hospital, but since the employment of the Public Health Commission there is less trouble, speaking from my own experience, and better satisfaction than ever before, and it has saved thousands of dollars in the district where I live by the appointment of district surgeons who are doing better work for less money. I say what I know. There is some enquiry as to why some doctor was getting \$2,000 or \$3,000; the doctor now in our district gets about 25% of what he got years ago and he is doing the same work.

It seems to me that the Prime Minister has been something like a man with a family, and as soon as there is a falling out he will say "That is all right; we will have you on a Com-

mission; we will make a Commission and put you on it." To satisfy somebody he is appointed on a Commission; that happened before; it happened right here in this House with the same Prime Minister; somebody got a Commission to go out of the country and come back.

I have belonging to my district—I was down there this morning—four or five old age pensioners. There is not a cent for the old age fishermen, 75 to 80, and I think every other district has them on the waiting list. It is no use sending names in; mine were overdrawn, but you can find money for the overdraft of every other account but for the old age pensioner, for old men who kept this country going you can't find a dollar for him. Now the payments to Hon. Dr. Campbell from Commissions of \$21,000 would pay 420 old people that are probably starving today and don't know where they are going to get something to eat. It is a deplorable condition to say that we can hand it out to men who don't want it, and to the man who kept this country going, and can no longer do so, we can't give anything.

In reading over an answer to a question tabled the other day, I don't know what day it was, I read reports from the International Power & Paper Co. They talk of installing one or two other machines, and they require a certain amount of paper. On making enquiries I find that was 1929 instead of 1930 report; they would require 50 or 100 per cent more wood. Does that mean that they are going to make application for a supply from the Labrador? I wonder if that is what will happen.

I read the report from the Economic Commission; their findings are now before the House. I wonder why it

was necessary to bring in sworn evidence before a Commission to find out what bread could be sold for. I saw prices tendered to the Hospital and the Sanatorium, and the prices were accepted for bread for 4½ cents a pound while it retailed around town for 8 cents. I don't see why they want to call in the men who sold flour and the men who sold the bread to get evidence that bread could be produced and sold to people for less than 8 cents a pound while it was sold to the institutions for 4½ cents. I don't suppose it was given to the Government without profit; there is no need of all this formality of having evidence as to the expense of baking when the bakers could sell to the public institutions for 4½ cents a pound. I think that is evidence enough.

The same Economic Commission last year in the month of June had a meeting in one of the settlements in my district, and they appointed a Committee to call and interview the Prime Minister. They got word before they came in that he did not need them and handed them over to the Economic Commission. This Committee was headed by a clergyman who was sworn before the Commission as he would be in the Supreme Court and examined under oath before a dole order would be given.

Examined for over half an hour. The enquiry called him in and administered the oath, now I have been told that that the enquiry had no authority whatsoever to administer an oath. I was told this last year the reason given being that it was only a police enquiry. Yet this clergyman was subjected to a half an hour's gruelling examination regarding a cheque which he had never seen before in his life. This is the manner in which he was treated.

In my district there are about three hundred and fifty people who go to the Labrador fishery every year.

Last year between myself and the member for Bay Roberts we were able to arrange with the railway and we were able to get the steamer away by the first of June and the men got there in time to prosecute the fishery and they did very well. If it wasn't for this they would have been on the dole. But this year conditions are very different. We don't know what price salmon fishermen are getting or what it is selling for. Last year things were all right, but people won't go to the Labrador again unless the Government can do something about salt.

The Economic Commission ought to find what price the fish is going to sell for and allow so much for expenses and fix the price so as to allow the fisherman a decent margin.

Something must be done about the price of salt even were the Government to pay the difference of fifty or sixty cents. It costs about \$2.50 or \$2.60 per ton of salt. Fishermen can't afford to pay more than \$2.00. Something should be offered in the way of inducement.

In 1920, however, the Relieving Officer in Carbonear paid out only \$471.00 and I think that this compares favorably with the \$15,000 and similar amounts paid out in other districts.

I feel for these people which I have represented for years, who in the years past have asked no assistance whatsoever from the Government. I can only say I feel deeply for them. They are too proud to take relief. They would rather go hungry than be seen going to the Relief Officers. Yes, rather wait till dark and go to some more fortunate neighbor and beg a bit to eat.

Something must be done. There is no inducement to go fishing on the Labrador for the men of Carbonear, Spaniard's Bay or Bay Roberts. Otherwise the conditions will be worse than they have ever been seen in Newfoundland.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity in addressing the Honorable Members of this House to refer to the great calamity we have lately suffered, the Viking disaster. The Prime Minister moved certain Resolutions of sympathy and condolence to those directly or indirectly concerned in that disaster. These Resolutions were seconded by me and supported by the House. I feel sure we are all still mourning for those who went down with the ship and when the full history is told no doubt many acts of bravery will be unfolded, many acts of forgetfulness of self and loyalty to shipmates and friends, for are not Newfoundland fishermen and sailors noted for their disregard, I might say indifference, to the hazards of the sea. What men of other countries might call the terrors of the deep. I feel sure our heartfelt sympathy goes to the injured, sick and to the others directly or indirectly concerned.

But this is not enough our sympathy should take a practical turn and it should be our duty to see that no widows or orphans or dependents suffers privation because of this tragic disaster. Most speakers have given a word of congratulation to those who helped in any way in which I wish to join.

I would like to extend a word of praise to those doctors and nurses who at a moments notice immediately responded. I would like to congratulate Dr. Paterson particularly, for he, though by no means a young man, at

a half hour's notice packed his bag and set off which would have done credit to a much younger man.

Regarding the reply to the Speech from the Throne all my colleagues have spoken and they have been critical and acquitted themselves in a manner which showed deep study of the Speech from the Throne and of the general conditions of the country. I am proud of each and every one of them, too proud to single out any one of them for praise. They have each taken their full part in showing up the extravagance of the Government.

The Prime Minister has told of a depression in the country which he said was only stringency. He has stated that the accounts in the Savings Bank is a sign of the prosperity of the country. Now I think it is more a sign of past prosperity than of present prosperity. It shows that the people are afraid to take the ordinary risks of trade, that such is their opinion of the Government that they dare not support any local industrial enterprise.

I noticed in the Auditor General's Report the amounts paid to certain members of the Government. I remember in 1928 we were termed blue bloods. I think the government members may now be termed the new rich, they have made themselves so.

As I see it the third year of a Government's terms is the crucial one. It proves whether they have failed or been successful and shows whether the people will again accept them to fill public offices or whether they will be hounded out of the position. The second year tells how they have mastered their administration of public affairs. For it takes the first year for the heads of the departments to get accustomed to their position.

During the second year that the Government is in power the fruit, or, perhaps I should say the seed that was set comes above the ground. It is not the harvest but the returns made by the Government. The third year of any government in my opinion tells whether the policies before the elections bear fruit and it is on that that the Government of the day will be judged by the electorate of the country. A few weeks ago a Bill was introduced into this House to protect the people against bogus stock brokers and to prevent them from issuing false prospectus. Don't you think the Prime Minister issued a false prospectus in the fall of 1928 when he, by unfair means, got not the money of the people of this country but the votes of the majority of the people.

The people look to the Speech from the Throne to see the progress that the Government has made towards the carrying out of its pre-election promises and policy, and from these promises the people were looking forward to rich profits and handsome rewards. The annual Speech from the Throne is from the Government what an annual report is from a business corporation and should show the people what dividends they are to get from pre-election promises and policies.

Another simile. You, Mr. Speaker, in your travels must have run against what is known as the Quack Doctor who stands on the corner shouting his wares and carrying a twelve ounce bottle the contents of which he claims will cure any ailment. If the first bottle don't cure you, the second one is sure to.

Some time ago I was reading an article written by a humorous writer who was joking about problems of medicine and cure. He said that he had gone to the trouble of going to

the Public Library in England and that of all the complaints listed there was only one that the medicine sold by the Quack Doctor could not cure and that one was the housemaid's knee. Following along the same line I thought that the honorable gentleman who wrote the 1928 manifesto if asked at a meeting the contents of his manifesto he could say that he had listed therein a specific remedy for every need throughout the country and if it was not specifically stated it would be covered by the first paragraph of the manifesto. The only ailment left uncared for was writers' cramp. These patent medicine cures are, Mr. Speaker, in the most flowery language but none of them can surpass the Prime Minister's manner in which he clothed his manifesto. For comparison, I have culled some of the high spots which I will read for you:

"My message is one of hope, enthusiasm, work and the success which naturally follows when that trinity of power is applied for the Common Good."

"My railway reorganization programme has already saved the country many million dollars. With the co-operation of the highly efficient and loyal railway organization, from the general manager down, I believe that railway operations when freed from political interference can be so directed that the service will no longer be an annual charge on the tax-payers of the country."

"Within six months of resumption of office a 2½ million dollar industry. Within a year and a half I can secure a million and a half for an entirely new industry."

"I can breathe the breath of industrial life into the Gander territory and make it a hive of industry."

"I know the fisheries can be saved from the ruin which has been threatening them and can be made successful and profitable to fishermen as well as merchants."

"I know I can revolutionize the food problem by Agricultural development, particularly in the South and West, which territory rightly may be called the Garden of Newfoundland."

Then as an augury of the future the Right Hon. Gentleman recounts some performances of his past.

The Humber development, the Petty Harbor development, the improved Street Car Service in St. John's, Highroads and Concrete Bridges and in fact anything that appeared to be worth while. Like the Quack Doctor he says you cannot blame the prescription if the ailmen is not made specific.

Within the first six months he promised to start a two and half million dollar industry and within a year and a half "I will have started an industry that would net this country a million and a half." When I read this it reminded me of the old time riddle "If a herring and a half cost a penny and a half how much would one cost." I don't take this paragraph any more seriously than the riddle in view of the pre-election promises made and I believe that if the people of the country were asked today whether they would take the herring and a half or the million and a half they would sooner the herring and a half as they would feel that they might possibly get it. Further on he states that I will breathe the breath of life into the Gander and make it a hive of industry. The word hive reminds me of something that I read a couple of weeks ago in the "Watchdog." In this article the Prime Minister was described as

one who worked night and day without ceasing and he was termed as a self sacrificing and ideal leader. I have the habit of epitomizing what I read to the lowest possible terms and I have been sometime trying to think of a phrase that would be suitably applied to the Prime Minister.

I first thought of "While others sleep he toils upward" but on second thought I did not think this suitable for the occasion—then I thought of "Learn the luxury of doing good" but was still unsatisfied and kept wandering on until I thought of the verse about the busy bee which is:

How doth the little busy bee
Improve each shining hour
And gather honey all the day
From every opening flower.

I think this verse aptly describes the Prime Minister and I portrayed him visibly gathering honey as I said before the word hive brings it back to my memory.

I will again read for your the part referring to the fisheries:

(Reads)

All I have to say is let it be done quickly for after the $2\frac{1}{2}$ years that the Government has been in power the fisheries are in a much worse state than they ever were. The men have been working on the Highroads, work which I contend is demoralizing the fisherman. Their boats have been left drawn up on the beaches and their gear left to rot while they are earning \$2.50 per day. I always looked upon the fishery as an honorable means of livelihood but men have forsaken that to work on the Highroads.

Since the Government has come into power nothing has been done to improve the conditions and I say that

there must be something radically wrong with it, but still the Prime Minister says he can save the fisheries and my only wish is that he would hurry up and start in.

I will now refer to the part which refers to the food problem:

(Reads)

The Government have been three years at it and on looking through the report of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, a report that takes up 5 pages we find that only 2 half pages are devoted to the food problem. The first deals with the blight of the potato crop and the second to the fly on the turnips. The hay crop was supposed to have been good and that was all that was said about it although it is as valuable as the seal fishing industry.

Compared with this my own Manifesto appears to be very flat, insofar as promises are concerned. I stated as follows:

"In soliciting your support let me say at once that it is not my purpose to make any promise impossible of fulfillment. If I wanted to deceive and delude it would be an easy matter to outline an alluring program and make extravagant pledges; but that is not my desire, and I am content to pledge myself to undertake with your co-operation and support, not alone to maintain the present general prosperity but to make every possible effort to increase the earning power and improve the social conditions of the people."

Well, Sir, there is just one difference in the Hon. gentleman's Manifesto and mine and that is that I intended to carry out my Manifesto to the letter, to dot the last i and cross the last t. That was my Manifesto and

I intended carrying it out or I would know the reason why. If you make a promise you should carry it out. We who are in business get into that habit but it seems that there are many who never acquired that habit. Look at it this way, there is the Prime Minister's Manifesto and here is his speech from the Throne three years after. That Manifesto contains all the promises that the Hon. gentleman gave to the people of the country and this, the Speech from the Throne should be the fulfillment of these promises. When that is not the case the man who made the promises must be insincere. As I said about this quack medicine bottle, you buy a bottle of this medicine that will cure any ailment no matter what it may be. In this case the majority of the people of this country bought this medicine, the price was their vote, it was the dearest price that the people were ever called upon to pay and I hope to goodness that they will never have to pay it again. They took his (the Prime Minister's) word and he failed them. It may seem strange but if he had carried out his promises, I would certainly be most delighted.

I think that our country comes first all the time. We here on the Opposition often have little discussions among ourselves and we always keep as our motto, "country first and party second," and I say leader last. I say in good faith that nothing would give me greater pleasure than to see the promises that were made to the people of this country in 1928 carried out. If only one half of them were carried out the country would be prosperous, the prosperity would reflect on ourselves. If you spent \$50,000.00 in one place and \$100,000.00 in another it spreads all over the country to the benefit of the people as a whole. As somebody said if you kick a pebble in your path you move the center of

gravity in the whole universe. If even one dollar were spent it helps somebody in another place in addition to the immediate beneficiary.

I would like to follow the simile of the quack medicine a little further. With those quack medicines you will always find testimonials from people who have used it. They are the guarantee of the efficacy of the mixture. A little boy of five years after four doses of the medicine is almost cured and after taking the whole bottle is absolutely cured of all his trouble, a man writes and a woman who perhaps has nervous trouble testifies to the wonderful efficacy of the medicine. It is the same thing here. The testimonials being the fact of carrying out his Manifesto in 1919 and that being so he would do the same in 1928. He tells us about the Humber development and that he was instrumental in putting it there, the Petty Harbor power development, the improved Street Railway System, the Highroads, concrete bridges and everything worthwhile taking credit for. I shall show the falsity of his claim that he instigated these developments.

The Humber development was at the start a great benefit to the people of the country, but is is a coincidence that in 1922 there were two gentlemen who were opposed to it and they were the present Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary, they were bitterly opposed to it in July 1922. In some ways I don't blame the Hon. gentleman because the terms of that deal were humiliating but we wanted the industry. It was necessary for the people of the country but it was unfortunate that the details were such as they were. They set the pace for every other company that same or will come into this country seeking

concessions. The first thing that a company wants—it takes the deal as its text—they want more if they can get it but they certainly won't take less.

I often wondered why a local man if he wants to develop a small industry with, say, a quarter of a million dollars receives no support, he is hampered and thwarted in every possible way. I could tell you stories about men who tried to start small industries in this country, but it is the foreign strangers who come here and talk in millions with the result that they succeed in getting outrageous terms. I don't blame the Prime Minister for being doubtful as to whether he could accept the terms that were proposed. He went across to the other side and met these promoters, he was out of his environment, I suppose, but at any rate they succeeded in getting over his scruples. He came back, and here is where his political shrewdness came in, he asked for a mandate from the people, and did not wait for the fall but had a spring election without giving any details of the scheme.

This is the third year of office of this Government and it is the crucial year, if there is anything to be done it should be done this year. The Prime Minister took all the credit for the last Humber developments but he was no more than a vehicle. Other men thought out this Humber development, it had been talked about for twenty-five years. The Hon. gentleman had charge of legislation, but that is the extreme length of credit that he can claim.

The Petty Harbour power development—this is not a very pleasant subject, but it is just as well to clear the atmosphere. If I make claims I want

to substantiate them. In 1921, I think that was the year, I am not quite sure, I am speaking from memory, we had the Reid Newfoundland Company and it comprised the Light and Power Company in addition to the Railway, Dockyards and Mines & Forests all in one. They were all centered in the same whirlpool, if one suffered a loss the other would show a corresponding gain. The Reids were farseeing people at that time and they not only engaged local counsel but also engaged outside counsel as well. The Railway was getting worse and they decided to segregate the different companies. They decided to start the Light and Power Company as a separate enterprise and have the Railway dock known as the Dockyards Ltd., and they incorporated Mines & Forests to take care of all their freehold lands, and the bone—the Railway, after they had stripped all the flesh off the bone, that is, the Light and Power, the Dockyards, etc., they left the bone, the railway—we were told that we could have the Railway if we wanted it. I don't see how anybody can claim credit for the Street Railway in view of the fact and if he were looking after our interests he should have seen what was going on. I don't blame him, however, for being a bit shortsighted, but he should never have allowed them to segregate their activities. The Light and Power Company is now worth a million and a half dollars, I guess that it was worth a million dollars then. Mines & Forests brings us back to the Gander. If we were to make a deal as we should have, the hon. gentleman never should have allowed them to segregate their activities, if this had not been permitted we would now be masters of the whole situation instead of Mr. Alan S. Butler. Unfortunately the timber areas that the Government have placed writs on are of no value

as a manufacturing enterprise without the waterpower that goes with the freehold. They should have never been segregated and he boasts about it, if he had not boasted about it it would have never been mentioned in this House.

Now a few words about the Speech from the Throne.

Why does not the Government admit we have depression and lots of it? Everybody knows it does exist and it must be tantalizing in the last degree to people who are actually feeling the pinch of want to see blazoned forth in the Government organs that there is no depression. We who are in business in the country and in constant touch with the people of the country know that it is so, and as I have said, so do those people themselves.

Then there is a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne dealing with minerals, etc., which would look much better in the Budget Speech of the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs. Then there is something about the Empire Marketing Board, and as the Hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries appear to be taking a genuine interest in it, I do sincerely hope that some good will come out of it. Then it goes on to say that the re-railing of the Railroad has been completed. That is indeed a blessing, but as the work was commenced under the Monroe Administration, to them the credit is due. Then it mentions the Prime Minister having met the Prime Ministers of the other Dominions at the Imperial Conference. It must have been a most interesting experience, to meet those men face to face. One conversation like that is worth fifty letters, and I am sure, should the occasion ever arise the Right Hon. gentleman would show the benefits he has derived from

the Conference. I see, too, the Hotel is for sale. Well, I hope they get a good price for it. That's not the Government's fault. It was built at a time when high hopes for the country were entertained in the Tourist Traffic.

The general depression all over the world has blasted these hopes for the present at least, but I do think the thing will eventually be a paying proposition. It's all very well to say it was only built for the rich. In that case the hotels in America are only for the rich, too. It was built for anyone who cared to go there. In any event there must be more rich men on the other side of the House now, than on this side side, after all the money they've got.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose saying a few words about that peculiar bird called the Gander. I should like first of all to go back to the Humber deal. That was a proposition in which I always took the keenest interest. I happened to know the manager at the time intimately, I had gone to the same school as he had, and Mr. Alexander often used to confide his trials and tribulations to me at the time. That enterprise was undertaken with two guarantees. The British Treasury had guaranteed £2,000,000 and the Newfoundland Government \$10,000,000, making a total of \$20,000,-000.

I want to say now that I have no objection to guarantees of this nature as long as they are sound. Those were certainly justified at the time in order to get the business on its feet, and I am of the opinion that if Armstrong Whitworth had not been so extravagant it would have been a paying proposition. The main source of all the trouble was that they tried to push ahead the construction too rapid-

ly. It is like a steamer whose ordinary rate of speed is ten miles an hour and when the speed is increased by a couple of miles an hour it puts its coal consumption up by 100%. And that is what they tried to do and when they did so, they found themselves running into all sorts of snags and additional expenses-

The townsite construction was an additional source of expense, and all told, it cost over \$43,000,000 to complete instead of \$20,000,000 as originally planned. The Armstrong Whitworth ruined the enterprise but they paid the price. That was the Humber deal. It struggled along as best it could until 1927, then they had to tell the Government that they could not meet their bond interest. There must have been a panic in Government circles at the time, as the thing was so totally unexpected. The Government got busy, they succeeded in getting time from the banks, and then we came into contact with the International Power and Paper Company for the first time.

Before this, but after the Humber Deal had gone through the Reids had started work on the Gander. In 1924 they had obtained a charter from the Government empowering them to treat with prospective customers for a paper mill. It was discovered also at the time that a 200 ton a day mill was not an economically sound proposition. In order to meet the competition and prices of the day a 400 ton a day mill was necessary. And then the Humber deal collapsed and the International Power & Paper come on the scene. ber deal they wanted the legislature Government. In addition to the Humber deal they wanted the legislature to grant them rights in connection with the Gander Valley. At the time they really seemed more anxious about acquiring rights on the Gander than

on the Humber, but after the deal was consummated, they cooled off.

Meanwhile the Reids were carrying on negotiations in New York, but they were told by authorities there that there was not enough timber on the Gander for a 400 ton mill and not enough waterpower. However, forestry experts and hydraulic engineers were sent down and surveyed the territory, and they said there was enough timber and enough water power. Then the International fell down on their promises and said that they had never considered putting a mill on the Gander.

At this juncture I want to give credit to the Reids. I hold no brief for the Reids. They have pulled off some bad tricks here at some times, and perhaps but for many of their dealings, politics in Newfoundland would be at a higher standard. But it must be remembered in this connection that if politicians are willing to accept graft from corporations, the corporations are willing to pay, but at their own price.

So I say it is very largely in the hands of politicians, if corporations are good or bad. But as I was saying it is only right to give the Reids credit where it is due. At this time they could have sold all their rights on the Gander to the International and at a very good price indeed, but they had set their minds on getting a mill on the Gander, and they held out and for that we must give them credit.

Negotiations then ceased between the Reids and the government, but the Reids continued to try and get the deal through in the United States and in Canada. It is then that the Hearst interests first appeared on the scene. In 1928 Hearst fell out with the International Power & Paper Company.

The International had fallen down on some contract with him, it had refused to deliver its orders, and Hearst was afraid at the time that he would not be able to issue his papers. As over 1000 tons of newsprint a day is used by Hearst interests, it can be seen what the action of the International in refusing delivery to them meant. There were various lawsuits at the time, and at the time the Reids approached Hearst with a suggestion of erecting a mill on the Gander. The Chicago Tribune and several other papers own their own paper mills and it was pointed out to Hearst that he was backward in not trying to obtain control of his own paper supply. He said that a 400 ton a day mill would be absolutely no good to him. He wanted a thousand ton a day mill or nothing, so that settled that for the time.

Three months later the Labrador decision was handed down and this country obtained control of enormous timber areas. That set the Reids thinking that if they had sufficient water power the Government might give them timber rights on the Labrador sufficient to keep a thousand ton mill in operation. Experts were got down, and by tapping other streams, they got a greater head, and it was found that sufficient power to operate a thousand ton mill could easily be developed. They sent for hydro-electric engineers and they developed their tests and had them confirmed.

Therefore, the scheme was all set for a huge newspaper mill with an outlet in Indian Bay—an industry, not an agricultural industry that the Prime Minister said was going to revolutionize the whole industrial section of this country.

During the fall of 1929 the Prime Minister was in the United States or

Canada at the time—we followed his movements closely—it leaked out that there was a possibility of the Gander. Hons. Dr. Barnes and Mr. Halfyard were either sent for or because they were there at the time were asked to join and participate in the interviews, as these gentlemen returned here in the late fall and certain things leaked out whether intended for publication or not, but at any rate there was a serious possibility of a Gander deal being put through, and we members of this House were accordingly of the same opinion.

In January, 1930, the Prime Minister, Sir William Coaker and the Finance Minister met the Hearst and Reid groups at New York, and, I suppose got down to a worthwhile discussion as to the possibilities of a mill on the Gander River. The Finance Minister returned and made no secret of the fact that our financial troubles were over and that there would be a mill erected on the Gander. He said that nothing more would have to be done than to sign on a dotted line and that there would be a big Gander proposition go through, and that there would be work and plenty for all. We were told in this House by the financial expert of the government of the benefits that would accrue from this deal. Still there is nothing done in relation to the Gander deal.

Now, it must be remembered that at that time Sir William Coaker was in Jamaica and was not wedded to the Gander Deal. He had met Mr. DeChamplain who advised him that he could sell the Labrador areas for one hundred million dollars and Sir William Coaker was convinced that it would be better for us to sell at that price and wipe out our national debt, reduce taxation all round for the people of this country and that we would be a happy country to live in.

Sir William Coaker knows differently now. He knows that Mr. DeChamplain could not sell a square mile of land—much less a hundred million dollars worth.

Sir Richard Squires was then in New York and the next comforting news we heard was in a paragraph from the Speech from the Throne and in which the Prime Minister interposed other matters in connection with industrial development. Here is what it says:

"In January last my Prime Minister and two other members of my Ministry met in New York for a conference with representatives of large water-power and timber holders in the Gander Valley and neighbourhood. Many propositions and counter-propositions have been made and discussed. My ministers are hopeful that the result of the timber and water-power discussions will result in a large pulp and paper development in connection with what is known as the Gander areas."

That was good news to everyone of you members of the government who were just as anxious as we were to have a Gander deal at last; and above all the Prime Minister was going to carry out one of his pre-election pledges—a promise that he never knew how he was going to carry out. Then for a time there was silence and the member for Burin East asked some questions in the House and which necessitated the tabling of the following correspondence:

(Reads from Hansard.)

That letter was dated May 22nd and without losing any time the Reid group replied on May 28th as follows:

(Reads from Hansard).

Now we have never heard of anything happening after that, although fourteen days earlier the government issued a writ on the property. Now those letters speak for themselves. But there is not the slightest doubt that the Reids and associates were ready and willing and promised the terms of the agreement; but it takes two parties to make a bargain just as it takes two to make a quarrel, and if you cannot get the man on the other side to discuss business with you everything goes wrongly.

Now that is what exactly happened in this case. During the remainder of last year's session of the House we were asking questions off and on concerning the Gander proposition and the Prime Minister told us that he was doing his utmost, and, that, very unfortunately, very little progress was made and very unsatisfactory replies were received. The House prorogued and nothing of any consequence happened until sometime in September last. Several gentlemen came down here representing the Hearst interests, the Canadian Power and Paper Company and the Reids and I will read to you what those different representative gentlemen had to say with regard to the Gander proposition as quoted in the city press, as follows:

"By S.S. Fort St. George this morning Messrs. R. G. Reid, and C. O.N. Conroy, Solicitor of the Reid Newfoundland Company, returned from Halifax accompanied by Mr. Frank W. Clarke, Vice-President of the Canada Power and Paper Corporation, and of the Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills, Limited. Messrs. D. E. Towns and J. D. Coffin, representatives of the Hearst organization who were parties in the recent negotiations in respect of a newsprint mill in Newfoundland, and Mr. Wilbert H. Hor-

ward, K. C., legal representative of the Hearst organization and of the Canada Power and Paper Corporation,

"Mr. Frank W. Clarke, vice-president of Canada Power and Paper Corporation had recently concluded arrangements with the Hearst interests—the largest consumers of newsprint in the world—involving the acquisition by the Hearst organization of a stock interest in Canada Power which, in turn, acquires a substantial interest in Dominion Newsprint Company Limited, the subsidiary company which has been negotiating on behalf of the Hearst organization, for the acquisition of water power rights and timber limits in Newfoundland, adequate for the requirements of a large paper mill.

"Mr. D. E. Town and Mr. J. D. Coffin, the representatives of the Hearst organization who were charged with the task of handling the recent negotiations in respect to a paper mill project in Newfoundland were interviewed in relating to the statement issued by Mr. Frank W. Clarke, vice-president of Canada Power and Paper Corporation, that his company had recently acquired an interest in Dominion Newsprint Company, Limited, upon a basis which involves among other things, the acquisition by the Hearst organization of a stock interest in Canada Power and Paper Corporation. Neither Mr. Town nor Mr. Coffin would discuss the situation but stated that, insofar as it related to the Hearst organization, Mr. Clarke's statement was correct.

"Mr. Wilbert H. Howard, K.C., of the law firm of Brown, Montgomery and McMichael, Montreal, has arrived in St. John's in company with representatives of the Hearst organization and of Canada Power and Paper Corporation and is understood to have

interviewed members of the Government in relation to a paper mill now project in Newfoundland. Mr. Howard stated that he had acted as legal adviser to both parties during the negotiations leading up to the union of interests just announced between the Hearst organization and Canada Power, and had accompanied his clients here for the purpose of giving the government the relevant facts regarding this newly constituted alliance.

"The visiting representatives will remain in the city until Saturday. They have come with a practical proposition, which it is understood, will include the securing of considerable of timber land in Labrador in order to enable them to operate a mill of sufficient capacity to meet their requirements.

"The fusion of interests of the Hearst organization with Canada Power, which has acquired substantial interests in the Dominion Newsprint Company, the subsidiary company with which the Reids were negotiating last year, and the presence here of representatives prominently associated with the different interests give a significance to the negotiations far greater than at any previous time, and the results will be awaited by the public with the deepest interest."

Now we do not mind what the Canadian interests say because they were familiar with the Reids, but, with your permission, Sir, I shall read the correspondence to the House:

This Canadian news corporation was operating and it was the explanation that there was no nigger in the wood pile so far as this company was concerned. This gentleman was asked to come down and explain the terms under which the Hearst and the Canadian Power and Paper Company

came together. The Canadian Newsprint was no more than an operating company. If Armstrongs had put themselves into the hands of practical newspaper manufacturers they would never have failed. Listen to what our people say:

(Reads)

Interviewed shortly after landing by a representative of the Telegram, Mr. Conroy said that the purpose of the visit of the Hearst and other Newsprint representatives was to revive negotiations which, it was hoped might lead to the establishment of a newsprint mill on the Gander. He said that they were prepared to consider modified terms to those discussed last year, when the Government were approached to approve of a project whereby a mill would be operated at Indian Bay by water obtained from the Gander River, and supplied with timber from the Gander property, supplemented with other supplies from Labrador.

That is all that could be got in view of the fact that these men had come all this way, every one of them of importance in the financial world. All our representatives say is "The less said about it the better." Perhaps some of our friends across the way would like to say the same today.

From then on, after those gentlemen—I am speaking as an outsider, one who has got to pick up what he can of interest in these matters, so far as the country is concerned, the next thing we hear of are lawsuits for damages, counter suits and all that sort of thing. These are bound to be expensive to the people of this country, because we always find that whosoever goes short the lawyer usually collects his fee.

February 1931, Mr. Alan Butler appears on the scene. He had been in

the background from the beginning. He had nothing to do in connection with the negotiations between the Hearsts and the Reids. He was a very important factor in the matter because he had put up a lot of money \$1,700,000. We take his word for that, but he had nothing to do with the negotiations. When he saw the hampering tactics of the present government he naturally got disgusted. He went after his money. He is a wealthy man; I can only tell you from hearsay, but I understand even wealthy men find themselves hard pressed at times; he was, as he appears to be from the tone of his letter; he wanted some of his money pretty badly. In this memorandum—I shall not read it because all of you have read it before—the gist of it is this; if the Government wants to save the Gander he wants them to guarantee bonds to the extent of \$875,000; those will be repaid when the Gander is sold and carry interest of seven per cent; the Government, for their accommodation, will get two per cent, the difference between what they borrow the money for and what they will get.

Another stipulation was that the Government should remove the present writs. It does not look well to have the writs on a property if you want to sell it. I am quite sure that all of you will understand that if I want to sell a property if there is a writ on it there is little chance of selling it. It is only for that that they ask to have the writs removed. There was another request—to have the Gander charter extended to give them a worthwhile time to negotiate with capitalists either in England, the United States or Canada and to try and get them to take over that project. Here is a protecting clause:

(Reads from memo.)

Now, what Mr. Butler wanted was the Government to guarantee bonds or cash, I don't know which, to the value of \$875,000 and he, on his part, would see that the Gander proposition was held for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland. I think the Government are rather unfortunate in their reply; they questioned the letter; questioned their title to the leasehold properties. That evidently aroused the ire of friend Butler because he writes,

(Reads Butler's Letter)

So now, the Gander seems very far off, and not only have we lost the Gander for a time, but we are involved in a lawsuit, and many thousands of dollars that will cost before it is concluded. I am not going to say a word as to whether the government should have treated with Mr. Butler or not. They have landed themselves in a pretty mess, and it is their business to get out of it in the best way they are able.

There is another side, of course, to every story, improbable at that other side may be, and we have been told that the Hearsts were never in earnest, that they were pulling what I might call a metaphorical leg of the Reid interests so that they could make a favorable contract with some people in Canada. We have no evidence to prove that; we do not know that. When the Reids could have sold they refused to do so. Why were they so eager? Why should they have bothered coming down if they were not in earnest?

This is where I blame the Prime Minister more than in any other way. Even if he were suspicious he should never have dared to allow his suspicions to hamper negotiations with the Hearsts and the Reids. It was too big a risk to take on the strength of

a mere suspicion. Hearsts never came to him and said "we are pulling Reids' leg." He had nothing but his own suspicion; it may be that his suspicion was no more than a suspicion. To think that he has wrecked this project simply because of his evil mind so to speak.

Another question is that there was no concrete offer to put up to the Government. I think I visualize people who are handling hundreds of millions of dollars every day. I once interviewed a man worth about \$150,000,000. I had to make arrangements with his secretary three months ahead before he would see me. Every day was filled in. Probably he did not work more than four hours a day, but he would not work one minute more than four hours. If you wanted to see him it took time. It took three months before I could see him. I did not wait three months in his outside office. I made arrangements with his secretary; he was there on the dot when I got there. Reids came to Hearsts and said: "Look, we were talking about a business proposition some months ago; we have got it now. We have 400 tons of paper a day in Newfoundland; we are hopeful, in fact we are going to get the balance of the timber from Labrador from the Newfoundland Government. The boundary decision has just been given. We have spoken to the Government about it in an indirect way." And Hearsts may have said, "Well, when you have a concrete proposition to put up to us, then we will talk business; but we have no time to talk of a venture, or possibilities, of probabilities, of anything of that sort. Come with a concrete deal and we will consider it." They even went further. They indicated their intention that they were going to do their very best to carry it out if the Government would bring legislation that would justify their

going to their wealthy associates asking them to make financial contributions towards their bonds. And I can only say over again if Hearsts were bluffing it was the Government's duty to call their bluff, and go to the very end of it, so that the Prime Minister and his associates, those who have been so opposed to the deal, would be able to say to the country, "We did our best, and Hearst failed," and they can't say this today because they never tried Hearst out. Just to show you that this Hearst deal is not dead, I have got a clipping here I have taken from a Canadian newspaper. It is called the Paper Trade Journal. There are two interesting paragraphs in that that I believe well worth the attention of the honorable members. I shall not read the whole of it, but just two paragraphs which relate to Newfoundland. (reads):

Extract from Annual Review and Convention Number Paper Trade Journal, February 19, 1931.

On the mainland of Labrador, the Newfoundland Government claims that at the very least there are some 30,000 square miles of pulpwood. The quality is represented to be the best. It is very largely spruce, and generally of the black variety, that has proven its admirable quality for paper making. Of the balance perhaps about one-tenth is represented by fir and spruce.

Now, as Newfoundland is becoming a formidable competitor of Canada in the American market, and as its mills have been running steadily at 100% of rated capacity as compared with about 60% for the mills in Canada, it will be seen that Canada Power and Paper Company's alliance with the Hearst interests in Newfoundland's newsprint development has added another puzzling complication to the

many complications attending the proposed supermerger of Canadian newsprint organizations.

This is dated February 19, 1931; they are even writing about this proposition in Canada today.

At 6.15 the Speaker left the Chair.

At 8.15 the Speaker resumed the Chair.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.— Mr. Speaker, when I ceased speaking at 6.30 I had to the best of my ability and memory reconstructed the case of the Gander proposal and perhaps without going into any unnecessary detail it might be just as well for me to review the principal links in the chain from 1923 when the Humber Deal was put through until 1930 when the Reids and Hearsts negotiated with the Government for a revised Gander charter. When the Reids learned that under modern conditions a 200-ton a day mill would be uneconomical, in order to increase capacity to as to obtain a 400-ton a day mill, they had to expend a lot of money in buying up a number of leasehold timber areas and finally they succeeded in getting enough to make a 400-ton a day mill feasible. Then in 1927 came the collapse of the Armstrong Withworth Co., and their announcement they were unable to meet their bond obligations. This caused a considerable furore at the time and marks the entrance of the International Power & Paper Company into this country.

The International group professed to be interested in the building of a mill on the Gander River. For business purposes they segregated their activities in Newfoundland from the parent organization by becoming incorporated under the name of the International Power & Paper Co., Ltd. The Reids discussed the Gander pro-

position with the International and did their best to put through a deal that would be beneficial to Newfoundland as well as themselves. The best experts in the world and the best hydro-electric engineers admitted that the power and timber were there. The International balked at the idea of building a mill and said that they had never promised to erect one on the Gander.

This, as I said before, was the time when the Reids could have sold their timber areas to the International for a remunerative price, and we should always bear this fact in mind when discussing this project. They had set their minds on a mill on the Gander and did all in their power to bring it about. Then came the falling out between the Hearsts interests and the International. The Reids then went to the United States and Canada in search of a group willing to interest themselves in a 400-ton mill. Among others they discussed the matter with was the Hearsts interests, whose reply was that a 400-ton mill would not meet their requirements but that they would be willing to discuss the possibilities of a mill of 1000 tons. Just at this time the Labrador Boundary decision was handed down by the Privy Council, resulting in Newfoundland getting control of the huge reserves of Labrador timber. It was then that it occurred to the Reid group that they might supply the deficiency between 1000 and 400 tons by getting the difference from Labrador.

Knowing the Hearst interests in a mill of this size they again approached these parties. Reids could only speak in a tentative way. They had no promise from our Government. Hearsts indicated their interest but stated, "If you want to discuss details you must be able to talk facts and figures, not tentative plans."

During January 1930 a meeting took place in New York. Those present were our Prime Minister, Sir Wm. Coaker and the Minister of Finance and Customs, together with Hearst and Reid representatives. Seemingly the several interviews were satisfactory, so much so that the building of a mill on the Gander was almost assured. The Finance Minister, in particular, seemed to be convinced that a splendid deal had been put through. He could see possibilities of not only balancing his budget, but of creating a reserve fund. He appeared to be highly jubilant.

At that time it will be remembered Sir William Coaker left New York for Jamaica, and he was not altogether wedded to the scheme; he had other plans. His idea was to sell the Labrador for a hundred million dollars and he thought Mr. J. de Champlain was the man to do it. Then came the Speech from the Throne in 1930, of a very encouraging nature, which read as follows:—

"In January last, my Prime Minister and two other members of my Ministry met in New York for a conference with representatives of large water-power and timber holders in the Gander Valley and neighborhood. Many propositions and counter-propositions have been made and discussed. My Ministers are hopeful that the result of the timber and water-power discussions will result in a large pulp and paper development in connection with what is known as the Gander areas."

I have already mentioned that the Hearst-Reid interests wanted their timber in one area. At one time I thought they were going to take only tit-bits of the Labrador, but we have since learned that they are taking it all in one block. I might say that the title of the government to the timber

areas on the Labrador is correct and that the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court has been in favor of the Government, so that there is nothing to hinder the Reid-Hearst interests from getting the one block of timber area where it suited them and that was on the most southern part of Labrador. With the Government right to these lands confirmed by the Supreme Court, the matter of financing has given the great majority of the people of Newfoundland some doubt, but I think that the following memorandum sent to the Government and Reids will set their minds at rest:

"When this matter was first brought to the attention of the Government, a definite area in Labrador was indicated as being most suitable for the Company's operation. Since that time it has developed that the title of the Colony to the area in question is disputed by persons claiming to be the licensees thereof. The Company still desires to make its selection from this area but in case the title of the Government thereto is not maintained, an alternative area is indicated in the accompanying memorandum as the Company's second choice. Request is accordingly made that the area first indicated be made available to the Company subject to its right, in the event that the Government's title thereto is not confirmed, to use the alternative area."

Here we come to the question of bonds, and it is worth bearing in mind that we are asked to guarantee second mortgage bonds for a term of fifteen years, whereas the first mortgage bonds would not expire for fifteen years later. We have heard a considerable amount of criticism and talk about what the Reids are making out of this proposition. Now I have no brief for the Reids because, in many instances they have given this country

a raw deal in the past, and they have done a great deal to lower the political standard of the country. But, after all, politicians make corporations what they are. If politicians want nothing from corporations except what they can get for the country, then the chances are the corporations will act squarely; but if the politicians are out for graft for themselves by lending their support in getting bills through this Legislature, then they are playing into the hands of corporations. We have the A.N.D. Company in this country, but I think we will all agree that they have acted fairly and squarely. Maybe they have driven hard bargains at times, but ever since the Bond ministry put through that pulp and paper deal many years ago that company has lived up to its agreement with the Government of this country. Now the Reids, according to the letter that Mr. Conroy wrote—and we have no reason to disbelieve him—were to get exactly what they were out of pocket on this Gander proposition.

You can be sure that before the Reids are paid their out-of-pocket expenses that the trustees for the Bond holders will see to it that they get not once cent more than they are entitled to get. Further the equity of both Hearsts and Reids will be represented by shares participating in the profits after the Bond requirements have been satisfied. Now we come to the contract or counter guarantee, and it contains nothing new to us. We have the Northcliffe press guaranteeing the A.N.D. Co. bonds—and their standing is unquestionable. In the present instance we shall have the Hearst Contract which will give equally sound security. There is no possible chance of the bondholders losing their money as long as the mill lasts.

The three cardinal principles of this agreement are, first, the Gander char-

ter changed to accomodate a 1000-ton per day mill; secondly, wood reserve on the Labrador sufficient to supply a 1000-ton per day mill for which we are to receive a handsome rental and royalty; thirdly, the guarantee of 15 millions of 15 years debentures. A timid soul, not used to dealing with large amounts might easily be frightened, but it is easier for a wealthy firm to guarantee fifty millions and with less risks than it is for a poor man to guarantee \$5.00.

This is the document that was laid on the table of the House a few days ago by the Right Hon. the Prime Minister.

(Reads)

Now the success of the proposition so far as we are concerned hinges on the firm contract for the output of the mill. That, in business circles, is equivalent to a counter-guarantee. The Northcliffe Press guarantees the A.N.D. Co's. bonds in this way at its last bond issue.

"Subject to the grant of this application by the Government and subject to confirmation of the representations which have been made "in respect to the potentialities of this project, which representations are as summarily outlined above, the Hearst organization has expressed its willingness to make a serious and bona fide effort to arrange for the sale of the Company's bonds, debentures and preference shares in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as will produce the funds required to bring this mill into successful operation. Its efforts in this direction will be predicated on the basis that, if successful, the Hearst organization will forthwith enter into a contract with the Company looking to the purchase of its entire output of newsprint paper during a period which will not be less than the term of the debentures, at

the general annual contract market price of newsprint paper in the United States from time to time prevailing, less three per cent discount and ocean shipment allowances, but in no event at a price which will be insufficient to provide for the estimated interest and sinking fund requirements of the Company.

"To ensure that the holders of the Company's bonds and debentures shall at all times enjoy the full security represented by the newsprint purchase contract, the Reid Company has stipulated that it shall be assigned by the Company to the Trustees for the bondholders and debenturees respectively."

In other words the bondholders own the contract, so that the trustees can protect their interests. In this case the Hearsts, as in the other case the Times and Daily Mail, may have instructions from the trustee of the bondholders to pay off certain amounts to cover bond charges against the invoices. The same applies here. The contract belongs to the trustee for the bondholders.

The Government and the Reids could make no headway. Something seemed to block the path. Next we have, during September, representatives of Hearst Canada Power & Paper Co. here to ascertain the intentions of the Government. Then apparently the Hearst and Reid groups discouraged by the action or rather the inaction of the Government gave up all hope of the deal, and the Reids decided to sue the Government for ten millions of dollars because of illegal acts.

I have said that the conduct of the Prime Minister was most peculiar. He has stated so often, until perhaps he believes it himself, that "the Hearsts were not in earnest." That, however, could be no more than a sus-

picion. Surely the people of Newfoundland are not to be deprived of the benefits bound to accrue from the establishment of this industry just because of the suspicious, I might almost say, evil mind of the Prime Minister.

If there was any justification for doubting the good faith of the Hearst group then the Prime Minister should have pushed matters to the limit—called their bluff, or, as we would put it colloquially, say to them, "Put up or shut up."

I should like now to come to the constructive end of the agreement. Without going into any detail, I should like to epitomize the figures in connection with the Gander, and briefly review the wonderful benefits it would have brought to Newfoundland.

A mill of a thousand tons a day capacity would mean a turnout of 310,000 tons a year. The general allowance made for labor charges in the manufacture of paper is \$20 per ton. If that is so it would have meant a distribution of a payroll of six million two hundred thousand dollars per annum. It would have meant the employment of over 6200 men at an average of \$20 per week. That's the amount that would have been brought in in labor alone. Let us see now where the Government would have benefitted. Let us take for example that an earning power of \$6,200,000 would have become a purchasing power of the like amount. Basing duties at 22½ per cent, which is a very conservative estimate, it would have meant an increased revenue of over \$1,379,000 per year.

The railroad, moreover, would participate in the profits caused in the increased transportation brought about by the new industry and the revenue accruing from that would I

estimate, amount to over \$400,000.00 per year. An increased earning power of over six million dollars would be bound to reduce able-bodied poor relief to a considerable extent. This six million dollars would do much to take the place of poor relief and in this connection alone should save the country over two hundred and fifty thousand dollars per year. To relieve distress we have to employ the people at the building of highroads. This goes on in a vicious circle.

We have to borrow money to build unnecessary highroads and then have to borrow money to repair them. By not having to expend money on unnecessary highroads would mean saving the country over \$500,000.00 a year. Then again application is made for 10,000 square miles of timber. They must have twenty million cords of wood in sight in addition to what is on the Gander Valley area in order to make a thousand-ton mill feasible.

For the sake of argument let me say they want 10,000 square miles for which they would pay \$200 per square mile, or \$2,000,000.00 in all. Now part of this land belongs to posterity, therefore we should invest the full amount and draw only the proceeds in the form of interest which calculated at 5 per cent would give us an annual return of \$100,000.00. Now as regards royalties: they require 300,000 cords annually, against which we are to collect one dollar per cord. This will bring us in \$300,000.00 yearly.

To recapitulate: Our annual return from this industry, which has been so contemptuously turned down by Sir Richard Squires, would have been:

1,000 ton mill on the Gander.

Proposed output 310,000 tons of newsprint paper, labor giving value

at \$20.00 per ton. Equivalent to 6,200 employees at \$20.00 per week—\$6,200,000.

Duties derived from earning power of workers based on average of 22½ per cent—\$1,379,000.

Increased earnings railroad—\$400,000.

Reduction able-bodied poor relief and unnecessary highroad expenditure, say \$750,000.

Payment for timber lands at 10,000 squares miles at \$200.00—\$2,000,000. Annual income rate 5 per cent—\$100,000.

Royalty from 300,000 cords Labrador wood at \$1 per cord—\$300,000.

Total \$2,929,000.

This sum of \$2,929,000, capitalized at 5 per cent, equals \$58,580,000.

In other words, to the Government this project has a capital value of over fifty-eight millions of dollars.

The members on the other side and the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, in particular, have had the same opportunity to figure as I have and surely before turning down a proposition such as this they should go a very long way. First, there is \$6,200,000 to the laboring men of the country and \$3,000,000 to the Government. I know that if the present Minister of Finance & Customs felt sure of getting this \$3,000,000 a year he would be a very happy man, he would be able to balance his budget, reduce taxation, help out welfare work and establish a sinking fund and so make amends for the terrible expenditure that is going on today and for which our children and our children's children will have to pay. I think that it is most unfair that the men of the present genera-

tion should saddle their children with such a great burden and ask them to pay it. Suppose a rich friend said to us, here is \$58,000,000; I will make you a present of it but you must not spend the principal; you must invest it in some solid project that will yield you at least 5 per cent. That present would be no more than what the Gander proposition would be to us. Both are practically the same, for both would go on until the end of time.

I hope that I have made my figures clear and concise as possible and that I have made myself clear. I am confident your good sense, if I cannot appeal to your patriotism, will cause you to think that instead of giving such a project the cold shoulder we should receive it with open arms.

Now let me get back to the agreement, or the memorandum of the agreement. It is divided into three parts; first, they require some amendment to the Gander charter. The Railway will be built in a new place and even then the Government would have to spend no money because the Company would build it and accept bonds guaranteed by the Government in payment; secondly, they require wood reserve on the Labrador to ensure the mill a sufficient supply of pulpwood for a thousand ton a day output, less, of course, the 400 tons available on the Gander; thirdly, there is perhaps one thing that an unthinking person would baulk at and that is the guarantee of second debenture bonds to the extent of \$15,000,000 for 15 years.

I do not want to quote the Minister of Finance and Customs for something which I believe he said in an impetuous moment, that was that he would guarantee a great deal more than \$15,000,000 for an undertaking

such as this. He is the financial expert on the other side of the House. He further stated that he would be prepared to guarantee to the extent of not only \$15,000,000 but \$50,000,000, and I confess I would do the same for the sake of getting such a large labor-giving project in our midst.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I have made myself clear. I have done the best I can; I feel that so far as this country is concerned, our only hope, from an economic point of view, is a proposition such as this. I don't see how this country is going to carry on; how it is going to pay its way; how we are going to relieve the burden of taxation of the people; how we are going to get them back into paths of industry and diligence; (many of our people have got into habits of idleness because we have not got work to give them). I can see no other way than some such industry. It would be unthinkable if you gentlemen on the other side of the House would prevent this industry becoming a fact, an actuality. I myself can see nothing against it.

One of the disturbing features in the whole matter is this, I can see no real effort to meet these people. I quoted a letter this afternoon in which they said, "If the terms are wrong, if you want any modification, if you name the modification, we will do our best." Can you do better than that? Can you hope for better? If I want to sell something to Mr. Lake, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and he says, "No; the price is wrong," I say, "Tell me what you want; tell me what you think is fair." If he says "No; I won't discuss the matter with you," I know he does not want to deal with me. Now, don't you think that we, who have only got outside information of this affair, judging from the information we have, don't you think that we

can do nothing else than come to the same conclusion, so far as the government is concerned in this matter. Don't you think the people can think nothing else? If it is true that Hearsts were only fooling Reids, why did not the Prime Minister put the Hearsts to the test? The Prime Minister had only got suspicions. I am sure that Hearsts never said, "We are pulling Reids' leg; we are making a bluff so as to secure a favorable contract for our newsprint requirements."

Surely these men, men of high standing in the financial and newspaper world, don't trot around the world for nothing. If nothing in reality were intended why in the world would they come here? They had done enough to make a bluff without coming down here. They came down here and wanted to discuss matters with the Executive Council. The Prime Minister was not here; perhaps if he had been here things would have been different.

This flimsy excuse that the only way that the leasehold areas could be saved for a Gander mill project was by clapping writs on them is too ridiculous. We know that the Reids had ample opportunities of selling to the International and they refused them. It is common knowledge to all of us. The International Power and Paper Company brag to this day that nobody but they would ever get those Gander areas. I have heard one of their principal men say that they would get them. Then it was necessary to clap writs on them to keep them from going where Reids had never any intention of letting them go.

We got a report the other day, the wording of which is such as to lead one to think they don't even know there is such a thing as a Gander area. It is the annual report of the Inter-

national Power and Paper Company. It is dated 28th March, 1930. Here is what they say:—

"The Company should complete the construction of two more paper machines as soon as practicable. The addition of two more machines adding 50 per cent to the production of the mill, will increase the Company's profits, particularly thru reduction of fixed charges, inasmuch as many of the facilities for additional machines are already installed, particularly power. Also the possibility should not be lost sight of that in the not too distant future it may be advisable to bring the mill up even to a 8 machine basis.

"Eventually, therefore, the Company must add to its timber holdings by about 50 per cent (with the possibility that it will be advisable to add 100 per cent) and while the present holdings would provide sufficient wood for many years to come additional timber lands should be acquired when they can be purchased on reasonable terms, up to the amount necessary to provide for the Company's needs including the extension on a sustained yield basis. Such acquisitions should be made gradually and only after the consideration to the effect of the carrying charges on the earnings during the period between acquisition of the lands and operations of the new machines."

They don't know probably where they are going to get that land; there is a nigger in the woodpile. Sooner or later it is going to be, gentlemen; it is not only possible, but more than probable you are going to see a merger between the A. N. D. and Corner Brook. When they do that, if they get the Gander areas, too, then God help Newfoundland and the

men who work in the woods. That is coming; it may not come for 3 or 4 years. God help Newfoundland with a company of this size in control. With the Gander areas, Corner Brook, and A.N.D. under control of one company they can squeeze the life out of us and they will do it if it serves their purpose. It is a serious proposition.

Every word I say I mean, and I would not be in the position of a man who has anything to do with the hindering of the Gander proposition. I tell you tonight, Mr. Speaker, the time will come when that man will wish he had never been born. This is our last chance; if we don't get the deal put through like this we will not be able to meet the interest on our public debt; the people can't live under the burden of taxation. I say this is a reasonable proposition; it is a proposition that I myself would be only too glad to embrace if I owned the Gander area; if I owned the free-hold on the Gander River; if I owned that Labrador property, I would take that deal gladly; It would make a very good business proposition.

Don't you know that this thing is fraught with such great possibilities for Newfoundland; it is not to be used merely as a political dodge; we should all of us be here for the good of Newfoundland. I believe that the way the cold shoulder has been turned to these Hearst people shows that the interest of Newfoundland is not at heart in the minds of some of the members of the present government.

The manner in which the government has handled this proposal can only be classed as a huge blunder or a damned crime.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Speaker, rising to the return of the debate, I would like to beg the opportunity of extending a hearty

word of congratulation, appreciation and thanks to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for having informed the public fully of his attitude in connection with the Gander development. It is always a great satisfaction, Sir, to know that when a person does a thing that he cannot be attacked, and I am wonderfully well pleased to-night to know that a programme which, if I had put through six months ago, would have been the subject of bitter attack by my Hon. friend, now cannot be attacked because of the pronouncement of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I do want to express again my appreciation and thanks to the Hon. gentlemen opposite for having given us an opportunity of seeing their minds, their lines of thought and having the benefit of their criticism. I feel that their criticism has been very estimable because it has given us the opportunity of seeing their lines of development.

I would again express my appreciation and thanks to the mover and seconder of the motion that is now before the House; they must have done wonderfully well; the Speech must have been really full of real value when ten gentlemen opposite have found it necessary to take two or three weeks in which to criticise it, its contents and non-contents. I feel that, Sir, is a great compliment that has been extended to us by the Hon. gentlemen opposite.

We have matters on the agenda to-night; there is one matter in particular of outstanding public importance, of much greater importance than mere talk because there is no Gander motion before this House; there is no Estimate motion before this House; there is no Budget motion before this House. All this talk has been on the Address in Reply. I do

feel that I should not delay the development of what I can say to be of much greater public policy, a policy which I think has taken two years to develop and bring to that practical stage when we can put a printed Bill on the table of this House for consideration, not mere talk, mere reply, mere legal debate on an Address in Reply. I consequently move that the debate be adjourned.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill "An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare" was read a second time.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions For a New and Improved Steamship Passenger, Mail and Freight Service for Conception Bay and Bell Island.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister presented the Report of the Select Committee of the Life Insurance Bill, as follows:

**To the Honourable House of Assembly
In Legislative Session Convened:**

The Select Committee appointed by your Honorable House to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Relating to Life Insurance" begs to report as follows:

Your Committee has considered the said Bill to it referred, copy of which is hereunto annexed marked "A" and recommends its being passed by your Honorable House subject to the following amendments:

1 Amend Sub-section 3 of Section 2 by adding thereto the following words, namely, "and includes a con-

tract for the payment of special benefits or indemnities upon death by accident or upon disability as may be provided by and made part of a contract of Life Insurance."

2. Amend Sub-section 10 of Section 2 by adding between the word "benefits" and the word "surplus" in the second line thereof the word "indemnities."

3. Delete Section 51 and substitute therefor the following:

Repeal

"51. Chapter 193 of the Consolidated Statutes, 3rd Series, entitled 'Of Life and Accident Insurance' and all acts in amendment thereof in so far as the same relate to Life Insurance or to special benefits or indemnities payable upon death by accident or upon disability as may be provided by and made part of a contract of life insurance are hereby repealed."

(Sgd.) A. J. WALSH,
J. A. WINTER,
L. E. EMERSON,
P. J. LEWIS.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the matter be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 9th, 1931.

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

Mr. Tobin presented a petition from the residents of Flat Rock in connection with a Launchway.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. James Baird and Mr. Stienhardt, Directors of the St. John's Gas Light Co., Ltd., I beg leave to present a petition which I ask permission to read to the House as it respects private Legislation.

(Reads Petition)

Attached is a printed form of Draft Bill and copies of notices required. I move that this petition be received and referred to a Committee of this House to see that it is in keeping with rules of the House.

The Select Committee was appointed as follows: Hon. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Winter.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by a large number of Clerks of St. John's to present the following petition:

(Reads Petition)

Annexed is a draft form of the petition and signed, I am informed, by over one thousand people. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the same Committee as the last petition.

On motion this petition was received and it was ordered that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire and report as to whether the Rules of the House respecting such petitions have been observed.

The Select Committee was appointed as follows: Hon Mr. Speaker, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Winter.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on

tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to a proposed agreement in connection with the treating of Newfoundland Cod, Seal, Whale and other Oils, and their by-products.

Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the mode of collection of the tax on Telegraphic Messages.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Public Works to question No. 56 which has not yet been answered.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. member, with reference to question No. 56 (reads question), my answer is that this is internal Departmental correspondence and I do not think that it would be in the public interest to table it. I might say that I am always ready to extend courtesy to every member opposite, and always used my best endeavors to have questions answered as speedily as possible, but in this particular case I do not think that it would be in the public interest to answer that question.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I cannot question the Minister's right but I don't know what would be in that correspondence that he would be ashamed of. If I were Minister of Public Works I would certainly like to clear the matter up, it is official

correspondence and is in the files of the Department and I do not think that it would do any harm if the members of the House saw it. There has been a lot of talk on the street about libel suits and the Minister would be doing himself a good turn if he showed us whether the Superintendent really did say that and if proved whether he was a grafted or not, he should let us see the correspondence and let the public judge. The honour of the Minister is at stake and I think that he should be only too glad to let us see whether the charges are true or untrue and he should be only too glad to let the public see all the correspondence. There might be another way we could use to see this correspondence.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

Mr. Speaker, it was only when Mr. Puddester spoke that I ever heard of any such charges. I'm afraid that Mr. Puddester was tempted and added a good deal to the rumours that were floating about the streets. There was no correspondence relating to this matter received or issued at my Department, I did hear of that remark but it was not proven and neither Mr. Puddester or any other man in this country can prove it.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions for a New and Improved Steamship, Passenger, Mail and Freight Service for Conception Bay and Bell Island.

Mr Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to Life Insurance."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 amendments.

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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to Life Insurance" 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 Posts and Telegraphs the Bill entitled "An Act 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 tomorrow.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I might point out that it is introduced to rectify misunderstandings that arose in connection with the Bill passed last year to empower the Department of Posts and Telegraphs to use stamping machines. The Customs Department refused to recognize the stamping machine for the purpose of stamping Customs documents; but this new Amendment gives the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs power to use this stamping machine for Customs as well as Stamp duty, and I understand the Government and the Minister of Finance and Customs agree on that point.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

The Minister of Public Works tabled the Report of the Highroads Commission, 1930.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 10th, 1931.

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

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, I leave to present a petition from the people of Conception Harbor, adjacent harbors and Brigus Junction, asking for the granting to them the completion of the road between Conception Hr. and Brigus Junction. Already the road extends from Conception Hr. towards Brigus Junction for a distance of five miles and there is only another three miles to be finished to complete this much-needed road. There are in all about thirty families residing at Brigus Junction with absolutely no means of access to the outside world, except by railroad, and the people of Conception Hr. and adjacent places, through Avondale, which is a distance of seven miles. This road would be a great boon to the places and the petition has been very largely signed and supported in fact by every voter in the District.

Last Sunday night a public meeting was held in Conception at which the Rev. Father Scully, P.P., was chairman. The petition was drafted and forwarded that it might be presented to this House for its consideration. They recommend that the work be carried on under the supervision of the Highroads Commission under whose

management, they feel, the work will be best done. I very heartily endorse this petition and feel that it will be of enormous benefit if the Government can see its way clear to meet with the request. I would ask that the petition be referred to the Highroads Commission that they might include it in the work planned for the near future.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, the Mayor of St. John's has done me the honor of asking me to present a petition to this House on behalf of the City of St. John's.

(Reads Petition)

On motion this petition was received and it was ordered that the said petition be referred to a Select Committee to examine and report as to whether the Rules of the House with respect to such petitions have been complied with.

The Select Committee to be: Mr Speaker, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Winter.

HON. MR. LEWIS presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the St. John's Gas Light Company, as follows:

April 10th, 1931.

"The Select Committee appointed to examine and report on the petition of the St. John's Gas Light Company, beg to report that they have examined the said petition, and find that the Rules of the House have been observed and recommend the introduction of the attached Bill, as asked for.

(Sgd.) A. J. WALSH,
P. J. LEWIS,
J. A. WINTER

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the

Act 56 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the style and title of the St. John's Gas Light Company,' be introduced and read a first time, and second time, and referred to a Select Committee to examine and report as to whether the Rules of the House have been complied with.

The Select Committee to be Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, Hon. Dr. Campbell, Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Fitzgibbon.

On motion it was ordered that the financial clauses of the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Lewis presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of certain clerks, office, and other mercantile assistants, as follows:

April 10th, 1931.

"The Select Committee appointed to examine and report on the petition of certain clerks, office and other mercantile assistants, beg to report that they have examined the said petition and find that the Rules of the House have been observed, and recommend the introduction of the attached Bill, as asked for.

(Sgd.) A. J. WALSH,
P. J. LEWIS,
J. A. WINTER

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Closing Hours of Shops within the Electoral Districts of St. John's City, East and West," be introduced and read a first time, and second time, and referred to a Select Committee to examine and report as to whether the Rules of the House have been complied with.

The Select Committee to be Hon Dr. Campbell, Mr. Fitzgibbon, Hon. Mr. Bradley, Mr. Bindon, Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Winter.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's."

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition sought some information as to the Memorial College and Normal School for Teachers. The following information has been prepared for me by Dr. V. P. Burke, the Secretary for Education, which is as follows:

THE NEED FOR EXPANSION.

1.—The Building as it stands is no longer large enough to accomodate the numbers:

(a) Normal School.—Accomodation for 60 at the most. Present number 86. The rooms are crowded beyond the limits of what is sanitary.

(b) Memorial College—The classes in the first year have to be divided and the classes duplicated. Even so it means that 40 students are taken in rooms designed for 30. 33 fully qualified applicants were declined. Had they been admitted, the number would have been 56 in rooms designed for 30.

This refers to lecture subjects, but in the experimetal sciences, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, it would have been a sheer impossibility to accomodate the students in the laboratories.

We started with one Laboratory which had to serve also as Lecture Room for both Physics and Chemistry. The time came after the first year when the two subjects had to be divided and we had to use a semi-basement room, intended for a Playroom (not large enough for a Gymnasium) for a Physics Laboratory and Lecture Room. All our Science Laboratories are hampered:

1. Because they have to be used for Lecture Rooms as well.
2. There are no preparation rooms.

Our Biology Room has to meet the needs of Botany, Zoology, Entomology, Geology, and provide Aquarium for both fresh water life and salt water. This means in none of our Laboratories can any experiment be undertaken which means keeping the apparatus set up for over a period of three hours. Everything has to be cleared away for the incoming class.

The Engineering classes have to be taken in the Assembly Hall and there is no end of time wasted clearing away the desks and setting them up again.

The Library has hundreds of books now waiting till there is shelf room for them to be set out.

There is no Gynasium, no room for the Staff, no Museum. There are 100 men students; only three toilets are provided. There should be ten at least.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

1.—There is a demand for Correspondence Courses, but we have no room we can spare to provide for it and consequently Newfoundland Students in the Outports have to send to Chicago or New York or the Old Country, have to wait six weeks before

they get their papers returned and pay **four times as much** as they would have to pay if we could meet the needs of our own students.

2.—There is no doubt that in the coming years the demand for entrance will increase. Every year sees a larger number of students passing the Junior Matriculation. The subjoined figures show the inevitable trend:

1919	70
1920	79
1921	89
1922	71
1923	117
1924	111
1925	99
1926	112
1927	161
1928	197
1929	282
1930	295

The Memorial University College is the "only provision made for those students who want to go forward to degrees in Arts, Science, Medicine, Law, Engineering, or to the Teachers' University Grade.

What are we to do with the larger number of students who are sure to be applying for entrance? Are we to slam the door in their faces?

EVENING WORK.—Apart from the University Courses, there are evening courses which provide for instruction in:

- Commercial Subjects
- Cultural Subjects
- Navigation
- Domestic Science and Nursing
- Engineering Subjects

Here again we are hampered by lack of room. There are no practical Classes in Engineering or Building Construction. There is no room

equipped for these subjects. We have offered us, one steam engine, three internal combustion engines, for purposes of demonstration. But we are not in a position to accept, because we have no room in which to house them.

Summer School provides for 165 teachers. We have to borrow from other buildings for some of our classes.

CONCLUSION.—If the Memorial University College had been a failure there would be no need for enlargement. But the facts make it clear that those who projected the building underestimated the numbers of the younger generation who were eager and qualified for higher work, and the support which the movement was going to receive from the general public and especially from the teaching profession.

NORMAL SCHOOL

The number enrolled 1929 was 99.

The number enrolled 1930 was 119.

The number enrolled 1931 was 139.

Students from every district in Newfoundland have attended this school. In one year 31 districts were represented. Over 96% of the students attending the Normal School were born in outports. One school which had never had one candidate able to pass the Matriculation Examination has passed 15 of its pupils in the Matriculation Examination since 1925 when the school was first taught by a graduate of the Normal School.

Two other places which in 1925 or 1926 had not a student able to pass the Junior Matriculation Examination have since these schools have been taught by Normal School graduates, passed 15 students in the Junior Matriculation Examination.

Estimating that it would take each of these students \$400 to come to St. John's and study for the Matriculation Examination, the parents of the students in the places mentioned above have been saved some \$12,000 because of the Normal School in St. John's.

The number of pupils enrolled in the Memorial University College and Normal School, including Normal School students, regular College students, Summer School students and Evening Classes was about 750.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to a proposed agreement in connection with the Treating of Newfoundland Cod, Seal, Whale and other Oils, and their by-products.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, I moved the House into Committee so that I can tell the Committee what it is about and we can raise the Committee and go on tomorrow. In the year 1926, I think, (I am speaking from memory and I am subject to correction on that point) in the year 1926 the late ministry of Hon. W. S. Monroe entered into some engagements with Mr. John P. Powell concerning certain matters pertaining to the refining of oils and a contract was entered into. The Terra Nova Oil Company was the name of the Company, I think, and they were given certain privileges for a period of two and five years. In 1928 the Monroe Government enlarged the time. About some few weeks ago, Mr. Powell came to me and asked for an extension. I agreed; but I

found that the Act had expired and it was necessary to introduce a new Bill for really confirming what had been done twice before, once in 1926 and again in 1928.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
The Bill is the same?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, there is this difference, in the old Bill the time was two and five years; in the new Bill the time is three and five years. Three years to commence and five years to complete. There is the duty clause which is now the standard clause. There was no standard duty clause in the 1926 Bill and we are now inserting a standard duty clause at the suggestion of the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice who thought it advisable to have exactly the same wording in the various Acts.

I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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 House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman, these Resolutions were distributed yesterday in relation to the mode of collection of the tax on telegraphic messages. So that the House may not misunderstand what we hope to attain, I would like to explain what we are going to do. There is no intention to interfere with the present tax and there is no increase in taxation. The present position with regard to the 10 cents on foreign messages is as follows: The authority to collect that tax goes back to Cap. 28 of the Consolidated Statutes of 1914. Every foreign cable is supposed to have a ten cent stamp affixed to it; the company when it receives the message for transmission is supposed to put the ten cent stamp on the message. We do not know if this is always done or not, and we do not want to be always going to the Companies sending foreign messages, like the Anglo and Commercial Cable Companies, to see whether or not the ten cent stamp has been affixed.

The first section of these Resolutions reads as follows:

"There shall be paid upon every telegraphic message by cable, wire or wireless method (other than a "service message") originating within this Dominion and sent to any other country, a tax of ten cents."

The object of that section is that now a tax of ten cents is paid by revenue stamp; under this Act the amount will be collected in cash. This not only applies to foreign cable companies, but even more so to our own local offices. For instance, supposing a foreign message goes to Grand Bank or Catalina at the present time. The telegraph operator at either place accepts the message, but

we do not know whether our operator puts on the ten cent stamp or not, so that we want to make it clear, under these Resolutions, that the person who sends that message has got to pay the ten cents in cash. Section Two of the Resolutions reads:

"There shall be paid upon every telegraphic message by cable, wire or wireless method (other than a service message) transmitted from one place in this Dominion to another place in this Dominion wholly over any line or course of transmission except those of the Newfoundland Postal Telegraphs a tax of five cents."

The explanation of this section is that there is a stamp tax of five cents on all messages originating outside our own lines. For example, the Anglo American Telegraph Company collect twenty-five cents for a message and are supposed to have a five-cent stamp attached to it. Under the new arrangement the sender of a message will have to pay the additional five cents tax in cash instead of by stamp. The reason why the Postal lines are not included in this section is because we collect the five cents already.

Section Three of this Act says:

"The said tax shall be collected by the Newfoundland Postal Telegraphs and by every Telegraphic and Cable Company or other commercial transmitter of messages at the time of the acceptance of the message."

I may say that any message that originates on our own lines and is then transferred to the Anglo Company's lines we collect twenty-five cents on it and pass over twenty cents of it and keep back five cents; and upon any message accepted by the Anglo people they are supposed

to collect twenty-five cents and pass us over five cents in cash instead of by stamp.

Section Four reads:

"Every Telegraphic or Cable Company and every other corporation or person handling commercial telegraphic communications shall within ten days after the end of each calendar month furnish to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs a statement showing (a) the number of telegraphic messages sent abroad wholly over the lines or courses of transmission of the said Company, corporation or person during the said month; (b) the number of telegraphic messages transmitted from one place in this Dominion to another place in this Dominion wholly over the lines or courses of transmission of the said Company, corporation or person during the said months (excluding in both cases "service messages"). Such statement shall be proved upon the affidavit of the Superintendent, chief accountant or some other principal officer of the said Company or corporation, or in the case of a person, then of such person, and shall be sent to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs together with a certified cheque for the amount of taxes payable upon the business shown in said statement."

That section prescribes the method of collecting the ten cents tax. Any further information that is desired I shall be only too pleased to furnish as we go through Committee stage.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what latitude he allows operators as regards service messages. Are they allowed to send them? Suppose an operator wants to send a message on his

own private business. Do you allow that to go through as a service message?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS.—I really don't know whether they send messages of that nature or not. I daresay they talk pretty freely from one to the other over the system.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I don't mean that. Supposing the operator at Northern Bay wants to send a message here to a business firm or to a newspaper office, do you allow that operator to send that message as a service message?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS.—I really don't know whether anything of that nature is done.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I think it is worth while for the Minister to enquire. I have a reason for asking that. I don't think it is fair for operators to take advantage of the office for their own private business.

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 it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages" be 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to 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 Mr. Greene the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in Relation to a Contract for Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Chairman, I wish to take advantage of this occasion, the introduction of the Bill into this House to take the opportunity of giving the reason for this Bill.

In the years past Conception Bay and Bell Island has been served by a Government steamer carrying Mails, but the steamer does not run on any regular schedule. Bell Island, one of Newfoundland's greatest industrial centres had for years past been sadly neglected in the matter of facilities for carrying the miners or residents to the mainland.

In normal times the Wabana Mines employ about 2,500 miners, of these nearly 1,000 belong and have their homesteads on the mainland, yet there is no efficient facilities for carrying men to their homes in Bay de Verde, Harbor Grace and other points in Conception Bay.

In the Winter season these boats, which are only second hand trawlers having only accomodation of a very poor nature and for only a few and there is no accomodation for ladies. It is frightful, during the winter time, to see ladies and the miners on deck or sheltering in a cubby hole in all kinds of weather.

In winter time the three mile tickle is often rendered impassable owing to blockage by the ice and these old trawlers cannot cross and often the service, the mail, is held up for as long as a week.

This new steamer is specially built having a reinforced bow which will make her sort of ice-breaker and she will have a minimum speed of 19 knots an hour, not as the present boats which have a speed of from five to seven knots. The mail now leaves St. John's at 3 o'clock in the afternoon and arrives at Portugal Cove at about 4 o'clock and does not reach the Wabana Mines until 7 that evening. Yet Bell Island is only 10 miles from St. John's. It is frightful to think that the letter which you write in the afternoon and which your stenographer posts on her way home to tea does not reach it's objective in Bell Island until 6 or 7 tomorrow evening, more than 24 hours for a letter that had only 10 miles to travel.

It is proposed in the new service, which we are now inaugurating, to have the mail close at the General Post Office at 9.30 in the morning, it will be at Portugal Cove at 10 and be at Wabana Mines at 11 o'clock. This will enable the people to enjoy many privileges previously denied them, among them the morning paper, tho it is true this fact will hardly profit them to any great extent.

It is also intended to run a Sunday service. For years past Bell Island has been isolated on Sundays but under the new system the people and the miners may leave Saturday and return Sunday afternoon, thus affording the men the opportunity to get to their homes which they deserve. There was an old service which was curtailed. This Sunday service will be run during the months of June, July, August

and September. Formerly anyone leaving on Sunday could not get back until some time on Monday.

There are now more than 140 cars on Bell Island and these cars are a source of revenue to the country, paying as they do, license fees and drivers fees and these cars are debarred from the Highroads of the Island owing to being unable to get across the tickle.

The new steamer will have a deck capacity of 46 feet, sufficient room for 5 or 6 cars, there will be a special crane provided for the purpose of hoisting the cars onto the wharf as owing to the tide there is often a difference of 5 or 6 feet at the wharf and it is necessary to have the hoisting done from the ship.

The ship will go up the bay to Holyrood, Hr. Main or Conception Hr. on Tuesday evenings and over to Hr. Grace and Carbonear on Thursday also. There will be a trip on Wednesday.

The service is not solely to the advantage of Bell Island as it also benefits Bay de Verde, Bay Roberts and Port de Grave. This is the only contract ever made for the benefit of Bell Island and Conception Bay of such a nature.

The former arrangement was only a Postal Department arrangement for the carrying of mails and the rest of the schedule was solely at the discretion of the steamship owners and it has remained for the Squires Government to put this new service into execution, and I am proud to have been associated with the formulation of this new service. The new service will come into effect the first of June.

It must be remembered that neither Bell Island or Conception Bay have

a steamship service and Bell Island does not directly benefit from the Government Railway or from any of its branches, neither is it served by any of the coastal boats.

Bell Island is Newfoundland's greatest industrial centre, it has one of the largest iron-ore lodes in the world. Neither Grand Falls, Corner Brook or Buchans contribute as much revenue to the country as Bell Island. In normal times employing 2500 men, its weekly payroll is over \$45,000, yearly its payroll amounts to over two million dollars. In royalties it gives over \$100,000.00 per year; another \$100,000.00 for customs duties received from the many ships loading there. Its people are among the most industrious in the country, yet with the exception of those having relatives or business on the Island comparatively few have had acquaintance with it. It is our hope, with the new service to encourage a sort of local tourist traffic, diverting some of the holiday makers who would otherwise spend their days around Conception Bay, to the activities and beauties of the Island.

Bell Island is entitled to a proper connection with the mainland. The new steamer has been built by J. Ernst & Sons at Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia, for the Bell Island Steamship Company, and it was launched a few days ago, the Bell Island Steamship Company having been granted the tender by the Government.

The new steamer will be 126 feet long and 34 feet wide; deck space is provided for six motor cars. There is a cabin for the ladies, suitably furnished, and private toilets.

This steamer will be able to accommodate 250 people below deck in comfortable circumstances. In addition to this there will be a ladies cabin

which will be comfortably fitted up with upholstered lounges and off the cabin will be a ladies' toilet. On the upper deck will be a gentlemen's lounge or smoking room. The steamer will be electrically fitted throughout and steam heated and will have motor engines of 250 horse power. The engine will be a Fairbanks Morse of the latest type which will enable the steamer to travel at an average speed of ten knots per hour, as against five or six knots at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like, as representative of the miners of Bell Island, to stress the importance of this steamship service. I do not wish to knock the owners of the present service, but I want to point out the crudeness and unsafeness of it and the hardships the miners had to undergo getting to and from their homes in Conception Bay. Time after time they have to stand exposed to the elements in a manner that was unfit for cattle. These miners are, in my opinion, the hardest working men we have in Newfoundland. They are continually undergoing terrific strain and dangers and risking their lives that they might earn sufficient to keep those near and dear to them supplied with the necessities of life. It is for these men that I stress the desperate need of not luxurious but safe and comfortable means of getting to their homes from work and back to work again. They work many miles under the sea and are constantly in danger from injury caused by falling timbers when hoisting iron ore from the mines. They have to work continually with electric light and carbide lights attached to their caps, while they are anywhere from 100 yards under the surface and out in Conception Bay.

Before concluding I should like to add a few words of appreciation to the

owners of the steamer, George Neal, Ltd., Mr. J. B. Martin of Bell Island, and Capt. J. C. Colbourne, who were awarded the contract for the steamer, and notwithstanding the fact that a great wave of depression set in on Bell Island and the mines were only working at a 50 per cent capacity, these men though they were not bound by any contract and despite the fact that they had a great deal of their own private money invested still went ahead with the work that they might give to Bell Island and to the miners employed there a service that would be comfortable, safe and speedy.

I thank you for your patient hearing of this long speech and when you are considering this Bill I want you to bear in mind the fact that there are some six or seven thousand people on Bell Island to whom this steamship service will be a Godsend.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman I have not had much opportunity of studying the Bill, but in glancing through section 2 of the proposed sailing schedule of the steamer I see that it will only go as far as Carbonear. I was wondering if it would not be possible to extend it to Salmon Cove as this would be a great convenience to the miners who live in that place. As it is now they will have to leave the steamer at Carbonear and then at a great expense have to take cars to get them the additional seven or eight miles to their homes in Salmon Cove.

MR. GREENE.—Owing to the shallowness of the wharves it would be impossible for the steamer to dock.

MR. PUDDESTER.—This would not be required as the steamer could anchor outside and the men could get ashore in boats.

MR. GREENE.—That will be arranged.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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 "An Act to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 Posts and Telegraphs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services'" 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 Monday afternoon next, the 13th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 13th, 1931.

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

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House report of the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund for the period ending the 31st day of March, 1931. This is over the signature of the Hon. Sir M. G. Winter, Chairman, and Mr. Eric Bowring, Honorary Secretary Treasurer. I would request you, Mr. Speaker, to direct the Clerk of the House to include this report in the Journal of this session.

Report of the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund for the Period ending 31st March, 1931.

To His Excellency the Governor in Council.

May it please Your Excellency:—

We have the pleasure to forward you for submission to the Legislature, the Report of the work of the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund for the period of fifteen months, ending 31st March, 1931.

The Fund has continued to assist as in previous years, Veterans of the War, their families, and those of deceased men of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment and the Royal Naval Reserve.

During the period under review, the sum of \$4,304.11 was expended. In the last Report it was stated that the resources of the Fund, would enable the Trustees to continue their activities to a date not later than April 30th, 1931. By a careful scrutiny of claims and the circumstances of beneficiaries, it is now found that payments can be continued to June 30th, 1931, and that at that date a very small balance may possibly remain.

After correspondence with the Colonial Secretary, and the Board of Pension Commissioners, it is pleasing to note that provision has been made for continuance, through the Great War Veterans Association, of allowances payable to dependents of the Fund at the present time. There are at present nineteen Grants current.

As the work of the Committee of the Fund is drawing to a close, your Committee wish to record again their appreciation of the splendid response which was always given to their appeals for contributions by the gen-

eral public, of the co-operation of the various governments under which the Committee has functioned, and of the gratuitous assistance at all times afforded the Committee by Clergymen, Magistrates, Justices of the Peace, the Police, and of all others whose services were placed at the disposal of the Committee whenever requested. We would also gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to the Comptroller and Auditor General for his gratuitous services in auditing our accounts.

As this Report will probably be the last the Committee will have the honor of submitting, we think it may be interesting to give some details of the Fund since its inception.

At the outbreak of the War in 1914, when the Patriotic Association was formed, an offshoot of the Association was created, known as the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund. An Act to incorporate the Fund was passed on the 5th June, 1915. After the assumption by the Department of Militia of the duties of the Patriotic Association, the Fund continued to function independently, dealing with monies received by Public Subscription to assist the dependents of men who joined the colours.

In response to the appeal originally made the sum of \$129,250.22 in all was collected.

Interest on the amounts in hand during the period the Fund has been in existence amounted to \$15,990.45

Repayments for outlays on account of Imperial, Canadian and other cases amounted to \$50,964.46.

Received from various governments in respect of sums aggregating \$27,500.00. \$30,000.00 overpaid to men on active service. The total sum dealt with by the Fund has amounted to \$223,705.13.

With this amount 1689 Grants have been paid, and 1185 families or individuals have been assisted.

The total cost of administration, which amount includes Books, Stationery, Printing, Costs of Investigations, Postage, Telegrams, etc., has amounted to only \$2,912.83, or 1 1/3% of the total sum dealt with.

Attached here with will be found a statement of the financial resources of the Fund.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) M. G. WINTER,
Chairman,

ERIC A. BOWRING,
Hon. Secretary Treasurer.

**Statement of Patriotic Fund to April
1st, 1931.**

DR.

To Contributions	\$129,250.22
Nfld. Govt. Grants.....	27,500.00
Nfld. Repayments.....	15,779.58
Canadian Repayments....	30,660.37
Imperial Repayments.....	1,803.36
R. N. R. Repayments.....	2,721.15
Interest	15,990.45

	\$223,705.13

CR.

By Nfld. Beneficiaries.....	\$184,798.65
R. N. R. Beneficiaries.....	2,721.15
Canadian Beneficiaries....	30,660.37
Imperial Beneficiaries.....	1,803.36
Incidentals	2,912.83

	\$222,896.36
Balance	808.77

	\$223,705.13

Examined and found correct,

(Sgd.) F. C. BERTEAU,
Comptroller and Auditor General.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. Greene, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Passenger Service for Conception Bay.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GREENE.—Mr. Chairman, as some technical error has crept in, I would move that the following be inserted in place of Clause (8):

(Reads)

I think that gentlemen opposite will agree that the subsidy is not extremely high considering that it is a brand new steamer, passed A1 at Lloyds. The plans have already been drawn up, which we have here, and which I would ask Hon. Mr. Lewis to table.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, If the boat has dories only, what's going to happen if she capsizes? I understand the Customs officials have some power regarding such matters. There must be something in some Act about it. This is a boat of 190 tons, and there must be some regulations.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chariman, in reply to the honorable member, may I say that there is actually an Act regarding this in the Statute Book.

This ship will be examined and certified by the Registrar of Shipping and will be certified as being allowed to carry a certain number of passengers and if she carries more than this number, then the company running her is subject to a very large fine. I may say that the Customs have the right Mr. Moore speaks of regarding boats carrying passengers without

any conveniences in case of accident. For some time past the Customs have been rather up against it owing to the number of small boats running from all around Conception Bay to the Island. I remember I was over on Bell Island last summer when a small boat arrived carrying some seventy passengers, yet it's practically impossible to do anything until some tragedy occurs. If the Customs started enforcing this law there would be much trouble among the people. This boat will, however, be inspected by the shipping department under Mr. McGrath and if passenger allowance is exceeded the company will be liable for a very heavy fine.

MR. EMERSON.—Certified by the Department to carry so many passengers; possibly 200?

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, may I enquire regarding that last section (re safety appliances) if it is intended for the boat not to have a wireless set. Suppose the ship is somewhere in Conception Bay and an accident happens, it wouldn't be necessary to have a very elaborate set installed; a small one would be sufficient. The captain could be instructed in the sending of a simple S.O.S. signal..

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, on Friday afternoon I spoke concerning the sailing schedule of the new steamer and asked if it would not be possible to include Salmon Cove and Broad Cove in the week-end trips of the steamer. If possible I think it would be better if the steamer were to leave Bell Island and make its first call at Broad Cove than come up the Bay. I do not think the fact that there are no wharves at which the steamer could dock would make any difference insofar as the landing of passengers is concerned, especially in

connection with Broad Cove, as the people there would only be too glad to come out from the shore in boats and take the passengers from the steamer. These trips would of course be subject to weather conditions and the matter of whether or not it was fit for the steamer to land her passengers would be left to the discretion of the captain.

I was speaking to some of the people of Broad Cove by telephone this morning, and they are very anxious that Broad Cove be included in the schedule. In the olden days steamers continually called there, and despite the fact that there were no wharves they never had any difficulty in land-freight, and there was never any damage caused the steamer. I would be very much obliged if Hon. Mr. Lewis, who has charge of this Bill, would have these places included in the schedule.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to support the proposal put forth by Mr. Puddester and wish to point out to Mr. Greene and the Hon. Mr. Lewis what a wonderful convenience and saving it would mean to the miners belonging to Salmon Cove to have this port included in the sailing schedule. As Mr. Greene knows, there are in all about one hundred men from Salmon Cove and its vicinity who work at Bell Island, and if possible it would be better to have the steamer sail from Bell Island across the Bay on Wednesday evening instead of Thursday. Otherwise men whose shifts finish on Wednesday evening would have to stay on the Island for a whole day with nothing to do.

MR. GREENE.—Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in supporting the suggestions put forth by Mr. Puddester and Mr. Moore concerning their respective Districts and I would like

to say that the men they refer to are known on the Island as loaders, and are looked upon as the hardest working men in the mine. Their jobs consist of shovelling iron ore and in order to make their day's pay which amounts to \$3.50, they must shovel at least seventeen tons per day and if they desire to earn a bonus that amount must be increased to around twenty-four or twenty-six tons per day. The price to be charged for return trip over the week-end would be \$1.00, and when you consider that the trip is twenty-two miles each way, or a total of forty-four miles, it must be admitted that the price is reasonable. The price in the middle of the week would be \$1.50 return. Owing to the fact that the boat is scheduled to go to Portugal Cove on Wednesday evenings, it would not be possible to shift the middle of the week trip from Thursday to Wednesday.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Chairman, I took up the matter of including Salmon Cove and Broad Cove in the schedule of the steamer with Mr. Martin of Bell Island and he assured me that he would be only too willing to do anything within reason to make the sailings more advantageous to all the people working on the Island, but at the same time he pointed out the difficulty of landing life-boats at Salmon Cove. There will only be four hands working before the mast on the steamer and if they were to use life-boats it would mean that two of the hands would have to go ashore with the boat and leave only two on board, which, in case of a storm, would not be sufficient.

MR. PUDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, there will be no need for the captain to lower any life boats to take these passengers ashore, and we would not expect him to make these ports in stormy weather. As I said

before, the people from the district would know when the ship was coming and would make arrangements to meet her and take the passengers ashore.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Financial Clauses of Gas Light Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 Financial Clauses with some amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Select Committee be instructed that these sections, as passed by the Committee, now form part of this Bill and that the said Committee make provision accordingly.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Oils and By-Products Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, in regard to Clause (6) I would like to know what is the penalty and damages available to the Government for a breach of this section of the agreement?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I may say that that amounts to a declaration of policy of past Governments and the present Government.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, it seems all Companies in their agreements say that we are going to give you labor against the concessions they receive. Now it seems to be a pity that we cannot be able to avail of the services of the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice to draw up a code whereby more binding clauses would be inserted and whereby companies would be liable if they did not employ Newfoundlanders wherever and whenever possible.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, out of that arises a multitude of questions. So far as the employment of Newfoundlanders at Grand Falls is concerned ninety per cent are Newfoundlanders and ninety two per cent of our people are employed at Bishop's Falls, I am reliably informed. However, I think this matter is and should be covered by our Immigration Laws. The situation is that in the past the United States and Canada have been superabundantly courteous in regard to the free entry of our people seeking employment there; whilst at the moment there are but five per cent of the big industries in Newfoundland representative of the people of outside countries. Therein lies a problem that does not necessitate being put into original form, because if restrictions were placed against Canadian and United States

people it might have a detrimental effect upon us in the future, and so long as a Company runs over ninety per cent of Newfoundland born labor I think we are doing exceptionally well. This can be borne out by the number of Newfoundlanders employed in Grand Falls, Buchans, Bishop's Falls and other industrial centres in this country. In all of these commercial activities they have their own policy and all a Government can do is to keep a continual pressure on them so that the Newfoundland will not be done; furthermore, I may add, if we deviate from this course Washington authorities may seem fit to put certain restrictions upon us.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I am afraid Sir that the term ninety per cent Newfoundland employees looks better than it really is.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I think, Sir, that all such contracts provide for the engagement of skilled labor and I think my Hon. friend will find, also, as can be verified by Mr. Earle, a native of Bay Roberts, that the work has developed at Grand Falls to such a degree of success that a number of young men are in training and development in the United States for the paper making work at Corner Brook. I quite agree with the suggestion of my Hon. friend that sometimes the concessions asked for by foreign capitalists have been unreasonable. I have made enquiries from the I. P. and P. Company, through Mr. Howard, a high priced official of that Company, with a view to getting information as to the production of their payroll as regards nationality and to indicate how their jobs work out and to show how it can be studied as to how their statistics work out.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many high priced Canadian officials have replaced Newfoundlanders at Grand Falls and Corner Brook?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Speaker, yes, I think there is some degree of truth in that assertion in so far as those elderly gentlemen who have been dismissed have been placed on the pensions list. I have taken the trouble to enquire from Mr. Laycock, the Manager at Grand Falls, and he gave me a list of a number of elderly gentlemen who have been taken off their works and pensioned. The Company, he informs me, had undertaken the work of organization. The Company formerly had no competition as far as its paper was concerned, but now the Company, owing to its connection with the Canada Power and Paper Company, has to operate on a competitive basis and it is necessary to get the best men possible for the positions of skilled labor. Particulars as to the nature of the changes will be tabled as soon as received.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Chairman, apropos to the subject and in favor of the suggestion advanced by the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, I may say that the Company at Bell Island has already started and last year put two young men in the Memorial College and they are now at Dalhousie with a view to putting Newfoundlanders in the highest positions in their employ, and two more will be sent this year. The Company guarantees to pay their expenses and give them employment during their Summer holidays. In that way they hope eventually that all the mining men and engineers will be Newfoundlanders all.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, this is an abomination,

this whole thing. You should get the advice of the Government Engineer and one or two experts. It would be no trouble to drive a horse and car through this thing.

We need the money so badly that we cannot afford to be having any more free entry.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice to call upon the Government Engineer.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, Ltd." 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, 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.

* Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Public Health and Welfare" 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. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this Bill has the support, in the main, of the members of this House on both sides. I may say that health is man's most precious possession and we all wish to do everything in our power to safeguard the health of those, who through circumstances are not in a position to take care of themselves. The scope of the Bill in its present form is very wide, and it is rather of a preventative than a curative nature. the idea I take it being to improve conditions without involving the great cost that is involved. I would, however, like to point out that in its present form the Bill gives rather too much power or authority to one man and he would have to be a super-man in order to carry out the provisions of the Bill. Apart from this and other minor amendments I may say that the Bill has the support of myself and my colleagues though such support is qualified in certain respects.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I have had the advantage of hearing this Bill spoken of for two sessions now, and I would like to ask, as regards the cost of the administration of the Bill, how it will compare with the cost of administration of the Public Charities previously?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, it is indeed rather an awkward time to answer such a question as it would involve going into details and would take up a great deal of time. However, if the Hon. member wants it I will give it to him. The information will of course be provided for the Select Committee appointed to go into the Bill.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I think that there are one or two

amendments which might be made when the matter is referred to a Select Committee. The first point I would like to draw the attention of the House to is section 5 of the Bill. At present it consists of twelve members; the board is too changeable; of the twelve members of the board nine are members of the Executive Council, and this board, without casting any reflection on the present members of the Executive, it, I think, too awkward for the members to be able to be at or co-operate with the other members of the board.

It appears that the Secretary and Chairman of the Public Charities would be members of the board and I object to that on principle. These should be permanent appointments as it is there is nothing to stop Mr. Browrigg from standing as a member. These matters should, I think, be considered.

Another matter which I would like to draw the attention of the House to is what steps is it intended to take with the ordinary charitable organizations existing at present, such as the Child Welfare and Nonia and others. In the past these societies have received grants from the Government but have also received great support from the public, who, as we know, are very generous in giving to these organizations. If, however, it appears that the Government is running these societies, then these public wells of charity will dry up. If, however, the Government is going to merely make an inspection, then I see no reason why things should not go along as they have with regard to these institutions, which, as we know, have done a great deal of good. The Public Welfare and Public Charities, are, as we know, very efficient bodies and should be able to carry out the provisions of the act.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages" 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 the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Mode and Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages" 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. Mr. Lewis presented the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the Municipal Council, as follows:

To The Honorable The House of Assembly:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the St. John's Municipal Council has considered the matter to it referred and begs to report that the petitioner has not complied with the Rules of this House in connection with the publication of notice of its intention to apply for the introduction of this Bill.

Your Committee, however, recommends that the petitioner be excused from strict compliance with the Rules of the House in this respect, provided however, that the petitioner causes notice to be published in four consecutive issues of two Daily Newspapers that this Bill is now before this House in the form of a Private Bill and that any objections thereto may be forwarded in writing on or before April 20th, 1931 to the Clerk of this House, such notice to set out the nature and objects of the said Bill.

Your Committee further begs to report that the Rules of this House have not been complied with in respect to the printing in italics of Section 32 thereof.

With the consent of J. O'N. Conroy, Esq., City Solicitor, your Committee recommends that this section be struck out of the Bill.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends that leave be given to introduce this Bill with Section 31 stricken therefrom.

(Sgd.) A. J. WALSH,
J. A. WINTER,
P. J. LEWIS.

On motion it was ordered that the Bill "An Act to Amend the Municipal Act, 1921," be read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received the following Message from the Legislative Council:

The Legislative Council acquaints the House of Assembly that it accedes to the request of the House of Assembly for the appointment of a Committee of all its members to meet in conference with a Committee of all the members of the House of Assembly in the Assembly Chamber on Tuesday, the 14th of April, at 4 o'clock, p.m., to discuss the following Resolution:

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty the King praying that he may be graciously pleased to cause a Measure to be laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to give effect to certain Declarations and Resolutions set forth in the Reports of the Imperial Conference holden at Westminster in the years of 1926 and 1930."

(Sgd.) M. P. GIBBS
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
April 13th, 1931.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider Resolutions in Relation to the War Pensions Bonus.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 22, entitled "An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Custom Smelter."

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend the Crown Lands Act.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 14th, 1931.

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

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister tabled a Summary of the Proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 1930.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddeter gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in Relation to the War Pension Bonus.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, as I explained on yesterday this is a continuation of the War Pension Bonus that has been paid annually for several years past. There is no difference in the effect of these resolutions; it is merely a continuation of past practice.

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 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 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, with unanimous consent and on motion of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922," was read a second time, and it ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, 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.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, may I ask your permission to refer to the Colonial Secretary the following questions. I wonder would you mind taking a note of the questions that are unanswered: Nos. 14, 64, 66, 67, 161, 162.. I have not gone beyond the order paper of April 10th. I realise that some of these call for preparation.

May I call the attention of the Attorney General and Prime Minister to a couple of questions that are unanswered: Nos. 97 and 92. These are addressed to you as Minister of Justice, and one addressed to you as Prime Minister—No. 156. Minister of Agriculture and Mines—125. Minister of Fisheries—he is not here; Minister of Finance and Customs—241.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—Every question asked by you has been answered.

MR. EMERSON.—No. 125 has not been answered.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V, Chapter 22, entitled 'An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, On page 2, sub-section A, with respect to lighting installation, the suggestion was that the word "lighting" was abnormally broad and might include lighting fixtures. I would suggest the addition of the words "not including lighting fixtures or bulbs."

I rather like the draft of the honorable Leader of the Opposition; this, or slightly amended, would form the basis of the concluding clause in all the Bills.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

I think we ought to have a stereotyped section for free entries.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—So far as this little thing is concerned.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

I think mine will give you the basis, reading it over casually with no consideration from a legal standpoint, it appears to carry out the idea.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—I move that the following words be inserted after "lighting installation," paragraph A, 'not including lighting fixtures or bulbs.'

The next amendment is of the same wording; at the bottom of page 5 of the Schedule and after the words "lighting installation," there go in the same words "not including lighting fixtures or bulbs."

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, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Co., Ltd." 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill "An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's" was read a second time.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, this matter is purely formal in that it declares that the grounds now used and occupied by the Memorial University College for the site of the building, and its adjacent grounds, shall be known as these grounds and shall not be leased by the Department of Public Works. It just sets apart these grounds for that particular purpose. I laid on the table yesterday a large plan showing the boundaries.

MR. EMERSON.—Does any question of title arise?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—No; there is no question as to the title, with the exception of negotia-

tions which are pending with respect to a small piece of land in the north-east corner. Many years ago it was the intention of the Salvation Army to build a hospital. They were told that they could have that corner for their hospital for a nominal rental of one dollar a year. They abandoned the thing and the Government co-operated with them in connection with their hospital on the site where it is now. They have abandoned that site; the other is much better. The Salvation Arm have indicated to me their willingness of clearing any point in the interest of the situation, but this does not affect that aspect at all. If it be discovered that there is any title vested in them they have expressed very great friendship in co-operating.. I am not sure they have actually communicated, but they are in process of communicating with their headquarters in London; but, as a matter of fact it is disposed of.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, if these things go on for a number of years you can never tell when they are going to have a claim.

I don't intend to speak on this Bill directly on the question of the land, but I take it that the wide scope that is given to members dealing with a Bill of this kind justifies me in making one or two remarks.

What I wish to say has to do entirely with this extension which is now proposed. I don't intend to refer to the question of policy as to whether the extension should be made or not, but as to the cost or otherwise.

I understand there are plans suggested for the building of an extension to the Memorial University. By building the intended extension of brick and mortar it will be given an appearance similar to the United College on LeMarchant Road.

I would like to draw attention to the fact that in doing so you are joining on a mottled brick addition to a concrete structure. To build this building separately would not incur a much greater expenditure. What I mean is the cost of a fourth wall would not be very great. In erecting this building you ought to erect something of which the public will be proud. I grant that a brick building has a beauty of its kind, but these are two different kinds of beauty. As a separate building it would be quite correct, and as it is intended to erect another building on the eastern side of the present structure, then you could have a series of buildings having different types of architecture, but to join the whole together would be inartistic, as the concrete building which we now have has a certain cold chaste beauty of its own.

If we intend raising a university which will take at least half a century to build, then surely we can build something really worth while, and to connect the intended brick building with the present one would only be to make it hideous and inartistic .

Regarding the heating, you may say such an idea necessitates another heating unit; well it is quite easy to run a pipe underground from one building to the other.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am much obliged to the honorable member for his remarks, and I shall most certainly convey them to the architect.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, 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 tomorrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 15th, 1931.

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

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Southern Cove in the District of Trinity South on the subject matter of a road. The petition is largely signed and the petitioners are asking for an allocation for a grant of \$400 for the purpose of making a road to the way station, as at present they have to use a pipe line or track which is eleven months of the year under water. I do not think, Sir, that the request of the petitioners is unreasonable and I ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates and urge that it be given earnest and sympathetic consideration.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Western Bay North. This petition is largely and influentially signed. The petitioners ask that the Railway Commission put a Flag Station on the North side of Western Bay. At present the people of that place are handicapped by having to pull all their freight to and from a station which is a distance of about three miles and this, Sir, is a great hardship and inconvenience to them. This petition is signed by ninety seven of the voters of Western Bay North.

Within the past five or six years I have interviewed the Railway Management anent this same matter but without results and the people are now seeking the consideration of the members of the House of Assembly as a last resort in the hope that the Railway Commission will see its way clear to adhere to the prayer of this petition. The cost will not be very much, as all that is needed—they have already a siding and fish plates on hand—is a platform.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, would you do me the courtesy, Sir, to allow me to read a letter from Sir Marmaduke Winter, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Light & Power Co., Ltd. I ask that it be read as if it were a petition, as I desire that it be referred to a Select Committee. The letter reads as follows:

(Reads Letter)

I might say, Sir, that the letter deals with the Municipal Bill, which is a private Bill at present before the House and is a matter for consideration of the Select Committee and asks that section (54) of the Bill be stricken out. I, therefore, ask that this letter be referred to the Select Committee appointed to deal with the Bill.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Premier the Bill "An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare" was referred to a Select Committee to consist of nine members, as follows: Hon. Dr. Barnes, Hon. Dr. Campbell, Hon. Dr. Mosdell, Hon. Mr. Bradley, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Puddester.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Bill be referred to a Select Committee and the Select Committee be the same as last year with the addition of the member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Puddester.

There is this point, however, that under the rules of the House the number of members of a Select Committee is limited to seven, and only under express ruling may this number be exceeded.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the question of this Bill, I wish to point out that it is rather important, and I think the House should go into a Committee of the Whole to consider it. I have no objection to the Bill going before a Select Committee only I think it is wasting time, for among the Committee there is bound to be a great diversity of opinion, and this Bill should come before the Whole House. The Bill is a long one, but if we tackled it there is no reason why the Bill should not be taken up section by section.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, the idea I had in mind was that the Select Committee might deal in the main with the Bill. It consists of some 700 sections and about 600 of these are non-contentious; these could be passed by the Select Committee and the remainder of the sections come before the House for discussion.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I don't want to differ, but I don't want to lose time on a Select Committee unless it is going to do effective work. This Bill is a very important matter and it's above party politics, and I want it to be understood that the Committee is to rule out anything controversial. I want this under-

stood, there should be a full and free discussion and the Committee should not report on anything or any clause relating to extra expenditure. I don't want to be present on a Committee and present a minority report, and of course the opposition can always present such a report. If the Committee is solely for the purpose of dealing with the non-contentious section then I'll serve on it. I don't want to shirk my duty, but I do want it understood that only on these subjects will a report be made.

There's a feeling about the city just at present that this Bill is too elaborate and that it involves too much expense for this country with our small population of 260,000, and any section dealing with such expenditure should be debated before the whole House, not by a Select Committee.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I hope after what has been said that if the Select Committee is appointed to go into the Bill the House will not expect a report within a fortnight. Anything else would be only a pious wish which could never materialise. The only way in which the Committee can deal with the Bill is to rule out the contentious sections and leave such sections to be discussed by the whole House.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like before this Bill is passed to draw the attention of the Prime

Minister to the fact that in 1927, I think, the St. John's Amateur Athletic Association were given part of the Memorial College grounds bounded as follows: On the West by Parade St., on the East by the Police Gardens, and on the South by the Road to Fort Townshend."

These grounds were given the Association after a Minute of Council of the Municipality was passed to that effect, and were to be used by the Association as a recreation ground and athletic field for the young men and young women of this City. During the years 1928 and 1929 the Council did quite a lot of work dumping material and levelling the grounds out and the Athletic Association, thinking they were to get these grounds, began working and building up a reserve fund to put the grounds in good condition as a playing field. Then a Minute of Council was passed by the Government, who took the matter out of the hands of the Municipal Council and then the Memorial College work was started. I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to object to anything that is being done for the students of the Memorial College, but when you consider that the Amateur Athletic Association accepted these grounds in good faith, I do not think it is either reasonable or just that they should be deprived of what they considered was their right. I feel that if the Association cannot acquire these grounds as their own that perhaps some arrangement might be made with the Memorial College whereby the Athletic Association might have the use of the Memorial Grounds during the summer months while the College was closed.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, I am glad that Mr. Byrne has brought this matter to the attention of the House. Like him, I feel that anything we can do for the youth

of this City to get them to indulge in outdoor exercise should be done, but I had no knowledge that the Athletic Association had been granted this land by the Council, and in speaking from memory I think it was discussed at length in this House in either 1921 or 1922. I feel, however, that the point was very well taken and would like to say to Mr. Byrne or to anybody interested in the Athletic Association that perhaps with the co-operation of the City Council and the members of St. John's East and West, some arrangement might be made whereby St. George's Field might be converted into such a ground.

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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, 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 to a Select Committee, to consist of Hon. Mr. Cashin, Hon. Dr. Campbell, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Fitzgibbon, Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Byrne and Mr. Winter.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, this Bill is practically the same as the previous one which, however, was found to be too narrow, particularly with regard to the case in connection with logging companies who have erected buildings for the purpose of carrying out logging operations and to change the phraseology of the section dealing therewith. The second change is in section 2 which is only to correct an error in the 1930 Act.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 22, entitled 'An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Rt. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is nothing in this other than the extension of the time for an additional eighteen months and the inserting of the word "of" in one section of the Bill.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 16th, 1931.

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

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a series of petitions; I think there are others to follow from Trinity Bay, Trinity Bay South and Trinity Bay Central. I have shown these petitions to the honorable member for Trinity South, Mr. Godden. These petitions have been entrusted to me by the Society of United Fishermen who are quite strong on that side of Trinity Bay. I would ask the Clerk to read the petition which speaks for itself.

(Petition read by Clark)

This petition comes from the people of Green's Harbor; there is another here in the same words from the people of Islington. I understand there are 50 to follow. As you have heard, they ask the Government to vote a sum of money to the owners of the coal areas of Hurley's Cove, which is, I understand, in the electoral district of Trinity South, and with the money placed at the disposal of this Company they could ascertain whether coal is there in commercial quantities. In addition to the advantages that would be derived from the expenditure of that money, it would give considerable employment to the people of that section of the country. I present these petitions on behalf of the people of the S.U.F. and I ask that they be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. GOLDEN.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of these petitions, particularly as far as employment is concerned. I understand, however, that the possibility of coal in the area indicated has been gone into several times in the past and there is some difference of

opinion as to whether or not coal in commercial quantities is to be found there. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines is in a position to tell us more about this matter.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of these petitions. Anything that tends towards profitable and productive employment is worthy of our very best attention. These men ask no more than they be given a chance to earn their livelihood, to maintain their self-respect, and to be free from the degradation of the dole. For no other reason than to give these men honorable, profitable employment in the country the prayer of these petitions has my hearty support.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Speaker, replying to the honorable member for Trinity South, I have not very much to say about the matter. Some years ago, as Minister of Agriculture and Mines, I was very pleased to learn that a workable seam of coal had been discovered at Hurley's Cove. Last year, in deference to a very persistent effort on the part of the license holders, I sent our geologist there, and he gave me such a report thereon as to absolutely forbid any possibility of entertaining a hope that coal could be found in the locality. He stated the formation there was such as to forbid the entertainment of such hope, and from the samples that I saw I am compelled to agree with him. I think if anything of a promising character could be discovered we would give every attention thereto.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition forwarded to yourself from the residents of Colliers and Marysvale asking for a grant for the extension of the road extending from the River-

head of Colliers towards the Branch Railway and quite some distance towards Maher's. I understand a gap exists there of about three miles, and it is for the road to this gap that this petition asks a grant. That would give direct communication with the settlement of Maher's and give the people at Maher's communication with the main line at Colliers. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Minister of Public Works.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, some days ago I expressed from my place in this House the hope that the various contributions which had been given for the relief of suffering occasioned by the "Viking" disaster would be ultimately directed to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund, as I felt that the committee in charge of that organization and their staff were best suited to handle the situation. I also announced that it was my intention to forward to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund any contributions which were directed to me personally in connection with the Viking disaster. I consequently take this opportunity to read to the House a communication forwarded today to the President of the Marine Disaster Fund covering all contributions received by me personally up to this date.

I also desire to read for the information of the House a letter from Magistrate Fitzgerald, of Grand Falls. Magistrate Fitzgerald, it will be remembered, acted very promptly after the news of the disaster, and organized a committee at Grand Falls for the purpose of raising a substantial subscription, the A. N. D. Company contributing \$1,000.

Prime Minister's Office,
April 15th, 1931.

Dear Sir,—I have the pleasure in enclosing you herewith five cheques

representing subscriptions to the Viking Disaster Fund from the following:

Furness Withy & Co.	\$1,000.00
The Sargent family	1,000.00
The Canadian Press	100.00
Victoria Lodge, No. 318, L. O.	
B. A., Grand Falls	25.00
Loyal Orange Young Briton Assoc., Grand Falls	5.00

The cheques which have been made out to me personally I have endorsed to the order of the P. M. D. F.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) Richard A. Squires.

The President,
Permanent Marine Disasters Fund,
City.

Grand Falls,
April 9th, 1931.

The Rt. Hon. Sir. R. A. Squires, P.C.,
K.C.M.G., etc., St. John's.

Dear Sir Richard,—I have made some progress with the collection towards the Viking Disaster Fund and hope to remit a first installment of two thousand dollars within the next few days.

The consensus of opinion here is that this money be forwarded to the P. M. D. F., and I will act accordingly.

With kind regards,

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) H. F. Fitzgerald.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to present a petition from the residents of Cox's Cove, Grate's Cove and vicinity in the matter of the cutting of pulp wood on the three mile limit within their territory. This petition was forwarded to me by the Stipendiary Magistrate at Corner Brook, who,

in forwarding the petition, writes as follows: (Reads letter from Stipendiary Magistrate at Corner Brook.) I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice for investigation.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the staff of the Penitentiary asking for an increase in salary. The petition is rather short:

(Reads Petition)

For the information of the House I might read the salaries which those gentlemen receive. They maintain that they are the hardest worked and poorest paid in the Civil Service.

MR. EMERSON—Do they get any diet?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—
They do.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I would take this opportunity to say that the scale of payment for wardens of the penitentiary is far below the scale of payment for men of like standing, like education and like dependability in other branches of the service. The standard of efficiency, business and standard of dependability has to be particularly high in connection with wardency in that institution. The standard of accuracy of thought and decision has to be higher than that required for those in the ordinary occupations of life. The fact that the institution must be regarded as underpaid is evidenced to me by the fact that while, I do not suppose there was less than one hundred applicants for positions in each department in the Island of Newfoundland, I do not know of one single case in which anyone has come to apply for a job as a warden in the Penitentiary.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill Respecting the appointment of Arbitral Awards.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Statement of Fire Losses to December 31st, 1930.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Greene the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to a Passenger Service for Conception Bay.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Chairman, on the last day the Resolutions were up for discussion there were two clauses left open for the purpose of my getting in communication with the owners of the ship in relation to the request of Mr. Puddester, member for Bay de Verde, asking that Salmon Cove and Broad Cove be included in the schedule. I may say that I have communicated with Messrs. Martin and Neal and they say that, under no circumstances, do they agree to have Salmon Cove and Broad Cove included as ports of call on week end trips; but they are willing to make Salmon Cove a port of call provided proper wharfing and berthing conditions are available. They say that they are not prepared to accept the responsibility of handling passengers on that shore in boats, as that is something that is not covered in the tender when the contract was applied for.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I might say that I am unable to give any such undertaking as to a wharf at

Salmon Cove. As regards landing facilities at Broad Cove, there is not much need for the extension of the wharf there. I am very sorry that the principals of the Company who have tendered for this service have not seen their way clear to include Broad Cove in the ship's schedule because steamers have landed on that shore before Martin and Neal were born. In the past it was always deemed a pleasure for captains of steamers to land there and I do not see how it is that people in this generation cannot do what our forefathers did. In former years the S. S. Ethie landed there, without accident, and I fail to see the difficulty of landing there now. The calling of the boat would have been a great convenience to the people of Broad Cove, Blackhead, Northern Bay and of other places along that shore, particularly to those people who work at Bell Island and who would like to spend Sundays with their families; but, now with the added expense of a motor car trip from Carbonear on Saturdays to their homes and back to Carbonear again on Monday mornings the expense would be too great to incur, especially at the present time when the men are working on only half time. However, I have done my best and the responsibility rests upon the Government who are making the contract and are paying the contractors a pretty good subsidy of twelve thousand dollars a year at the expense of the people of this country.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Committee rise for the purpose of having the Hon. introducer of the Resolutions make another effort with a view to having the suggestion of the Hon. member for Bay de Verde complied with.

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that on several oc-

casions since the Hon. member for Bay de Verde brought up this matter I have been in communication with the promoters of this subject and it seems that it is impossible to get any further. They do not want to take the chance of landing passengers in boats, especially in darkness and when a number of people want to get off at the same time when the ship gets in.

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.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, is there any objection to our disposing of this Bill now or will we let it stand over?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, we would still like to take up that question regarding the boat calling at Salmon Cove, but it is all right to have the second reading isn't it?

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to a Contract for a Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay" 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 Mr. Greene the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to a Contract for a Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, with the concurrence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, I would like to explain a few phases of this Bill. It is purely technical and does not affect policy. As regards to section 1 the words "wood-working establishment" was not thought broad enough and might not fully cover activities of this sort so the words 'or other industrial establishments' were added. With regard to section 2, in the sub-sections of sections 2 the words 'licensee & license holder' appeared fifty or a hundred times in the old Act and so the words 'permit holders' were inserted as it was thought that this would be a great deal more accurate. When the Bill came from the printers it was found that in two cases the words 'license holder' appeared in two places and this has been corrected by the words 'permit holder.' With regard to section 1 there was some doubt as to whether or not the Governor in Council had power to give a lease for the erection of a shack or bunk house. It was argued that when logging was carried on, or logs were being driven down the river, an ordinary individual would accept this term but there was some technical point raised by some Solicitor and the words 'other industrial establishments' were inserted. As regards section 3, section 163 of the old Act is practically cut out and repealed. Some solicitors suggested that there was a doubt as to whether the

Governor in Council had the power to carry on licenses, etc., and so that there would be no doubt it was changed accordingly.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the driving of logs, I don't know if this is directly in connection with this Bill but I would like to say that very often logs are driven down rivers when the salmon are coming up. I don't know if that comes under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture and Mines Department, or under the Department of Marine and Fisheries; but this practise is very detrimental to the salmon fishery and is a great hardship on sportsmen if they go to a place where the fishing is good and they find the river choked up with logs. I think that there should be some rule about it, if necessary for each river and that no logs should be driven down after a certain date. I understand that in the Corner Brook section the rules for the preservation of salmon are being violated by the International Power and Paper Company. I don't know under whose control this matter comes but I think that steps should be taken to prevent logs being driven down when the salmon are coming up.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE &

MINES—Mr. Chairman, this matter of which Mr. Alderdice spoke does not come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and Mines. I would like to say that every mill owner desires to get his drive down at an early date, and the logs are in the river when the salmon strike the river early in June, the drive is in before they start to enter. There are also certain mills where they keep a certain quantity on hand in connection with their operations and use them as they need them. Last year we issued

instructions to these mill owners to get logs clear and it was immediately rectified.

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 the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 22 entitled "An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Chapter 22, entitled 'An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter'" 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.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the House into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public." Personally I don't think there is anything at all debatable in the Bill, but, if the members wish, it can stand over till tomorrow.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Speaker, I think this order ought be removed from the Order Paper altogether. I consider it antiquated. I agree where monopolies exist they stand in need of some kind of control. The fact that prices have gone down lately, I think, is due more to moral suasion than to any compulsion of this sort.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon next, the 21st instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 21st, 1931.

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

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Durrell's Arm, Farmers Arm, Jenkins Cove, Sandy Cove and Burnt Island, in the district of Twillingate, asking that no person be permitted to fish until after the 20th of October of any year in the water surrounding Spiller's Island. For years past the fishermen have set trawls, cod traps and other fishing gear and the petitioners pray that this in future be prohibited. The petition is signed by some 200 of the residents of the aforementioned places and in asking that this petition be referred to the Department to which it belongs, I hope that this petition does not die the death of so many petitions and I hope that the Government will take steps to effect the prayer of this petition. I give the petition my heartiest support.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions from the residents of the district of Harbor Grace.

The first is from the residents of the town of Harbor Grace asking that a sum of money be allocated for the purpose of reconditioning the roads of the north boundary of Harbor Grace.

The second is from the residents of Bryant's Cove in the district of Harbor Grace praying for the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of cutting a passage-way to the present road.

I beg that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they belong.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the residents of the district of Harbor Grace to support the prayer of this petition, made by the Colonial Secretary, and I give the petition my heartiest support.

MR. SKANES—Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the inhabitants of Bonne Bay in the District of St. Barbe to present a petition to this House dealing with the Mail Ferry Service and asking that same be made a daily one as far as Lomond. I shall now read the petition section by section.

(reads)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to you and to the Minister of Public Works the serious condition that exists at present. I know that people coming up the coast 30 or 40 miles have to wait sometimes two or three days or hire a boat at their own expense to get to Lomond, and in consideration of this I wish to give the petition my hearty support and pray that it be presented to the department to which it refers.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs tabled the Annual Report of that Department.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs presented the Report of the Select Committee on the St. John's Gas Light Bill, as follows:

Report of Select Committee on St. John's Gas Light Company Bill:

We beg to report that we have considered the above Bill and recommend the following changes in Section 6:

"Two" in place of "five"; comma after word "taxes" and small "a" in following word, and after word "its" add "trunk pipe line distribution system."

(Sgd.) P. J. CASHIN

ALEX. CAMPBELL

F. C. ALDERDICE

JOSEPH FITZGIBBON

G. C. BYRNE

On motion this Report was received and it was ordered that the said Report be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the style and title of the St. John's Gas Light Company."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the style and title of the St. John's Gas Light Company,'" 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 tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would

on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I move that this order be deferred and for the information of the House I would say that the Estimates will be all ready tomorrow; they are coming from the printers this afternoon and they will be corrected and ready tomorrow.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Minister gave a motion just now that he will move the House into 'Ways and Means' tomorrow. Does he intend to go on with this before Supply or does he intend, as he so often advocated himself, does he intend to run the two concurrently.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I hope to have my Budget ready by Friday.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, before the House proceeds with the Orders of the Day, I beg leave to move that this House adjourn to discuss a matter of grave and urgent public importance, that is, the question of supplies for the fisheries. I think that it is realized by every member of this House that this is a matter, at the present time, undoubtedly grave and urgent and should be dealt with at the earliest possible moment. I think also, sir, that it is realised that this is a matter that should be dealt with entirely apart from politics. There will be no charges against the Government for neglect, if there has been neglect, and the House should have an opportunity of discussing this matter in a non-partisan manner. This is a matter of extreme gravity and extreme urgency and it should be considered without regard to political results. I think I will express my

views by laying down certain axiomatic facts for your consideration. In the first place, in last year's fishery the fishermen lost considerable money, the fishery was poor owing to the weather, and the quantity of fish was small owing to circumstances over which we had no control. Following that, the merchants who supplied the fishermen suffered severe losses.

These facts were known and realized and it is the results that we have now to consider. Upon the fishermen the result is that they have no money. I had a number of fishermen in my district last year who had no money to start the fishery and I had considerable difficulty in obtaining supplies for them. These men caught no fish and today are in dire straits. The men who had a little money got their supplies and caught no fish, and this year they have no money to start the fishery. That is the condition of affairs in the fisheries.

We on this side of the House are supposed to be the "blue bloods." We are supposed to be the merchants' party. We have not the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union in our party, and there are several other fish merchants who are not in our party, but we are supposed to be the merchants' party; so now let us consider what happened to the merchants party last year. The market broke on them and they lost considerable money, with the result that today they are limiting supplies and what is more, good accounts are limited. There is a very serious curtailment in giving out supplies even to men whose honesty and integrity and standing were always unquestioned.

That is the condition that exists today, and I bring this matter up so that the House can consider what is going to happen if that matter which

is foreshadowed continues, and what is the remedy. There are certain aspects of this situation that I think every member should agree to. First, the Government should not guarantee supplies if it can be avoided at all; if the Government guarantees supplies it will surely result in a tragedy of the worst kind. I am absolutely against it. I think that it is only justified under conditions diver than those that exist today and I hope that the Government will not be pressed to that extent, and I further hope that the Government will not guarantee the price of fish.

These guarantees cost the Government a very substantial sum of money, which we can ill afford, and this should be only brought about by conditions of very grave nature if the Government guarantees supplies or the price of fish. I take it that members of this House can speak on these subjects mainly in connection with those districts which they are familiar with. If the Government does not do something about this matter they will have to do something the way of dole and this will cost a very large sum of money.

I discussed this matter with the Relieving Officers, several small merchants and the fishermen of my district, and in one settlement with people not directly interested at all, and the uniform advice is that they said that if you give the fishermen, now, three weeks work on the Highroads or Marine Works you will get some results. They would get, roughly, \$50.00 each, at \$2.50 per day. With this \$50.00 they could get \$100.00 worth of supplies; they would get \$50.00 credit. If this is not done they will get no credit at all, and it must be done promptly or it will be too late. That is the only solution I see before me. This would cost, in my

district, \$40,000.00. If you don't spend \$40,000.00 in this way in the next few weeks, you will have to spend \$40,000.00 later on in relief.

Whether those conditions exist in other districts I don't know, but I realize that this is a matter of great importance and urgency. If this matter is let slide until ten days or a fortnight before the fishery starts it will be too late, because you won't be able to get your organization ready to deal with it in time. I pledge my word that it is the only solution I see in my district. The small outport merchants who supply the men for the fishery say that if the men have \$50.00 they will get \$50.00 credit; the members know what that means. It means that they will be fully supplied; but if the men come to these merchants with nothing, they will get nothing, because the St. John's merchants will give these outport merchants nothing.

This is a matter, as I said before, and I make no apology for repeating it so often, of extreme urgency and grave importance, and I say that if it is not dealt with at once it will be too late. What is the Government going to do about it? I think that the Government should make some declaration as to what they intend to do for the coming season, and, if at all possible, to avoid guaranteeing supplies or the price of fish which will only cost the country a good deal of money which we can ill afford.

There is just another matter that I would like to mention prior to the motion of adjournment on this point, and that is, that I am speaking on this matter not as the spokesman of the Opposition party, but on my own, in a purely personal capacity. I may have mentioned this matter casually to the members of this side of the House, but if there is any other aspect of this question to be raised by mem-

bers of either the Government or the Opposition they should be referred to me personally.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.— Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur with the remarks made by the honorable member for Placentia East in his discussion of this matter and I wish to say that I think that a matter of this importance should be kept away from party politics and be discussed with impartiality. I think that through all the dark clouds I see a ray of light, and that is in the form of the Fishery Report. In Norway the catch up to date is only 60 per cent of last year. The Icelandic report shows their catch very short of last year, while the report from Lunenburg shows the catch at only 50 per cent of last year. If the ordinary law of supply and demand is to apply the coming year ought to be a good one in this country, as our catch of fish should be a small one, but the merchants ought to be able to market it at a price that would be favorable and remunerative to the fishermen, merchants and the country in general.

As I have said in this House before, Newfoundland is invariably the last country of the world to suffer hard times and the first to feel the beneficial results of good times. The problem to be faced at the present moment is that of getting the men supplied for the fishery, and it is beyond me how it is to be done. But one thing is certain and that is, to catch fish men must be able to get their gear in the water. I want to assure the Prime Minister that anything the members on this side of the House can do to help relieve the situation they will be only too glad to do.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, the problem so brought up by the honorable member for Pla-

centia East and by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is one that has been engaging the attention of the members of this Chamber for the past three weeks and has been looked upon as a matter not merely affecting us as members of this House, but as representatives of districts where the fishery is the sole support of the inhabitants. I wish to thank the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Placentia East for the manner in which they have expressed themselves concerning this all-important subject. During the discussions on this matter it was found that it was one that had to be gone into from many angles and one that required deep consideration as no two districts were similarly situated, and what, for example, might be admirably suitable for Mr. Emerson's district of Placentia East might not be at all suitable for the district of White Bay. I heartily agree and concur with the remarks made by the honorable gentlemen regarding their attitude towards the guaranteeing of supplies and the guaranteeing of the price of fish, and I think that extreme hesitancy should be applied before such a step is taken. Newfoundland has had experiences of this before and in many cases though the supplies were given and received in absolute good faith the people were unable, through poor fisheries, to pay for the supplies and the whole matter was generally unsatisfactory to the fishermen, merchants and government, and I feel that this should only be resorted to as a last effort. The suggestion as offered by Mr. Emerson was an admirable one for one section of the country, but might not be at all applicable to other sections.

I feel that the question of outfitting and supplying for the fishery is one that should be kept out of party politics and the policy should be that the welfare of the people is not a matter

for Liberals or Tories, for Government or Opposition, but one that should have the united efforts of all to help solve the problem.

It was only this morning that I had a lengthy conference with members of the party on the same subject and I want, on behalf of this chamber, to thank the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Emerson for the manner in which they dealt with a subject that is at present engaging the attention of the Ministers of the Government.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate business I wish to withdraw my motion for adjournment.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon the Prime Minister, the Bill "An Act Respecting the Enforcement of Arbitral Awards," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. Greene, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to a Contract for Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BROWN.—Mr Chairman, as the boat does not carry a searchlight, I

move that a clause be inserted in the Bill to have the steamer equipped with a searchlight, which would be a protection for the ship and particularly for the passengers in thick and foggy weather.

MR. GREENE.—Mr. Chairman. I beg to support the suggestion of the honorable member for Twillingate.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if anything has been done with respect to providing the steamer with a wireless set?

HON. MR. LEWIS.—No; it is not considered necessary.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill 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 Mr. Greene, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to a Contract for Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay" 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. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An

Act for the Prevention of Fraud in Connection with the Sale of Securities," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 21 George V, Chapter 14 (Summary Jurisdiction Act 1930), without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V, Chapter 3, entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company'" with some amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time and, with unanimous consent, 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 passed without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 22, 1931.

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

MR. GREENE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Beach Hill, East End, and front sections of Bell Island, concerning a lane known as Squires Lane, that same be turned into a proper highroad. This road leads to the agricultural part of the Island, and it is essential that there be made there a road that would be suitable for traffic that necessarily passes over it. In past years the Highroads Commission has had control of the other roads on Bell Island, and this spring the Highroads engineer examined this road and approved of the recommendation that this road should be taken over by the Highroads Commission. I therefore ask that this petition be received by the House and be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of my honorable friend from St. Mary's, Mr. Bindon, I beg to present a petition from the people of South East Arm, Placentia, asking that provision be made for a ferry service from South East to Placentia on Sundays and holydays. This petition is signed by practically everybody in that place and I ask that the Government make some arrangement whereby the ferry boat may go up at the necessary times so that the people may attend services. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. BINDON.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this petition introduced by my honorable friend, the member for Placentia East, Mr. Emerson. In the old contract a clause was put in whereby the boat would call at Dunville and bring the people to church, and it was found impossible to call at South East Arm. It now appears that a man can be got at South East who will undertake this service for \$100.00

for the season, and this would be a very good idea. As things are now the people have to travel five miles to and from church and they are not able to afford carriages or motor cars. I often saw them tramping down there, and it is a great hardship in summer. These people are kicking because Dunville was included and they were left out. I have great pleasure, Sir, in giving this petition my heartiest support.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, before we leave this Order I would like to interrogate the Colonial Secretary, with your permission, Sir, and draw his attention to question No. 122, which he has not answered yet. I notice that in regard to this amount of \$125,400.00 there is a discrepancy of \$17,000.00. I would like to ask him to ascertain whether that amount is still on hand and is still unspent.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I will have the answer prepared.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Criminal Law."

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Hon. the Leader of the Opposition 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. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, in order that I may present thereto the annual review of the public finances of Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, in rising to perform the duty of presenting this, my third, Budget Speech, it is my pleasing privilege to be able to congratulate the Legislature and the people of the country generally upon the unexampled condition of prosperity which our Colony enjoyed during the fiscal year 1929-30.

When twelve months ago I presented my second Budget it was my fortunate position to invite you to rejoice in the fact that the fiscal year 1929-30 would show the accounts of the Colony squared and a small surplus shown to our credit. My forecast at that period has not only been attained, but, it is gratifying to know

that the Revenue of the Colony for that fiscal year was the largest in the history of Responsible Government.

The Budget, as heretofore, is divided into three periods. Firstly, the period which ended on June 30, 1930; secondly, the period which will end on June 30th, 1931, or what we term the current year; and thirdly, the prospects for the year 1931-32.

Let us take each fiscal period consecutively.

I, therefore, first present to you the results in the form of Revenue and Expenditure concerning the year which ended on June 30th, 1930. That year's business, when the accounts were closed on June 30th last, disclosed to the public the following actual condition:

Estimated Revenue	\$ 11,470,544.41
Actual Revenue	11,579,214.96
 Excess of Estimate	\$ 108,670.55

Estimated Expenditure....	\$ 11,461,773.15
Actual Expenditure	11,434,312.95

Expenditure under Es-	
timate	\$ 27,460.20

You will recollect that in my last Budget Speech I estimated a Surplus of \$8,771.26, therefore, by adding the increase in Revenue of \$108,670.55 plus the decrease in expenditure of \$27,460.20 to that estimated surplus, the result is a surplus of \$144,902.01, or an increase in surplus over the estimate of \$136,130.75.

I introduce herewith a comparative statement showing the Revenue and Expenditure as estimated for the fiscal year, which ended on June 30, 1930, and as the actual facts were when the year closed:

REVENUE.

Revenue Resources	Budget Estimate	Actual Revenue	Over	Under
Customs	\$ 8,868,339.25	\$ 8,834,843.11	\$33,496.41
Postal	415,137.35	410,739.40	4,397.95
Telegraphs	195,822.26	204,497.37	8,675.11
Inland Revenue Stamps..	72,531.60	75,354.95	2,823.35
Crown Lands	124,877.28	124,279.69	597.59
Liquor Profits	359,000.00	359,000.00
Fines & Forfeitures	8,361.01	8,737.53	376.52
Int. Guaranteed Loans	76,735.43	76,891.08	155.65
Broom Department	2,161.69	2,123.80	37.89
Taxes and Assessments...	68,000.00	64,102.28	3,897.72
Fees Public Institutions..	66,915.66	60,450.95	6,464.71
Death Duties	120,000.00	113,268.45	6,731.55
Income and Other Taxes	660,906.18	812,758.57	151,852.39
Miscellaneous	431,756.43	432,167.73	411.35
	 \$11,470,544.41	 \$11,579,214.96	 \$164,294.37	 \$55,623.82
		 11,470,544.41	 55,623.82	
Net over Estimate	 \$ 108,670.55	 \$108,670.55	

EXPENDITURE.

	Budget Estimate	Actual Expenditure	Over	Under
Finance	\$ 4,796,182.44	\$ 4,718,950.89	\$ 77,231.55
Colonial Secretary	195,033.00	192,187.89	2,845.11
Justice	386,195.00	383,003.91	3,191.09
Marine & Fisheries	485,165.89	487,461.99	2,296.10
Agriculture & Mines	180,524.66	164,561.15	15,963.51
Public Works	1,033,249.33	1,000,679.48	32,569.85
Customs	667,592.50	681,679.00	14,086.50
Assessors	15,120.00	12,310.38	2,809.62
Pension Commissioners...	646,802.00	633,832.98	12,969.02
Education	999,535.03	999,313.85	221.18
Public Charities	323,911.05	437,156.14	113,245.09
Public Health	313,969.53	318,966.85	4,997.32
Posts & Telegraphs	1,418,492.72	1,404,208.44	14,284.28
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$11,461,773.15	\$11,434,312.95	\$134,625.01	\$162,085.21
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Net Under Estimate	\$ 27,460.20	\$ 27,460.20
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Estimated Revenue	\$11,470,544.41
Estimated Expenditure	11,461,773.15
	<hr/>
Estimated Surplus	\$ 8,771.26
	<hr/>
Actual Revenue Received.....	\$11,579,214.96
Actual Expenditure Incurred	11,434,312.95
	<hr/>
Actual Surplus	\$ 144,902.01
	<hr/>
Actual Surplus over Estimated Surplus	\$ 136,130.75
	<hr/>

Comparing the results with this fiscal year with that of the previous fiscal year, the following is shown:

Total Revenue 1928-29	\$10,025,649.06
Total Revenue 1929-30	11,579,214.96
	<hr/>
Revenue Increase for 1929-30.....	\$ 1,553,565.90
	<hr/>
Total Expenditure for 1928-29.....	\$11,132,822.43
Total Expenditure for 1929-30.....	11,434,312.05
	<hr/>
Expenditure Increase for 1929-30.....	\$ 301,490.52
	<hr/>

Statistical tables have been distributed to members, and details are given of these and other financial statements relative to the fiscal year 1929-30 to which I purpose to allude. These tables will form part of the Appendix to the printed Budget.

I would like to point out that the total Revenue collected during the fiscal year, which ended on June 30th last, is the largest in the history of the Colony's business and I give herewith statement of total Revenue collected each year for the past ten years.

1920-21	\$ 8,438,040
1921-22	8,269,681
1922-23	8,876,773
1923-24	8,401,669
1924-25	9,783,188
1925-26	9,752,551
1926-27	8,932,436
1927-28	9,466,006
1928-29	10,025,649
1929-30	11,579,214

You will note that the total Revenue collected for the fiscal year 1928-29 amounted to \$10,025,649 and I purpose to explain briefly how it was possible to collect an additional one and a half million dollars, in round figures, during the fiscal year 1929-30.

1. You are aware that when the present Administration assumed office in November, 1928, that it immediately reduced taxation on lines and twines, butterine, tobacco and ready made clothing. Under ordinary circumstances this would mean a reduction in Revenue of approximately \$300,000 but our experience has been that by a reduction in prices more purchases were made, with a result that more goods were imported and as values had not declined, considerable increase in revenue was realized.

2. The present Administration is also responsible for the reimposition of the Income Tax Act, which became effective on January 1st, 1929. It is gratifying to learn that the amount of \$812,758.57 was collected from this source and is the largest amount ever collected through such an avenue of revenue in the history of the affairs of the country.

3. No royalties had been collected on the iron ore exported from Wabana for many years. The present Government immediately grappled with the situation and through its efforts secured a royalty of ten cents per ton on the first million tons exported, and three cents per ton on the next 500,000 tons. Thus, by this process \$115,000 annually was added to the Customs Revenue of the Colony.

4. For many years, outstanding amounts had been due the Exchequer, which had been overlooked, and in some instances forgotten, but immediately the present Administration came into office, the necessary steps were taken to collect these amounts which resulted in over \$350,000, in round figures, being further added to the credit of our Exchequer Account.

The explanations as given above fully covers the increase of one and a half million dollars revenue collected during the past fiscal year, but, it must be remembered that at least \$500,000 of this amount cannot be collected again.

In addition to the above explanations, we must not forget the fact that the fishery, which is undoubtedly the principal industry of our country, contributed handsomely to the fishermen during the year 1929. Prices paid for this commodity were specially high with a result that the purchasing power of the fishermen was enhanced

and this reflected on the current year's operations in the form of large expenditures being made by the people for goods, which had to be imported and duty paid on them. It is questionable whether prices for our staple industry will reach such proportions in the very near future, therefore, special efforts must be made regarding the further development of the fishing industry generally throughout the country. I shall deal further with this

phase of the situation later on in my Speech.

It will be of interest to the members of this Committee as well as to the country generally to know the value of the various industrial centres of the Colony, and for that purpose I enumerate for the fiscal year 1929-30, the exports of Grand Falls, Buchans, Corner Brook and Bell Island; also the Customs Revenue collected at each of these ports for the same period.

Exports.

Port	Material	Tons	Value
Grand Falls	Paper	100,926	\$ 6,834,778.00
Buchans	Ore Concentrates	79,664	2,436,311.00
Corner Brook	Paper	148,611	9,122,974.00
Bell Island	Iron Ore	1,644,708	4,539,391.00
			\$22,933,454.00

Customs Revenue (all Sources).

Grand Falls	\$296,912.43
Buchans	90,901.22
Corner Brook	457,814.31
Bell Island	263,083.14

It is also gratifying to know that for the same fiscal period the total trade of the Colony exceeded in value the total trade for any year during the past ten fiscal years and I give here-with the approximate figures covering the periods mentioned:

1922-23

Imports	\$19,300,000
Exports	21,000,000
	\$40,300,000

1923-24

Imports	\$27,700,000
Exports	21,000,000
	\$48,700,000

1924-25

Imports	\$36,400,000
Exports	23,600,000
	\$60,000,000

1920-21

Imports	\$29,000,000
Exports	22,500,000
	\$51,500,000

1921-22

Imports	\$18,200,000
Exports	19,500,000
	\$37,700,000

1925-26	
Imports	\$27,550,000
Exports	27,560,000

	\$56,110,000

1926-27	
Imports	\$25,850,000
Exports	30,850,000

	\$56,700,000

1927-28	
Imports	\$27,650,000
Exports	33,650,000

	\$61,300,000

1928-29	
Imports	\$29,250,000
Exports	36,800,000

	\$66,050,000

1929-30	
Imports	\$31,900,000
Exports	40,000,000

	\$71,900,000

RAILWAY

In my first Budget Speech I dealt most minutely with the Newfoundland Railway since its inception in the country. At that time I pointed out that the railway system in this country represented a capital expenditure of approximately \$41,500,000, in round figures, being the actual cost to the

taxpayers up to that time. Since that period, however, approximately \$4,000,000 have been further expended on the railway for re-railing, purchase of new locomotives, railway cars and other capital expenditure, thus bringing our investment in railway affairs up to \$45,500,000 to date.

During the fiscal year 1929-30 a sum aggregating, in round figures, one and a half million dollars, was expended on the system, \$387,000 of this amount being the deficit on current account for the fiscal year 1928-29, the balance being expended to complete the re-railing of the division between Bishop's Falls and Humbermouth, the purchasing of two new locomotives, the buying of steel for the construction of the new machine shops; the material for the construction of Crabbe's Bridge and the purchase of two new sleepers and one diner.

The number of miles of railroad operated in Newfoundland, including all branches, total 907 miles. The fiscal year 1929-30 showed the earnings of the railway at \$3,714,606.18 and the expenses covering the operation of the system as \$4,095,100.15, leaving a deficit on the whole transportation system of \$380,493.97 against a deficit for the previous year of \$387,617.16. It will be interesting information for this Committee and the country generally to know the cost of the various branch railways to the Colony, and I herewith submit statement as follows, covering the fiscal year 1929-30:—

	Total Earnings	Total Expenses	Total Loss
Trepassey	\$ 43,879.63	\$ 90,758.69	\$ 46,879.06
Bay de Verde	37,278.97	66,623.12	29,334.15
Heart's Content	32,119.97	55,511.50	23,391.53
Bonavista	67,018.77	136,111.27	69,092.50
	_____	_____	_____
	\$180,297.34	\$349,004.58	\$168,707.24
	_____	_____	_____

It will be seen from this statement that the total loss on the four branch railways amounted to \$168,707.24. The total loss on the operation of the whole system, exclusive of steamships, dock shops and dry dock, amounted to \$519,391.38; this, it will be seen that with the exception of the branch lines the balance of the railway system showed a loss of \$350,684.14. The operation of the steamers on the various coastal routes throughout the country showed a profit of \$89,674.11; the dock shops a profit of \$19,814.47, and the Dry Dock a profit of \$29,408.83.

During the fiscal year 1929-30 the number of miles run by all trains aggregate well over a million miles. The cost for operation was \$2.24 per mile against \$2.30 for the previous year, and the revenue per mile run was \$1.81 as against \$1.79 per mile the previous year. 220,562 passengers were carried during the year 1929-30 as against 222,265 the previous year. The total number of employees throughout the railway system was 2,658 who were paid in salaries \$2,476,107.07; and the number of tons of coal used for the operation of the entire system was 75,711. The net result of all operations for the fiscal year was the best for the last five years, and this result was accomplished in face of extraordinary expenses which amounted to approximately \$80,000, principally made up of snow fighting, special repairs to the "Caribou," repairs to the bridge at Crabbes and special repairs to the "Portia." The freight revenue of \$1,156,665 for the year exceeded any previous year in the history of the railway, and the cost per ton of moving freight was the lowest since the war years. During the same period 8100 tons of paper were moved from Grand Falls to Heart's Content and 7710 from Corner Brook to Port aux Basques.

I think these are the main items which may be of interest to all of us, regarding the operations of our transportation system, and I would like to point out for the information of all concerned the actual cost to the Exchequer for the operation of our railway system, steamships and dock.

To begin with, as previously stated, the railway system, steamers and dock represents \$45,500,000 capital expenditure. Interest on this amount at 5% annually aggregates \$2,275,000; subsidies paid by the Exchequer to the railway for steamers and the carrying of mails, etc., by the railway aggregates \$460,000. Add a deficit of, say, \$380,000 to these two amounts and we arrive at the stupendous sum of \$3,115,000 annually as the cost of our transportation system, exclusive of another \$60,000 being paid to various corporations for small steamships operated in various parts of the country. Thus we find that the entire transportation system of the Colony costs the taxpayers of the country, in round figures, \$3,175,000 dollars annually.

It is gratifying to see however, that during the past five years the deficits have been gradually decreasing and whilst for the immediate present it may be too much to look forward to the balancing of our railway accounts on ordinary current operations, principally due, in my opinion, to the present doubtful commercial conditions which exist in our own country and are similar in a smaller degree to those existing in practically every country of the world, I feel confident that within the next three or four years we can view with optimism the balancing of our railway accounts for ordinary current obligations.

Table 7 in the Appendix of this Budget will give comparative statements of the earnings of the railway for the year 1928-29 and 1929-30.

Table 8 will give similar statistics regarding the operations of the various steamships owned and operated by the railway system.

In my Budget Speech of twelve months ago I intimated to the Legislature that such an important Department as the railway should have a representative in the House. At the present time a railway commission together with a General Manager are the only medium through which any information can be obtained regarding the operations of the railway system together with the expenditure of all funds. I hold that under the circumstances which exist, namely, that this Department handles \$8,000,000 annually, that the salaries paid to the officials and employees, amount to over \$2,000,000, that a General Head should be appointed who would be responsible to the Legislature and to the people of the country; that regular Estimates should be submitted annually to the Legislature for its consideration, similar to the regular Estimates which are submitted each year, covering salaries and expenditure on current account of the Colony.

I now turn to the current year. At the last session of the Legislature, Estimates were presented and approved for a total sum of \$11,363,139.86, and an Estimate of Revenue was presented in my budget speech, delivered on July 3rd, 1930, for \$11,389,500. When these Estimates were presented, particularly the Estimate of Revenue, the depression which now exists and has been existing throughout the world was not in evidence, and consequently this Revenue was based on the figures established by the Revenue which had been collected for the previous year 1929-30. It is regrettable, however, that this Estimate of Revenue will not be maintained,

and numerous reasons can be produced explaining the deficiency.

To begin with, let us make a comparison of the fishery, and when I say the fishery, I mean all branches of the fishery, particularly the codfishery, which is, undoubtedly, the staple industry of our country. During the calendar year 1929 the total catch of shore fish was approximately 1,000,000 quintals; which returned to the fisherman an average of \$9.00 per quintal, or \$9,000,000 in cash. For the same period the Labrador Fishery aggregated 250,000 quintals at \$5.00 per quintal, or \$1,250,000. It is therefore seen that the total amount of money paid to our fishermen for the production of the codfishery totalled \$10,250,000. This amount of money was distributed amongst the fishermen during the year 1929 with a consequent result that the spending of the greater portion of this money reflected on the Revenue for the fiscal year 1929-30.

Now let us make a comparison of the earnings in the same direction for the production of the codfishery for the calendar year 1930 and what do we find? We find the shore fishery producing approximately 900,000 quintals of codfish at an average price of \$5.00 per quintal, or \$4,500,000. The Labrador fishery produced 350,000 quintals at an average price of, at the most, \$3.00 per quintal, or \$1,050,000; consequently, the total value of the production in cash to the fishermen for the calendar year 1930 amounted to \$5,550,000, or in round figures, \$5,000,000 less than the same quantity of fish realized to the fishermen for the previous year. It is only natural for us to expect a consequent reduction in Revenue collected through the avenue of the Customs, because of the reduction in the earning power of the fishermen during that period. In sections of the country, particularly the South

and West Coast, the codfishery was a blank. The Bank Fishery for 1930 amounted to 86,000 quintals as against 106,000 for the previous year.

The shortage of the bank fishery is due in no small measure to lack of bait. The season just passed was one of unusual conditions throughout the length and breadth of the country with regard to bait facilities, and it is questionable if again in our history a repetition of this nature is likely to occur. The question of price is one which the law of supply and demand governs. The markets for our staple industry are principally in the South American countries and in the Mediterranean. These markets have been considerably disturbed during the past twelve months owing chiefly to internal troubles which have had a distressing effect on the purchasing power of their people. On the other hand whilst the price of codfish has been considerably lower than in previous years, this is not the only attributable factor to the reduction in the Customs Revenue for the present year.

The over-production of the world generally has caused prices on goods and commodities to decline more than 30%. As the Newfoundland Tariff is placed on goods on an ad valorem basis, the result is that considerable reduction in duty is effected because of the decline in the prices of commodities abroad.

The sealfishery for the calendar year 1930 contributed considerably to the earning power of the people engaged, and comparing the result with the calendar year 1929 we find that for 1930, 241,236 seals were manufactured against 201,856 for the year 1929. A similar state of affairs exists in this industry as in the codfishery. The price of seal oil and furs has declined at least 30%, and at the present

time considerable of the product of the 1930 catch is still in the hands of the operators, with a result that the optimism we felt twelve months ago has not been realized.

The same thing applies in practically every other branch of the fishery: the herring fishery, the salmon fishery, the lobster industry and the whaling industry. All these activities have suffered in the general worldwide depression, to such an extent that we should congratulate ourselves on the fact that our Revenue has declined in less proportion than possibly most other countries under similar circumstances.

I therefore estimate the Expenditure for the current year 1930-31 at \$11,895,100 under the headings as follows:—

Finance	\$ 4,973,300
Colonial Secretary	234,900
Public Charities	325,900
Public Health	341,000
Justice	406,000
Education	1,025,500
Marine & Fisheries.....	504,100
Agriculture & Mines....	197,300
Public Works	1,030,500
Posts	1,536,500
Customs	664,500
Assessors	15,100
Pension Commissioners	640,500

	\$11,895,100

The Committee undoubtedly will notice that in my last Budget Speech I estimated an expenditure of \$11,363,-139, and that therefore an over-expenditure of \$500,000 in round figures, is anticipated. There are various reasons for this over-expenditure, but the principal reason lies in the unquestionable fact that during the past six months many of our people throughout the country have had to be

provided for through the avenue of the Treasury, because the earnings of the fishery and other activities during the year 1930 were not sufficient to supply their needs, and I, therefore, give you a comparative statement of expenditure under the heading of "Able-bodied Relief," during the past five years:

1925-26	\$100,000.00
1926-27	168,827.00
1927-28	261,591.00
1928-29	128,706.00
1929-30	119,702.00

You will notice that for the fiscal year 1929-30 \$119,702.00 was spent in this direction, whilst I anticipate an expenditure for the year 1930-31 of at least \$250,000.00.

In my Budget Speech twelve months ago I pointed out that the Estimates which had been passed by the Legislature were given as an irreducible minimum, but, at the same time I felt that it would be necessary for that expenditure to be incurred in order to carry on the public service.

I now give herewith an approximate Estimate of the Revenue expected under the various headings for the current year:

REVENUE

Customs	\$ 7,650,000
Postal	400,000
Telegraphs	200,000
Inland Revenue Stamps	72,500
Crown Lands	110,000
Liquor	400,000
Fines and Forfeitures....	5,000
Int. Guaranteed Loan....	76,000
Broom Department	2,000
Taxes and Assessments	65,000
Fees Public Institutions	65,000
Death Duties	30,000

Income on Taxes.....	650,000
Miscellaneous	200,000

	\$ 9,920,500
Estimated Expenditure	11,895,100

Estimated Deficit	\$ 1,974,600

It will be seen from these two Estimates that I forecast a deficit at the end of the current year of \$1,974,600 on current account. There has been no attempt made by me to cover in any way, shape or form the financial condition on current account which confronts the Legislature and the people of the country generally at the present time. These figures speak for themselves and are incontrovertible evidence that steps must be taken in order to reduce our expenditure in every possible direction so that we may be able to bring such an expenditure down to the level where the Revenue collected will be sufficient to defray the expenses on current account.

I now propose to deal with the railway department for the current year 1930-31, and in doing so I would like to point out to the country the serious condition of this branch of the public service. During the fiscal year 1929-30 a deficit of \$380,000 in round figures, was shown on current account of the railway. Under the present system and management of railway affairs it is impossible to get the actual state of business conditions as they exist in the railway service, inside of a period of three months. For the information of the country I herewith give a statement of the earnings and expenditure up to the end of December 1930. During the first six months of the fiscal year 1929-30 the railway on its operations made a loss of \$146,421.07. For the same period this year a loss was shown of \$205,-582.09. Covering the same period the

operations of the coastal boats showed a profit of \$151,549.99, whilst for the same period the current year, a profit of only \$53,821.99 is shown. The Dock Shops showed a profit of \$3,977.24 for the 1929-30 period, whilst during the 1930-31 period they showed a loss of \$15,604.83. The Dry Dock showed a profit of \$12,768.96 during the 1929 period, but for the 1930-31 period a profit of only \$4,562.54 is shown, with the result that combining all the operations we find that for the period from July 1st to December 1st, 1929, a profit of \$21,875.12 is found, whilst for the same period the current year, a loss of \$162,802.39 is shown. In other words, a total decline of business amounting to \$184,700, in round figures, for the first six months of the present fiscal year, as compared with the same period 1929-30.

In addition to these losses, which I have conclusively shown, there is an amount of approximately \$140,000 owed to the Railway Department and shown on the railway books as an asset since the year 1926-27. This amount of indebtedness was incurred by the previous Government, in various ways, and as an illustration, I would point out that for the transportation of lumbermen as well as transporting men to work on the Buchans Diversion, during the year 1928 (which, incidentally, was an election year,) \$28,000 is charged up. Steamers were hired during the years 1926-27-28 for the purpose of carrying fishermen to the Labrador and authority was given by Minute of Council to the effect that the Government would accept the liability, but, up to the present time, these amounts have not been paid. It is imperative that this matter be adjusted and I estimate that \$140,000 will cover these deficiencies. In addition to this \$140,000, I foreshadow a further deficit on current ac-

count of \$600,000, or a total of \$750,000, in round figures, to be found by the Treasury of the Colony on June 30th, 1931, to pay the deficits on the operation of our railway and transportation systems. The reason for the decline in railway earnings and a consequent increase in deficits for the current year is obvious. Freight and passenger traffic, during the past eight months, have declined in the vicinity of 20%, due principally to the economic conditions prevalent throughout the country, and such cannot be changed until business generally readjusts itself.

In addition to the decline in business already mentioned, we must not forget that on August 10th, 1930, the S. S. "Caribou," which forms the connecting link between Canada and Newfoundland across the Cabot Strait, struck Green Island, west of Channel Head, in trying to make Port aux Basques in foggy weather. Under ordinary circumstances which exist on this part of the coast, it would have been impossible to refloat the ship but weather conditions were ideal for salvage operations which resulted in the "Caribou" being refloated and towed to St. John's by the wrecking tug, "Reindeer" of Halifax. The marine insurance policy covering this ship was only effective for total loss, consequently, the ship has to be repaired at Government expense and I estimate the cost to the Government will be \$100,000.00.

Another matter of interest to the Committee is the decline in the value of the product of Buchans Mine. You will note from the Appendix of this Budget that the exports of concentrates from Buchans during the calendar year 1930 decreased approximately 9,000 tons. At the present time this mine is not curtailing its output and

it will be of interest to note that during the year 1929, 163,114 tons were produced at a valuation of, in round figures, \$2,000,000 whilst the output for 1930 was 186,299 tons, valued at \$950,000. These figures may sound alarming but I would like to point out for the benefit of the Committee that the price of metal zinc during the year 1928 was £30 sterling, whilst today the same metal is selling at £11 10s, and furthermore, that the pre-war price on the same commodity was £20 sterling. In addition, lead was sold in 1928 for £26 sterling, whilst it is disposed of today at £13 sterling and its pre-war price was £15 sterling.

The paper mills at both Corner Brook and Grand Falls increased their exports during the year and by reference to the Appendix of this Budget you will notice that Corner Brook increased its output by 7,000 tons whilst at the same time the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd., at Grand Falls increased its production by 16,000 tons. The Company operating the mills at Grand Falls during the past nine months have considerably improved and extended their plant, with a result that this pioneer paper industry of Newfoundland can now work its output up to almost 400 tons daily.

The iron ore mines at Bell Island declined slightly during the past twelve months, due principally to two factors. Firstly, the steel market in North America was not what it might be, and secondly, the market in Europe has declined considerably during the past few months, and the operators of this valuable iron ore deposits are at present somewhat pessimistic with regard to the coming season's operations. It is to be hoped, however, that a readjustment of the steel industry, along economic lines, both in Europe and Canada, shall produce a

good effect on the operations at Bell Island the coming year.

Before closing my references with regard to the business of the 1930-31 period, I would like to give the Committee, and the country as a whole, some information with regard to the construction of the highroads and the cost thereof to the Colony since the origination of the Highroads policy by the Monroe Administration in 1925.

Up to December 31, 1930, 1,081 miles of highroads and second class roads have been constructed and repaired at a cost of \$4,216,796.65. For the same period, 120 concrete bridges were constructed which cost \$393,498.30; five wooden bridges were built and other bridges repaired at a cost of \$17,826.39. This brings the total expenditure for both roads and bridges up to \$4,628,121.34. All this money was spent on capital account and in addition \$500,-899.19 had to be taken from the Loan Account to help maintain these roads, therefore, the total cost of Highroads, second class roads, construction of concrete and wooden bridges up to December 31st, 1930, aggregated \$5,129,020.53. Against this expenditure a net Revenue, collected for fees on cars and licenses for the same period, amounted to \$224,809.76. In other words, for a period of five years the average cost of the Highroads policy of the country amounted to over \$1,000,000 annually, whereas, the Revenue collected has netted the Highroads Commission \$50,000 per year. True, a great number of cars were imported into the country, with a result that the Revenue thereon found its way into the Treasury of the Colony, via the Customs Department, but, under present conditions and circumstances we cannot expect a continuation of a similar amount of Revenue for the next few years, with a result that the upkeep of these Highroads

will cost considerable money which will have to be taken from Loan Account, or otherwise charged up to ordinary expenditure through the Avenue of the Estimates. I estimate that the maintaining of these roads, now constructed, in good condition without further extension will cost at least \$100,000 per year in addition to the Revenue collected for fees on cars and licenses.

I have covered fairly accurately, and I think in every detail, the commercial activities of the country during the past twelve months, and whilst the picture I have painted may be somewhat gloomy, it will be gratifying to find by referring to Table 12 in the Appendix of this Budget, that on December 31st, 1930, the people of Newfoundland had deposited to their credit in the various banking institutions in the Colony \$26,233,817, as compared with \$26,246,004 on December 31st, 1929. It will be seen that a decline in savings of \$12,000 is shown, but, on reference to the table showing the life insurance carried by our people, it will be found that this form of investment has increased by \$4,000,000, being extra protection and the premiums thereon are a further form of saving. I estimate that the increase in life insurance carried by the people of Newfoundland represents a cash payment in premiums of approximately \$100,000, therefore, it can be seen that instead of a decline in

our savings of \$12,000, these savings are being supplemented in another form, namely, life insurance, with a consequent result that an increase in savings is shown somewhere in the vicinity of \$90,000 over the previous year.

I now come to the Public Debt as it was on June 30th, 1930, and we find by referring to the Appendix of this Budget that the Public Debt on June 30th was \$82,592,105.59. In addition to this amount a loan of five million dollars, raised during the current year, has to be added which will bring the total amount up to \$87,600,000 in round figures. Add to this the estimated deficit of \$750,000 on the railway, and we find that on June 30th next, our National Debt will be raised to the substantial figure of \$90,315,000. It has been said in previous Budgets: "Where are we and whither tending," and I do not propose to make any further comment as I feel that it is unnecessary.

I would like to point out, however, that the Loan raised on the credit of the Colony during the present fiscal year was the most successful, as to returns, of any Loan raised in the history of the country, and to confirm my remarks I herewith give a statement showing the various prices obtained for the Loans, raised on the credit of the Colony during the past ten years.

Loan Act 1921	\$6,000,000.00	88.974 plus 11½ Ex.
1922	6,000,000.00	98.763
1923	3,500,000.00	(Cave) 96.78
Loan Act 1923	2,061,033.00	(Warren) No Record
1924-25	4,000,000.00	97.385
1924-25	2,000,000.00	97.49
1926	5,000,000.00	96 1/8
1927	5,000,000.00	98.513
1928	10,003,400.00	97.15

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY PROCEEDINGS

1929	6,000,000.00	96½
1930	2,500,000.00	99.318
1930	2,500,000.00	Par

I also wish to give the Committee, and through the medium of the Committee, the country as a whole an approximate analysis of the causes of our Public Debt. I have already stated that the Railway from its origin has cost the Colony in round figures \$45,000,000. In addition to this huge expenditure on capital account the Great War has cost the taxpayers of Newfoundland, up to the end of last year, \$34,500,000, which latter amount does not represent all capital outlay, but, does represent gratuities to returned soldiers and sailors plus Pensions. It will be seen, therefore, that the carrying out of our obligations in the War, together with the total of the Railway, makes a grand total of approximately \$80,000,000. Let us say, for argument's sake, that \$10,000,000 of this amount represents expenditure incurred during the past ten years on Soldiers' Pensions and re-establishment, (which amounts have been paid annually out of the Revenue of the Colony, and heretofore, not chargeable to Capital Account), and we find that the two major causes of our National Debt are responsible for \$70,000,000 outlay, consequently, we must infer that were it not for the construction of our Railway, which has cost us \$45,000,000 to date; and were it not for the outbreak of the War in 1914, the National Debt of Newfoundland today would be only \$20,000,000.

FISCAL YEAR 1931-32.

Before attempting to forecast the prospects for 1931-32, it would be well for us to make a brief survey of the economic conditions of the world in general, in order that we may more readily understand why the present

outlook, as to Revenue, is not so promising as in the previous year.

In all the great commercial nations of the world, the total volume of the purchasing power is ultimately limited by the amount of gold in their possession.

Commensurate with the increase of trade in the country, there is an increased elasticity in the purchasing power which permits an expansion of credit; there is, however, a legal limit to expansion. When this limit is reached the purchasing power does not increase in proportion to the trade. There is then a resultant lowering of prices as the only possible way in which to maintain trade. With a falling of prices, the momentary unit will buy more and more, gold then consequently flows in. With this influx of gold, credit is expanded and prices recover. It is then apparent that when an increase of trade is world wide there is a consequent falling of the price level so that gold cannot be attracted from one country to another, and stagnation results.

Two solutions may be offered to this problem: (a) An international agreement to lower the level gold ratio; (b) New discoveries of gold. Unless one of these solutions is forthcoming, a continued increase in world trade must eventually involve a further fall of prices. Business and industry become unprofitable, making it essential to reduce wages and overhead expenses. As it becomes less likely every year that new gold sources will be found, the danger of economic paralysis must be prevented by rigid economy of gold.

Four ways to end declining prices immediately offer themselves. These are, by increasing the demand of commodities; decreasing their supply; adding to the gold supply or decreasing the demand for gold.

The present depression is a result of over-production artificially induced by interference of governments with a normal law of supply and demand. In the United States and South America this began with coffee, spread to rubber and was eventually extended to wheat, resulting in a total collapse of these commodities, leaving a world market glutted, no stimulus in further production and consequent unemployment with poverty and all the horrors which follow poverty's wake.

An increase in the gold supply of sufficient magnitude to influence prices seems highly improbable. The only opportunity, therefore, for correcting the downward trend lies in decreasing the demand for gold. When we consider that the momentary gold stocks of France and the United States have increased by almost a billion dollars in the past two years, while the entire gold production of the world has amounted to less than nine hundred million, we immediately see that a draw on existing stocks elsewhere is constituted, particularly in such countries as Argentine and Brazil. This has been exemplified with a terrifying clarity in the unprecedented drop in the value of milreis. India, now on the gold standard, absorbs half of Africa's newly mined gold. In addition, various transactions, incident to payment of reparations and war debts, represent an increasingly heavy burden on the gold supply as world prices fall and the total value of world trade is diminished. With only fifty billions in exchange resulting from world trade in 1930, as against seventy-five billion

in 1929 almost 2% was required to pay war debts and reparations.

Accordingly, it is seen that with unemployment rife in various countries of the world, with over production in wheat and other commodities, with collapse of industries depending on governmental guarantees, a general dumping of materials into world markets has and will take place and no strengthening of exchange can be expected until trade is increased, not by subsidy but by supply and demand along a stream of moving gold. It is then but proper when forecasting the future of the country for the year 1931-32 that we become thoroughly cognisant with the world situation and not live in a "Fool's Paradise," when we are surrounded by the most unique event in the economic history of the world, an over-production of food, surrounding starving people; a tremendous surplus of money in France and the United States with no apparent outlet of investment market. With a summary before our mind, one can see that the prices will fall further with a resultant decrease in Revenue.

Another factor which is overlooked in our every day business life is that silver has fallen 35c an ounce from its former price of \$1.30. This means that the buying power of the Orient, has been reduced 70% which in itself creates an almost impassable barrier which must be surmounted before the period of depression is finished.

It is then seen that a state of depression, bordering on despair, exists throughout the economic world, and from the foregoing it becomes apparent that readjustment must of necessity be slow. Newfoundland then shares this general depression, not because of any internal reason, because her resources and industries are

sounder perhaps than the more competitive industries in larger countries. Our intrinsic value is greater perhaps than ever and owing to this stability, I feel sure that our next Loan will be raised at a more satisfactory figure than hitherto, because when business improves depression will be more quickly lifted from us than from less fortunately situated countries.

My forecast for 1931-32 is, under specific headings, the following:

Customs	\$ 7,750,000.00
Posts and Telegraphs	620,000.00
Crown Lands	115,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures	6,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps ..	65,000.00
Interest Guaranteed	
Loans	76,891.08
Brooms—Penitentiary	2,500.00
Taxes and Assessments ..	65,000.00
Fees—Institutions	60,000.00
Estate Duties	50,000.00
Liquor Sales	300,000.00
Income and other taxes ..	600,000.00
Miscellaneous	300,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,010,391.08
	<hr/>

We shall now turn to the estimated expenditure for the fiscal year under consideration. My estimates of expenditure are at present under consideration of the Committee and all necessary explanations will be given as the Debate on Supply proceeds. Under the specific heads of expenditure, enumerated as follows, we will require \$11,418,546.06:

Finance	\$ 5,202,431.08
Colonial Secretary	124,412.50
Public Charities	311,537.05
Public Health	325,674.00
Justice	387,857.75
Education	1,013,065.03
Marine and Fisheries	410,697.09
Agriculture and Mines	102,450.66
Public Works	943,675.50

Postal and Telegraphs	1,445,585.90
Customs	549,869.50
Assessor	15,840.00
Pension Commissioners ..	634,050.00
	<hr/>
	\$11,467,146.06
	<hr/>

The total amount represents the actual figures as presented to the House in the Book of Estimates. From these amounts must be deducted specific amounts on which no discount of 10% can be taken, as set forth in the Resolutions on Supply, consequently, the 10% reduction effects the expenditure included in the Estimates of \$5,532,007.30, therefore, we must deduct the amount of \$553,-200 from \$11,467,146.06 leaving a total estimated expenditure of \$10,913,946.-06. According to these figures an estimated deficit of \$903,554.98 is shown. In addition to this amount, however, we must look forward frankly to unforeseen expenditure, which of necessity will occur, and which has occurred in practically every fiscal year without exception, and I estimate an amount not in excess of \$500,000 to cover these disbursements, consequently, I look forward to the fiscal year 1931-32 presenting a deficit on Current Account of \$1,400,000 in round figures. These items, outlined in the Resolutions before the House on Supply, effect every branch of the Civil Service with the exception of the irreducible amounts, which approximate under heads, the following figures:

Interest on Public Debt	\$4,674,222.51
Military & Naval Pensions	619,500.00
Old Age Pensions	160,000.00
Civil Pensions	132,427.75
Relief for Poor	240,000.00
Hospital Grants	80,000.00
Customs Refunds	90,000.00
Coal and Water Refunds ..	73,700.00
	<hr/>
	\$6,069,850.26

The items shown above, cost us, in round figures, \$6,000,000 thus, it will be seen that the cost of operating the Civil Service, maintaining roads, bridges, subsidies, education, etc., must be approximately five millions four hundred thousand dollars.

Twelve months ago in my Budget Speech I pointed out that we could not go on indefinitely paying Railway Deficits and Highroads Deficits from Capital Account, and that they, sooner or later, would have to be paid from Current Revenue. I am still of the same opinion and feel that when economic conditions readjust themselves and our people concentrate more on production of a remunerative character that the maintenance of the Highroads will have to be paid from Current Account. The same applies to our railway transportation system, and whilst at the present time our chances of squaring our accounts on ordinary current operations do not look hopeful, I do not think the time is very far distant, that with development in the mineral and paper industries sufficient revenue will be found in the form of earnings, so that both sides of the railway account will be squared.

Can any further reduction be made, apart from those already effected, without dislocating the service generally? In my two previous Budgets I pointed out that the Public Service was already overmanned and that Governments had been pestered with a flood of applicants for Government jobs. Doubtless, many Government services are 'duplicated and the time is not far distant when such duplication will have to be eliminated.

I consider that the votes placed under the charge of the various departmental heads are sufficient to operate the public service for the next twelve

months. I ask the earnest co-operation of the several heads of the departments, together with the various representatives of the constituencies throughout the country to keep our expenditure within the votes. The responsibility for the management of these votes rests entirely with the departmental head. I feel sure, therefore, that I can look forward with hope to the earnest co-operation of each and every ministerial head, and his doing all possible in the way of economically handling of his department. Such actions and efforts will be to me, as Minister of Finance, of considerable patriotic assistance.

It is impossible at this juncture to forecast with any degree of accuracy the possibilities for the Railway system during the fiscal year 1931-32. I have given very minutely all details of expenditure in connection with this branch of the service, having in view the general reduction which is proposed to apply to this Department, as well as the fact that very little capital expenditure is required during the coming year. I feel confident that the ultimate financial situation of the Railway, Steamships and Dock on June 30th, 1932, will be considerably better than on June 30th, 1931.

Forming the Appendices of this report are statements relating to Revenue and Expenditure, Railway, Steamer Operations, Catch of Codfish, Imports and Exports, Trade Statistics, Savings Deposits, Exports of Iron Ore, Exports of Fish and Oil, Exports of Paper and Pulpwood and Seal Fishery, all of which offer interesting and instructive information to this Committee and the public generally. They are all self-explanatory.

In conclusion I wish to thank the members of this Committee for the

kind attention they have given me. A Budget Speech, consisting as it does to a large extent of figures, is apt to become monotonous. I have tried to convey to this Committee my ideas with regard to the trade and economic conditions of the Dominion and my views on the subject of its finances, in as

clear and concise as in me lay, and I trust that the information which I have given will be sufficient to enable this committee to arrive at a clear and full understanding of our financial position. I now beg leave to propose certain Resolutions amending the existing Revenue Act.

RESOLUTIONS.

To be submitted to a committee of the Whole House for the further amendment of the Revenue Act, 1925.

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The Act 15 George V., Chapter 34, entitled "The Revenue Act, 1925," as heretofore amended is hereby amended by inserting in Schedules A, B and D the following changes:

Schedule A.

- Item 55.—After the words "Fruit Pulp" add the words "Vegetable Pulp and Paste."
- Item 72.—Delete the words "20 cents per lb." whenever they occur in this Item and substitute the words "18 cents per lb."
- Item 124.—After the word "manufacturers" add the words "and Peat Moss as litter for poultry."
- Item 151.—Strike out ".01½c." and substitute ".01½c."
- Item 181.—After the word "Incubators" add "Special seamless Milk Cans including Strainers in use by farmers."
- Item 184.—Add after the word "Sutures" the word "Splints."
- Item 190.—Strike out "50 p.c." and substitute "40 p.c."
- Item 204(f)—After the word "kinds" add the following, "Miners' Diamonds and Diamond Set Bits for Diamond Drills."
- Item 258.—After the words "Toilet Paper" insert "Blotting Paper."
- Item 306(g)—After the words "printed upon," insert "Blotting Paper having any advertisement printed, lithographed, stamped or otherwise reproduced thereon or attached thereto."
- Item 315.—After the letters "N.E.S." add the words "Tins for the packing of Honey produced in Newfoundland."
- Item 335.—Add after the word "Schools" "Malleable pressed steel desk forms, when imported by manufacturers for use solely in the manufacture of School Desks."

Schedule B.

After Item 344 add an Item 344 (a) as follows:

No.	Goods	When subject to Drawback	Portion of duty (not including special duty or dumping duty) payable as drawback.

344 (a) Paper If actually printed upon in this Colony and when exported from this Colony and upon the production of a landing certificate from the foreign port at which it was landed.

Schedule D.

After Item 371 add an Item 371 (a) as follows:

371 (a)—Oleomargarine, Butterine or similar compounds when put up in metal containers per lb. .07

2. The changes in the several Items in the preceding Section set forth shall be held to have come into effect at and from the following dates:

Item 55 12th January, 1931, 9.30 a.m.
 Item 72 1st December, 1930, 9.30 a.m.
 Item 181 3rd January, 1931, 9.30 a.m.
 Item 190 1st October, 1930, 9.30 a.m.
 Item 335 1st March, 1931, 9.30 a.m.

All other Items April 24th, 1931, 9.30 a.m.

3. A Bill shall be introduced to give effect to these Resolutions.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BALANCES

DR.

Bank of Montreal for:

Surplus Trust Fund	\$ 3,015.00
Loan 1898	3,015.00
Loan 1921	3.07
Loan 1922	111.75
Loan 1923	1,350.99
Loan 1926	4,721.12
Loan 1927	453,350.65
Loan 1928	419,390.31
Loan 1929	807,274.40
Redemption 1918 Loan	2,938.75
Debenture Redemption	18,271.49
Note Reserve Fund	68,186.90
Imported Specie	9,793.24
Death Duties	7,398.43
Debenture Conversion	263.41
	----- \$ 1,950,971.52

Guaranteed Loan Municipal Council	\$1,652,794.54
Imperial Govt., Temporary Loan	1,946,666.66
Harbor Grace Water Company	13,700.00
Nfld. Savings Bank—Estate W. J. Cairns	10,582.56

Public Debt	3,623,743.76
	----- 87,592,105.59
	----- \$93,166,820.87

CONSOLIDATED FUND BALANCES

CR.

Surplus Trust Fund	3,015.00
Loan 1898	10,000.00
Loan 1921	3.07
Loan 1922	111.75
Loan 1923	1,350.99
Loan 1926	4,721.12
Loan 1927	453,350.65
Loan 1929	419,390.31
Loan 1929	807,274.40
Redemption 1928 Loan	2,938.75
Debenture Redemption	18,271.49
Note Reserve Fund	68,186.90
Imported Specie	9,793.24
Death Duties	7,398.43
Debenture Conversion Account	263.41
Revenue and Expenditure	144,902.01
Guaranteed Loan to Municipal Council	1,652,794.54
Imperial Government, Temporary Loan	1,946,666.66
Stock Account—Harbor Grace Water Co.	13,700.00
Estate W. J. Cairns	10,582.56
Sundry Loan Act Balances	87,592,105.59

	\$93,166,820.87

NOTE.—The foregoing does not include Trust Fund Balances.

COMMITMENTS

I note the following commitments of the Colony as on 30th June, 1930:—

(a) Guarantee of Mortgage Debenture Bonds and Interest (5½% per an.) of the International Paper Co. of Newfoundland Ltd., under Act 14 Geo. V., Cap. 1, as amended by the 1927 Act, £2,000,000 stg. maturing in 1973	\$9,733,333.33
(b) Guarantee of Mortgage Debenture Bonds and Interest (6% per an.) of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Ltd., under Act 16, Geo. V., Cap. 6	\$450,000.00
Less paid off	3,000.00

	447,000.00
(c) St. John's Municipal Council, Guaranteed Loan from the Royal Bank of Canada—not funded	453,000.00
(d) Balance of the Stock of the Harbor Grace Water Co. The Government hold \$13,700 of this Stock, which is not included here	62,700.00
(e) Stock of the Placentia Water Co. and Interest at 4% per annum	40,000.00
(f) Stock of the Placentia Water Co. and Interest at 4% per annum	18,000.00

(g) Guaranteed Stock and Interest (at 6% per an.) of the Western Marine Railway Dock under Act 15 Geo. V., Cap. 13	33,000.00
---	-----------

With regard to (b), I beg leave to report that the Acts of 1925 and 1926 relating to the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Ltd., have not been carried out by the Company so far as relates to the Government Guarantee of the Debenture Bonds and the Interest thereon is concerned. Only \$3,000.00 has been paid off on account of the Sinking Fund and up to November 8th, 1930, the Government paid \$132,042.51 accrued interest and other expenses on these Debenture Bonds. At the date of writing, the Government have arranged to take over the Hotel in payment of the guarantee and accrued interest. The Loan of 1930 provides \$500,000 to meet this obligation.

With regard to (d), (e) and (f), while the Government guarantees the Interest on the Stock of these Companies, it is not, legally, responsible for the principal.

POSITION OF LOANS AT THE CLOSE OF FISCAL YEAR 1929-30.

	At Credit in Bank	Expenditure	At Credit in Bank	Of which is	Balances
	June 30, 1929	1929-30	June 30, 1930	Allocated	Unallocated
Loan 1920	\$ 10,000.00	\$.....	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	30th, June 1930
Loan 1921	3.07	3.07	3.07
Loan 1922	363.75	252.00	111.75	111.75
Loan 1923	1,418.39	67.40	1,350.99	1,350.99
Loan 1926	26,083.20	21,362.08	4,721.12	2,325.56	2,395.56
Loan 1927	779,595.58	526,244.93	253,350.65	31,399.06	221,951.59
Loan 1928	610,258.75	190,868.44	419,390.31	7,176.83	412,213.48
Loan 1929 Realized	5,804,007.44	4,996,733.04	807,274.40	57,276.27	749,998.13
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$7,231,730.18	\$5,735,527.89	\$1,496,202.29	\$ 109,528.71	\$1,386,673.58
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Included in the total Loan Expenditure of \$5,735,527.89 are payments totalling \$2,916,254.45 for deficits in current account and Railway Operations for the years 1927-1928 and 1928-29.

TABLE 1.

Statement of Revenue—Budget Estimate and Actual Receipt—for the Fiscal Year 1929-30.

REVENUE.

	Budget Estimate	Actual Amount Received	Over	Under
Customs	\$ 8,868,339.52	\$ 8 834,843.11	\$.....	\$ 33,496.95
Postal	415,137.35	410,739.40	4,397.95
Telegraphs	195,822.26	204,497.37	8,675.11
Inland Revenue Stamps	72,531.60	75,354.95	2,823.35
Crown Lands	124,877.28	124,279.69	597.59
Liquor Profits	359,000.00	359,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures	8,361.01	8,737.53	376.52
Interest Guaranteed Loans	76,735.43	76,891.08	155.65
Broom Department	2,161.69	2,123.80	37.89
Taxes and Assessments	68,000.00	64,102.28	3,897.72
Fees Public Institutions	66,915.66	60,450.95	6,464.71
Death Duties	120,000.00	113,268.45	6,731.55
Income and Other Taxes	660,906.18	812,758.57	151,852.39
Miscellaneous	431,756.43	432,167.78	411.35
	—————	—————	—————	—————
	\$11,470,544.41	\$11,579,214.96	\$ 164,294.37	\$ 55,623.82
	—————	11,470,544.41	55,623.82	—————
Net Over Estimate	—————	\$ 108,670.55	\$ 108,670.55	—————

TABLE II.

Statement of Expenditure—Budget Estimate and Actual Disbursement for the Fiscal Year 1929-30.
EXPENDITURE.

	Budget Estimate	Actual Expenditure	Over	Under
Finance	\$ 4,796,182.44	\$ 4,718,950.89	\$ 77,231.55
Colonial Secretary	195,033.00	192,187.89	2,845.11
Justice	386,195.00	383,003.91	3,191.09
Marine and Fisheries	485,165.89	487,461.99	2,296.10
Agriculture and Mines	180,524.66	164,561.15	15,963.51
Public Works	1,033,249.33	1,000,679.48	32,569.85
Customs	667,592.50	681,670.00	14,086.50
Assessors	15,120.00	12,310.38	2,809.62
Pension Commissioners	646,802.00	633,832.98	12,969.02
Education	999,535.03	999,313.85	221.18
Public Charities	323,911.05	437,156.14	113,245.09
Public Health	313,969.53	318,966.85	4,997.32
Posts and Telegraphs	1,418,492.72	1,404,208.44	14,284.28
	-----	-----	-----	-----
	\$11,461,773.15	\$11,434,312.95	\$134,625.01	\$ 162,085.21
	11,434,312.95			134,625.01
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Net Under Estimate	\$ 27,460.20			\$ 27,460.20
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Estimated Revenue	\$11,470,544.41	Actual Revenue Received	\$11,579,214.96	
Estimated Expenditure	11,461,773.15	Actual Expenditure Incurred	11,434,312.95	
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Estimated Surplus	\$ 8,771.26	Actual Surplus	\$ 144,902.01	
	-----	-----	-----	-----
	Actual Surplus over Estimated Surplus	\$136,130.75		

TABLE III.

Detailed Comparative Statement of Current Revenue—1928-29 and 1929-30.

	Amt. Collected 1928-29	Amt. Collected 1929-30	Increase	Decrease
Customs	\$ 8,308,339.52	\$ 8,834,843.11	\$ 526,503.59
Postal	394,708.80	410,739.40	16,030.60
Telegraphs	199,883.49	204,497.37	4,613.88
Crown Lands	147,982.48	124,279.69	23,702.79
Inland Revenue Stamps	56,892.73	75,354.95	18,462.22
Fines and Forfeitures	6,948.97	8,737.53	1,788.56
Income and Other Taxes	175,772.15	812,758.57	636,986.42
Fees Public Institutions	58,902.69	60,450.95	1,548.26
Broom Department—Penitentiary	1,300.31	2,123.80	823.49
Liquor Profits	225,097.42	359,000.00	133,902.58
Interest Guaranteed Loans	87,155.56	76,891.08	10,264.48
Estate Duties	51,434.93	113,268.45	61,833.52
Taxes and Assessments	67,799.91	64,102.28	3,697.63
Miscellaneous	243,430.10	432,167.78	188,737.68
	<hr/> \$10,025,649.06	<hr/> \$11,579,214.96	<hr/> \$1,591,230.80	<hr/> \$37,664.90
		<hr/> 10,025,649.06	<hr/> 37,664.90	<hr/>
Current Increase over 1928-29		\$ 1,553,565.90	1,553,565.90	<hr/>

TABLE IV.

Comparative Statement of Current Expenditure—1928-29 and 1929-30.

	1928-29	1929-30	Increase	Decrease
Interest on Public Debt, etc.	\$ 3,894,939.58	\$ 4,159,800.49	\$264,860.91
Finance	345,690.08	353,651.47	7,961.39
Colonial Secretary	270,839.30	190,187.89	\$ 80,651.41
Justice	376,322.43	383,003.91	6,681.48
Education	941,481.29	999,313.85	57,832.56
Public Charities and Health	726,834.75	636,420.75	90,414.00
Marine and Fisheries	561,878.75	478,482.05	83,396.70
Agriculture and Mines	161,393.35	164,561.15	3,167.80
Public Works	980,979.89	987,524.48	6,544.59
Posts and Telegraphs	1,275,171.50	1,404,208.44	129,036.94
Customs	581,724.85	681,679.00	99,954.15
Tax Assessor	12,310.38	12,310.38
Pension Commissioners	642,891.44	633,832.98	9,058.46
Old Age Pensions	119,137.50	123,650.00	4,512.50
Government Engineer	15,723.52	31,848.93	16,125.41
Audit Act	237,814.20	193,837.18	43,977.02
	<hr/> \$11,132,822.43 <hr/>	<hr/> \$11,434,312.95 <hr/> 11,132,822.43	<hr/> \$608,988.11 <hr/> 307,497.59	<hr/> \$307,497.59
Increase over 1928-29		\$ 301,490.52	\$301,490.52	

TABLE V.

Revenue for Five Years—Comparative Statement.

	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28	1928-29	1929-30
Customs	\$7,790,533.62	\$7,321,512.52	\$7,902,959.72	\$ 8,308,339.52	\$ 8,834,843.11
Posts & Telegraphs	524,706.82	524,717.04	570,926.98	594,592.29	615,236.77
Crown Lands	112,133.77	107,602.76	183,004.12	147,982.48	124,279.69
Fines & Forfeitures	4,939.05	4,613.08	5,746.37	6,948.97	8,737.53
Inland Revenue Stamps	50,381.85	48,762.23	52,620.04	56,892.73	75,354.95
Inst. Guaranteed Loans	87,155.56	87,155.56	87,155.56	87,155.56	76,891.08
Brooms, Penitentiary	3,486.14	2,893.79	2,760.56	1,300.31	2,123.80
Fees, Institutions	49,038.30	43,512.66	46,139.21	58,902.69	60,450.95
Taxes & Assessments	64,130.74	67,596.68	67,692.51	67,799.91	64,102.28
Estate Duties	149,271.86	89,803.03	40,000.00	51,434.93	113,268.45
Liquor Sales	410,276.93	350,000.00	250,000.00	225,097.42	359,000.00
Income and Other Taxes	254,704.38	169,134.09	119,494.12	175,772.15	812,758.57
Miscellaneous	261,792.26	115,132.02	137,506.35	243,430.10	432,167.78
	—————	—————	—————	—————	—————
	\$9,752,551.28	\$8,932,435.46	\$9,466,005.54	\$10,025,649.06	\$11,579,214.96
	—————	—————	—————	—————	—————

TABLE VI.

Expenditure for Five Years—Comparative Statement.

	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28	1928-29	1929-30
Interest on Public Debt,					
Sinking Fund, etc.	\$3,381,706.09	\$ 3,538,785.22	\$ 3,841,922.65	\$ 3,894,939.58	\$ 4,159,800.49
Civil Government	510,047.32	546,310.37	589,821.41	654,444.73	666,005.49
Civil Pensions	89,159.33	89,426.23	94,202.19	97,410.12	99,221.00
Military and Naval					
Pensions	626,559.64	618,835.08	620,747.74	628,341.68	619,297.72
Old Age Pensions	104,637.50	114,425.00	118,937.50	119,137.50	123,650.00
Administration of					
Justice	447,627.27	481,008.79	442,686.34	455,106.76	466,826.40
Legislation	90,807.91	93,676.51	96,337.12	95,169.22	100,079.67
Education	858,996.98	914,958.97	894,749.59	906,590.35	964,334.56
Public Charities	1,080,244.03	1,135,752.64	1,115,931.58	1,206,704.60	1,146,150.67
Agriculture and Mines ..	86,427.35	79,629.66	98,443.01	115,506.77	110,877.64
Marine and Fisheries	424,606.73	408,275.40	422,497.72	505,514.39	420,716.12
Roads and Bridges	218,362.42	458,541.43	215,892.89	220,255.68	226,099.79
Posts and Telegraphs ..	1,168,062.18	1,142,949.10	1,170,817.06	1,235,056.14	1,358,630.13
Customs	673,102.55	628,220.56	668,324.01	581,724.85	681,679.00
Contingencies, General..	76,718.95	80,309.26	48,124.54	79,306.02	84,932.23
Elections		21,977.39	39,898.32	99,799.84	12,174.86
Audit Act Section 33 (b)	28,101.19	180,327.26	261,591.36	237,814.20	193,837.18
	<hr/> \$9,865,167.34	<hr/> \$10,533,408.87	<hr/> \$10,740,925.03	<hr/> \$11,132,822.43	<hr/> \$11,434,312.95

TABLE VII.

Summary of Appropriations and Expenditures for the Fiscal year 1929-30.

	Grant, Including Supply Act and Transfers	Expenditure	Grants Exceeded	Grants Unexpended
Interest on Public Debt, Sinking Fund, etc.	\$ 4,296,707.83	\$ 4,159,800.49	\$136,907.34
Finance Department	357,574.61	353,651.47	3,923.14
Colonial Secretary's Department	193,162.50	190,187.89	2,974.61
Justice Department	386,145.00	383,003.91	3,141.09
Education Department	999,535.03	999,313.85	221.18
Public Charities Department	318,911.05	317,453.90	1,457.15
Public Health Department	318,969.53	318,966.85	2,68
Marine and Fisheries Department	482,183.88	478,482.05	3,701.83
Agriculture and Mines Department	180,525.26	164,561.15	15,964.11
Public Works Department	1,006,473.27	987,524.48	18,948.79
Posts and Telegraphs Department	1,418,492.72	1,404,208.44	14,284.28
Customs Department	682,592.50	681,679.00	913.50
Government Engineer's Department	32,167.91	31,848.93	318.98
Tax Assessor	15,120.00	12,310.38	2,809.62
Old Age Pensions	140,000.00	123,650.00	16,350.00
Board of Pension Commissioners	646,802.16	633,832.98	12,969.18
Audit Act, Section 33 (b)	193,837.18	193,837.18
Total Appropriations	\$11,669,200.43	\$11,434,312.95	\$234,887.48
Total Expenditure	11,434,312.95
Balance of Votes unexpended and surrendered to the Treasury	\$ 234,887.48

TABLE VIII.

Newfoundland Railway—Comparative Statement of Earnings and Expenses for the Years 1928-29 and 1929-30.

Revenue	1928-29	1929-30	Increase	Decrease
Passenger	\$ 670,292.36	\$ 643,742.48	\$ 27,549.88
Freight	934,653.58	1,156,665.68	\$222,012.10
Mail	61,251.60	61,251.4317
Dining and Sleeping Cars	76,460.70	74,537.05	1,923.65
Miscellaneous	39,813.84	44,739.47	4,925.63
Express	175,700.51	192,607.73	16,907.22
Steamer	1,014,467.65	1,115,139.37	100,671.72
Dock Shops	381,104.31	377,041.80	4,062.51
Dry Dock	42,931.79	49,381.17	6,949.38
	<hr/> \$3,396,676.34	<hr/> \$3,714,606.18	<hr/> \$351,466.05	<hr/> \$ 33,536.21
	<hr/>	<hr/> 3,396,676.34	<hr/> 33,536.21	<hr/>
Increase in Revenue		\$ 317,929.84	\$317,929.84	
		<hr/>	<hr/>	

TABLE VIII.—(Continued).

Newfoundland Railway—Comparative Statement of Expenses for the Years 1928-29 and 1929-30.

Expenditure	1928-29	1929-30	Increase	Decrease
Conducting Transportation	\$1,122,567.40	\$11,200,705.06	\$ 78,137.66
Maintenance of Way and Structure	645,757.56	673,815.74	28,058.18
Maintenance of Equipment	468,409.22	528,096.07	59,686.85
General Expenses	191,855.57	200,753.78	8,898.21
Dining and Sleeping Cars	55,539.34	55,025.05	514.29
Express	32,088.56	33,539.52	1,450.96
Operating Steamers	786,945.42	903,444.45	116,499.03
Repairs to Steamers	98,330.43	122,020.81	23,690.38
Dock Shops	362,540.69	357,227.33	5,313.36
Dry Dock	20,259.31	20,472.34	213.03
	<hr/> \$3,784,293.50	<hr/> \$4,095,100.15	<hr/> \$316,634.30	<hr/> \$ 5,827.65
	<hr/>	<hr/> 3,784,293.50	<hr/> 5,827.65	<hr/>
		<hr/> \$ 310,806.65	<hr/> \$310,806.65	<hr/>
Deficit for 1928-29 amounted to				\$378,617.16
Increased Revenue 1929-30			\$317,929.84	
Less Increased Expenditure 1929-30			310,806.65	
			<hr/> 7,123.19	<hr/>
Leaves Deficit for the Fiscal Year 1929-30 at.....				\$380,493.97

TABLE IX.

Newfoundland Railway—Result of Steamer Operations for the Years 1928-29 and 1929-30.

Steamer	Earnings	Expenses	
	1928-29	1928-29	1929-30
S. S. Argyle	\$ 68,266.72	\$ 75,447.24	\$ 66,567.48
S. S. Clyde	81,504.04	63,982.39	70,637.15
S. S. Glencoe	72,919.42	92,403.69	76,405.94
S. S. Home	75,112.18	85,662.18	66,919.66
S. S. Kyle	113,377.75	131,469.39	102,040.91
S. S. Meigle	36,104.92	50,658.41	44,207.96
S. S. Sagona	64,183.61	62,053.12	75,464.68
S. S. Caribou	219,901.26	195,889.11	141,800.48
S. S. Portia	108,667.35	96,699.05	97,766.16
S. S. Prospero	120,870.82	131,029.52	94,148.61
S. S. Malafoff	44,963.17	51,919.58	38,444.43
S. S. Earl of Devon	5,018.40	39,204.27	6,686.17
S. S. Susu	3,578.01	38,721.43	4,186.22
	<hr/> \$1,014,467.65	<hr/> \$1,115,139.37	<hr/> \$885,275.85
			<hr/> \$1,025,465.26

TABLE X.

Comparative Statement of Imports and Exports for the Fiscal Years 1928-29 and 1929-30.

	Imports			
From	1928-29	1929-30	Increase	Decrease
United Kingdom	\$ 6,211,906	\$ 5,527,575	\$ 684,331
Canada	11,832,415	12,992,600	\$1,160,185
U. S. A.	9,880,431	12,101,752	2,221,321
Other Countries	1,312,629	1,249,224 1	63,405
	<hr/> \$29,237,381	<hr/> \$31,871,151	<hr/> \$3,381,506	<hr/> \$ 747,736
		29,237,381	747,736
Increase over 1928-29		\$ 2,633,770	\$2,633,770	
	Exports			
To	1928-29	1929-30	Increase	Decrease
United Kingdom	\$ 7,578,190	\$ 8,647,948	\$1,069,758
Canada	3,046,802	3,968,479	921,677
U. S. A.	11,596,643	11,432,918	163,725
Other Countries	14,576,068	16,002,614	1,426,546
	<hr/> \$36,797,703	<hr/> \$40,051,959	<hr/> \$3,417,981	<hr/> \$ 163,725
		36,797,703	163,725
Increase over 1928-29		\$ 3,254,256	\$3,254,256	

TABLE X.—(Continued.)

Total Trade.

With	1928-29	1929-30	Increase	Decrease
United Kingdom	\$13,790,096	\$14,175,523	\$ 385,427
Canada	14,879,217	16,961,079	2,081,862
U. S. A.	21,477,074	23,534,670	2,057,596
Other Countries	15,888,697	17,251,838	1,363,141
	—————	—————	—————	—————
	\$66,035,084	\$71,923,110	\$3,888,026
		66,035,084	
	—————	—————	—————	—————
Increase over 1928-29		\$ 5,888,026	\$5,888,026	

TABLE X.—(Continued.)

Trade Statistics from 1922-23 to 1929-30

Year	Imports	Exports	Toal Trade
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
1925-26	27,552,305	27,563,213	55,115,518
1926-27	25,813,871	30,839,859	56,653,730
1927-28	27,637,193	33,644,619	61,281,812
1928-29	29,237,381	36,797,703	66,035,084
1929-30	31,871,151	40,051,959	71,923,110

TABLE XI.

Comparative Statement of Business Difficulties from 1921 to 1930.

Year	No.	Assets	Liabilities	Deficits
1921	93	\$3,697,368	\$6,031,153	\$2,333,785
1922	79	763,933	2,106,975	1,343,042
1923	70	1,569,080	3,963,636	2,394,556
1924	48	486,299	1,886,544	1,400,245
1925	45	128,977	467,045	338,068
1926	52	175,566	679,409	503,843
1927	56	153,574	822,826	669,252
1928	31	341,060	560,155	219,095
1929	42	45,307	146,519	101,212
1930	52	633,957	1,628,315	994,358

In the Comparative Statement, Liabilities are taken from statements submitted either at Creditors' Meetings or in the Insolvency Court.

Assets in the Comparative Statement have been reduced 50%, as it seldom happens that when assets are realized on, they exceed over 50% on their "On Paper" value.

TABLE XII.

Comparative Statement of Savings Deposits in Newfoundland Showing Amount of Deposits as at 31st December for Each of The Past Five Years.

	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930
Bank of Montreal	\$ 8,158,286.60	\$ 8,479,631.86	\$ 9,348,715.66	\$ 8,667,243.49	\$ 8,863,196.96
Canadian Bank of Commerce	990,066.00	963,555.00	1,018,484.00	1,300,988.00	1,255,912.00
Royal Bank of Canada	4,097,537.89	4,325,565.27	4,511,170.32	4,516,687.16	4,540,823.58
Bank of Nova Scotia	8,664,691.58	8,766,405.74	9,448,721.77	9,567,601.81	9,547,458.55
Govt Savings Bank	2,011,262.88	2,011,452.72	2,162,473.43	2,193,484.23	2,026,426.85
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$23,903,844.95	\$24,546,610.59	\$26,489,565.18	\$26,246,004.69	\$26,233,817.94
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

The Following Figures Will Show the Savings by the People From Life Insurance.

	1926	1927	1928	1929
Premiums paid by Policy Holders	\$ 1,175,659.39	\$ 1,292,810.63	\$ 1,406,345.15	\$ 1,540,836.06
New Policies Issued	5,793,414.16	5,196,337.14	10,951,470.51	7,468,832.95
	(3264 Policies)	(3566 Policies)	(4181 Policies)	(4097 Policies)
Total Insurance in force 31st December	33,760,947.52	37,660,710.70	44,360,771.40	48,412,142.47
Value of Securities deposited in Bank of Montreal to meet adjusted reserve	4,948,932.89	6,114,878.21	6,630,771.55	6,875,248.19
N.B.—The Insurance are always a year in Arrears.				

Memo of Iron Ore Shipments From Wabana, Newfoundland
(In Long Tons.)

Year	Canada	Europe	U.S.A.	Total	Grand Total
1895	2,399	2,399	2,399
1896	15,547	20,559	35,906	38,305
1897	10,844	5,046	29,503	45,395	85,698
1898	30,917	70,224	101,141	184,859
1899	23,496	191,398	87,947	302,841	487,680
1900	174,588	15,194	137,403	325,185	812,865
1901	408,158	249,238	75,273	732,669	1,545,534
1902	236,056	504,888	86,355	727,299	2,272,833
1903	244,042	256,999	81,005	582,046	2,854,879
1904	306,040	266,733	5,380	578,153	3,435,032
1905	452,589	228,478	5,795	686,862	4,119,894
1906	560,940	190,988	126,675	878,605	4,998,497
1907	600,597	149,197	110,706	860,500	5,858,997
1908	637,398	178,629	53,162	869,189	6,728,186
1909	622,482	153,347	215,397	991,226	7,719,412
1910	722,224	181,750	220,876	1,124,850	8,844,262
1911	658,374	211,649	185,025	1,056,046	9,899,509
1912	854,117	164,001	171,258	1,189,376	11,088,684
1913	936,258	292,986	204,855	1,454,099	12,522,783
1914	372,746	154,487	38,857	566,090	15,088,873
1915	716,293	59,226	775,519	13,864,592
1916	905,170	905,170	14,769,562
1917	783,130	783,130	15,552,692
1918	763,738	763,738	16,316,430
1919	449,230	449,230	16,765,660
1920	556,614	32,775	589,389	17,355,049
1921	152,700	155,602	308,302	17,663,351
1922	276,360	722,105	998,465	18,661,816
1923	418,376	272,591	46,340	737,306	19,399,122
1924	155,895	821,400	977,295	20,399,122
1925	543,567	788,443	1,132,010	21,508,427
1926	416,037	330,155	119,544	865,716	22,374,143
1927	429,248	845,151	61,050	1,335,429	23,709,572
1928	616,354	894,493	37,048	1,547,895	25,257,467
1929	681,400	759,259	76,340	1,516,999	26,774,466
1930	467,784	661,406	48,771	1,177,961	27,952,427

**STATEMENT OF IRON ORE EXPORTED FROM BELL ISLAND
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1925 to 1930.**

1925	Tons	Value
Canada	343,567	\$ 584,063.90
Germany	788,433	1,340,353.10
United Kingdom	Nil	Nil
U. S. A.	Nil	Nil
	1,132,010	\$1,924,417.00

1926

Canada	416,037	\$ 707,262.90
Germany	330,135	561,229.50
United Kingdom	Nil	Nil
U. S. A.	119,544	203,224.80
	865,716	\$1,471,717.20

1927

Canada	429,248	\$ 729,721.60
Germany	845,151	1,436,756.70
United Kingdom	Nil	Nil
U. S. A.	61,030	103,751.00
	1,335,429	\$2,270,229.30

1928

Canada	616,354	\$1,047,801.80
Germany	886,953	1,473,820.10
United Kingdom	27,540	46,818.00
U. S. A.	37,048	62,981.60
	1,547,895	\$2,631,421.50

1929

Canada	681,400	\$1,880,664.00
Germany	753,929	2,080,844.04
U. S. A.	76,340	210,698.40
United Kingdom	5,330	14,710.80
	1,516,599	\$4,186,917.24

1930

Canada	467,784	\$1,291,083.84
Europe (Germany)	661,406	1,825,480.56
U. S. A.	48,771	134,607.96
	1,177,961	\$3,251,172.36

STATEMENT OF CATCH OF CODFISH FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1925-1930

Quintal—112 lbs.

Year	Shore	Straits	Labrador	Total Qtls.
1925	801,164	52,000	359,220	1,212,384
1926	979,588	13,630	175,380	1,168,598
1927	888,938	34,350	291,245	1,214,533
1928	853,421	18,830	301,750	1,173,991
1929	1,000,000	250,000	1,250,000
1930	900,000	350,000	1,250,000

SEAL FISHERY

(From Nfld. Year Books.)

T—Tons, 2240 lbs.

Year	Steamers	Men	Seals	Weight
1923	8	1,224	101,770	T 2,674
1924	8	1,227	129,561	2,802

1925	10	1,423	127,882	5,248
1926	12	1,648	211,531	4,616
1927	9	1,634	180,459	3,713
1928	11	2,110	227,022	4,629
1929	12	2,323	201,856	3,710
1930	18	2,320	241,236	4,813

BANK FISHERY

(From Nfld. Year Books.)

Q—Quintal, 112 lbs.

Year	Vessels	Men	Catch
1923	57	939	Q 69,372
1924	36	607	70,013
1925	41	753	101,384
1926	47	874	109,847
1927	41	740	99,663
1928	57	932	123,675
1929	56	1033	106,995
1930	62	1150	86,098

STATEMENT OF CODFISH EXPORTED FOR CALENDAR YEARS**1925 to 1930.**

(Supplied by the Official Broker at Custom House, St. John's.)

Year	Quintals
1925	1,244,666
1926	1,467,523
1927	1,650,212
1928	1,382,630
1929	1,205,312
1930	1,191,502

Year	Cod Liver Oil. (Tun—256 gals.)	Tuns
1927		1248
1928		1309
1929		683
1930		770

Year	Cod Oil	Tuns
1927		2708
1928		3087
1929		2641
1930		3360

Year	Salmon (Pickled) Tierce—336 lbs.	Tierces
1927		3103
1928		3352
1929		1856
1930		2246

Year	Herring (Bulk, Frozen, Pickled, etc.) Brl.—200 lbs.	Brls.
1927		46,561
1928		62,633
1929		62,263
1930		38,608

**STATEMENT OF ORE CONCENTRATES EXPORTED FROM BUCHANS
VIA BOTWOOD FOR THE CALENDAR YEARS 1929-30**

(Supplied by the Collector at Botwood.)

	1929	Tons	Value
United Kingdom	22,761	\$ 647,635.64	
Belgium	38,550	1,233,602.04	
France	4,936	141,732.30	
Germany	13,151	722,701.35	
 Total	 79,398	 \$2,745,671.33	
 1930	 Tons	 Value	
United Kingdom	
Belgium	43,133	\$1,116,124.73	
France	24,353	275,931.15	
Germany	2,727	121,172.71	
 Total	 70,213	 \$1,513,228.59	

PULPWOOD

Exported From Hampden During the Calendar Years 1924 to 1930.

(Supplied by the Collector of Customs at Hampden.)

Year	Cord—128 Cubic Feet.	Cords	Value
1924	7,167	\$ 80,834	
1925	10,788	139,679	
1926	11,500	120,788	
1927	34,258	411,099	
1928	30,998	371,864	
1929	26,752	311,994	
1930	24,755	295,058	
 Total	 146,278	 \$1,731,316	

STATEMENT OF PAPER EXPORTED FROM GRAND FALLS

(Supplied by Collectors of Customs at Grand Falls, Botwood and

Heart's Content.)

Ton—2000 lbs.

	1923	Tons	Value
England	58,888	\$5,075,755	
U. S. A.	Nil	Nil	
 Total	 58,888	 \$5,075,755	

1924

England	55,538	\$4,879,243
U. S. A.	3,902	345,927
Total	59,440	\$5,225,170

1925

England	61,432	\$5,231,132
U. S. A.	5,832	516,939
Total	67,264	\$5,748,071

1926

England	70,882	\$5,099,755
U. S. A.	9,263	688,636
Total	80,145	\$5,768,319

1927

England	78,403	\$5,747,674
U. S. A.	2,822	203,737
Total	81,225	\$5,951,411

1928

England	87,045	\$6,387,916
U. S. A.	Nil	Nil
Total	87,045	\$6,387,916

1929

England	90,859	\$6,123,676.19
U. S. A.	Nil	Nil
Total	90,859	\$6,123,676.19

1930

England	106,577	\$7,139,292.15
U. S. A.	Nil	Nil
Total	106,577	\$7,139,292.15

**STATEMENT OF PAPER EXPORTED FROM CORNER BROOK
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1925 to 1930.**

(Supplied by Customs Collector at Corner Brook.)

Ton—2000 lbs.

1925	Tons	Value
U. S. A.	17,556	\$1,141,129
New Zealand	286	18,600
Total	17,842	\$1,159,729

1926

U. S. A.	98,674	\$6,413,788
England	642	41,715
New Zealand	1,902	123,653
Total	101,218	\$6,579,156

1927

U. S. A.	103,884	\$6,752,441
England	Nil	Nil
New Zealand	2,969	192,980
Total	106,853	\$6,945,421

1928

U. S. A.	133,798	\$6,311,146
New Zealand	127	8,266
Total	133,925	\$6,319,412

1929

U. S. A.	149,676	\$8,232,168
England	Nil	Nil
New Zealand	Nil	Nil
Russia	6,666	366,618
Total	156,342	\$8,598,786

1930

U. S. A.	163,463	\$8,990,444.43
England	Nil	Nil
New Zealand	Nil	Nil
Russia	Nil	Nil
Total	163,463	\$8,990,444.43

Statement of Amounts Advanced by Nfld. Government on Account of Nfld. Railway, July 1st, 1920 and January 31st, 1931.

276

Year	Operation Account	Capital Account	Relief Work	Reid Nfld. Co. Acct. Written Off	Loss on Coal Brook Mine	TOTAL
1920-21	\$1,773,192.50	\$1,024,616.15	\$372,294.78	\$115,396.57	\$ 3,285,500.00
1921-22	1,249,993.00	\$235,081.13	1,485,074.13
1922-23	814,345.59	100,819.27	91,395.05	1,006,559.91
1923-24	200,000.00	203,460.52	90,355.45	493,815.97
1924-25	290,000.00	311,774.18	128,964.73	730,738.91
1925-26630,000.00	1,464,319.48	2,094,319.48
1927-28	617,675.56	975,070.44	1,340,070.44
1827-28	617,675.56	385,186.21	1,002,861.77
1928-29	300,000.00	1,348,191.39	1,648,191.39
1929-30	387,617.16	1,099,588.43	1,487,205.59
July 1, 1930 to Dec. 31,						
1930	375,000.00	205,676.87	580,676.87
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	\$7,002,823.81	\$7,118,702.94	\$545,796.36	\$372,294.78	\$115,396.57	\$15,155,014.46
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
New Dock Construction					\$1,947,325.10	
Purchase of Railway					2,000,000.00	
					-----	\$ 3,947,324.10

						\$19,102,338.56

NOTE:—Included in the amount advanced to the Railway Commission for the year 1920-21 is the sum of \$372,000.00 approximately, balance due the Commission by the Reid Newfoundland Company, Ltd., for accounts other than the loss on operation. This amount was written off as part of purchase price of Railway under the Railway Settlement Act, 1923.

**STATEMENT OF THE CURRENT ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF
NEWFOUNDLAND FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30th JUNE, 1930.**

DR.

Customs' Revenue	\$8,567,038.06
Light Dues	45,877.28
Harbor Dues	936.50
Miscellaneous	59,751.48
Royalties	161,239.79
Total Customs' Revenue	<u>\$8,834,843.11</u>
Postal Revenue	410,739.40
Telegraph Revenue	204,497.37
Crown Revenue	124,279.69
Stamp Revenue	75,354.95
Liquor Revenue	359,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures	8,737.53
Broom Department, H. M. Penitentiary	2,123.80
Fees from Public Institutions	60,450.95
Income Tax and Arrears	812,758.57
Miscellaneous	427,593.54
Cable Tax	64,102.28
Death Duties	113,268.45
Insurance Assessment	3,329.04
Insurance License	800.00
Carbonear Water Company	445.20
St. John's Municipal Council	76,891.08
	<u>2,744,371.85</u>
	<u>\$11,579,214.96</u>

LOAN

Loan Act, 1922	\$ 252.00
do. 1923	67.40
do. 1926	21,362.08
do. 1927	17,861.11
do. 1928	2,556.81
do. 1929	1,363,991.77
	<u>1,406,091.17</u>
	<u>\$12,985,306.13</u>

Examined by me and found correct,

F. C. BERTEAU,

Comptroller and Auditor General.

**STATEMENT OF THE CURRENT ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF
NEWFOUNDLAND FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30th JUNE, 1930.**

CR.

Head	I. Interest on Public Debt	\$4,159,800.49
	II. Civil Government	666,005.49
	III. Civil, Military, Old Age Pensions	842,168.72
	IV. Administration of Justice	466,826.40
	V. Legislation	100,079.67
	VI. Education	964,334.56
	VII. Public Charities	1,146,150.67
	VIII. Agriculture and Mines	110,877.64
	IX. Marine and Fisheries	420,716.12
	X. Roads, Bridges and Ferries	226,099.79
	XI. Posts and Telegraphs	1,358,630.13
	XII. Customs	681,679.00
	XIII. General Contingencies	84,932.23
	XIV. Elections	12,174.86
	Audit Act, Section 33B	193,837.18
		—————
		\$11,434,312.95
	Revenue in Excess of Expenditure....	144,902.01
		—————
		\$11,579,214.96

EXPENDITURE

Loan Act, 1922	\$ 252.00
do. 1923	67.40
do. 1926	21,362.08
do. 1927	17,861.11
do. 1928	2,556.81
do. 1929	1,363,991.77
	—————
	1,406,091.17
	—————
	\$12,985,306.13

PETER J. CASHIN,

Minister of Finance and Customs.

STATEMENT PUBLIC DEBT TO JUNE 30th, 1930.

DR.

Loan at 3 per cent.	\$ 1,581,666.66
Loan at 3½ per cent.	18,905,060.00
Loan at 4 per cent.	6,041,352.29
Loan at 5 per cent.	2,061,033.33
Loan at 5 per cent.	6,500,893.33
Loan at 5 per cent.	5,000,000.00
Loan at 5 per cent.	4,999,526.66
Loan at 5 per cent.	10,002,946.66
Loan at 5 per cent.	5,999,626.66
Loan at 5 per cent.	5,000,000.00
Loan at 5½ per cent.	6,000,000.00
Loan at 5½ per cent.	6,000,000.00
Loan at 5½ per cent.	3,500,000.00
Loan at 6½ per cent.	6,000,000.00

\$87,592,105.59

Examined by me and found correct,

F. C. BERTEAU,

Comptroller and Auditor General.

STATEMENT PUBLIC DEBT TO JUNE 30th, 1930.

			CR.	
Act 54	Vic. Cap.	8 at 3	per cent.	\$ 1,581,666.66
56	" "	1	\$3,384,473.35
56	" "	2	4,708,800.00
61 and 63	" "	6 and 4	351,373.33
1	Ed. VII.	6	2,263,000.00
5	" "	2	1,900,433.33
10	" "	39	3,893,333.33
2	Geo. V.	18	1,946,666.66
			at 3½ per cent.	18,905,060.00
49	Vic. Cap.	3	60,000.00
50	" "	6	480,000.00
50	" "	7	320,000.00
51	" "	3	50,000.00
51	" "	5	218,000.00
52	" "	5	408,000.00
56	" "	1	602.30
58	" "	13	2,676,666.66
60	" "	2	973,333.33
9	Ed. VII.	3	380,000.00
10	" "	7	90,000.00
1	Geo. V.	32	384,750.00
			at 4 per cent.	6,041,352.29
14	" "	2 at 5 per cent.		2,061,033.33
9 and 10	" "	2 at 5½ per cent.		6,000,400.00
11 and 12	" "	2 at 6½ per cent.		6,000,000.00
12 and 13	" "	1 at 5½ per cent.		6,000,000.00
14	" "	9 at 5½ per cent.		3,500,000.00
15	" "	22 at 5 per cent.		500,293.33
17	" "	25 at 5 per cent.		4,999,526.66
18	" "	18 at 5 per cent.		5,000,000.00
19	" "	18 at 5 per cent.		10,002,946.66
20	" "	31 at 5 per cent.		5,999,626.66
21	" "	1 at 5 per cent.		5,000,000.00
				\$87,592,105.59

NOTE—Operating Sinking Fund.

Amount of Loan under Act 58, Vic. Cap. 13....	\$ 1,652,076.45
Amount invested in British Treasury Bills and Cash	388,125.06
	\$2,040,201.51
Harbor Grace Water Company Stock	\$ 13,700.00
Municipal Council Stock	1,652,794.54
	1,666,494.54
	\$3,706,696.05

PETER J. CASHIN, Minister of Finance and Customs.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions effecting certain rates in the Estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, referring to Question No. 303, asked by Mr. Byrne: It is against the regulations of the Customs to give the names of importers of different commodities.

MR. BYRNE.—If we cannot have the names, can we have the quantities imported?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Yes.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I suppose the Minister of Finance and Customs knows the purpose for which the question has been asked?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I have not the least idea.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—It is in order to try and put a stop to the wholesale smuggling of tobacco, cigarettes, etc., that is going on in that district at the present time.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I was not aware that there was any such smuggling going on, and would appreciate any information that you might be able to give me in this behalf.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—All you have to do is to go into almost any of the shops in that district and you can purchase smuggled cigarettes.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Leader of the Opposition alleges that criminal acts are being done in the District of Hr. Main and I think it is his duty to lay any information that he has on that subject before the Department.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Prime Minister has received a copy of the cable which was received from London this afternoon in connection with the recognition of the Provisional Government of the Spanish Republic.

(Reads telegram)

If all the other Dominions are recognizing the new Republic, I feel that we also should recognize it, particularly as Spain is one of our chief fish markets.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Enforcement of Arbitral Affairs" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, the 27th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 27, 1931.

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

CAPT. PARSONS.—Mr. Speaker, I leave to present a petition from the residents of the District of Bay Roberts. I have also a petition from the residents of Spaniard's Bay on the subject of a road leading from Spaniard's Bay to New Harbor. This road was built fifty years ago and since that time it has been the only connecting road between Spaniard's Bay and New Harbor. A few years ago there was a certain amount voted to repair this road, but it is now absolutely impassible for pedestrians and vehicles.

I have also a petition from the people of Shearstown and Coley's Point regarding a road between these two places. This road was built about fifty years ago as an agricultural

road. All the people in this vicinity are farmers and they find this road very useful. This road is in such a bad condition that they find it very hard to get materials to their homes for the repair of fences and such things. They want this road extended for four or five miles so that they can get these materials. In connection with this petition I would like to point out that there are a lot of families in these places well-nigh destitute and in addition to the direct benefits they would receive from the repair of this road, they would by working on this road get money for their families.

I sincerely beg that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they relate and that the honorable gentlemen in charge of these Departments will give them careful consideration before they are consigned to their ultimate end—the waste-paper basket.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from one hundred and thirteen male electors of Eastport in the District of Bonavista Centre, asking that the sum of \$500.00 be allocated for the construction of a shed on the Public Wharf at Happy Adventure. It is not very necessary for me to elaborate on the geographical aspects of this coast, but it is safe to say that Eastport is a very important place and so is Sandy Cove, and as the Malakoff calls at Happy Adventure, the three places could be served in one. I have also a petition from twenty-five electors of Bishop's Hr., asking for a public wharf; also, while I am on my feet, I would like to say that I am sufficiently acquainted with parliamentary practise with regard to presenting petitions in this House to know their ultimate end, but it is the traditional right of the electors, and after

all such matters in most instances must remain a matter between the Departmental Head, the Executive Government and the Member. I have much pleasure in presenting these petitions and referring them to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to Insurance on Crews prosecuting the Sealing Industry.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in Relation to the Newfoundland Hotel.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.
Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House copy of the first interim report of the Commissioners appointed under Chapter 21 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) which Chapter is known as the Public Enquiries Act, as a Commission of Enquiry into the Viking Disaster. The Commission was issued on the 23rd day of March last, and read as follows:

COMMISSION.

By His Excellency Sir John Middleton, Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Governor and Commander in Chief in and over the Colony of Newfoundland.

To the Honorable Sir William H. Horwood, Kt., Chief Justice, (Chairman), Isaac R. Randell, Esq., and Martin G. Dalton, Esq., Master Mariners, Greeting:

Whereas the steamship *Viking*, Abram Kean, master, cleared from the

port of St. John's on the ninth day of March instant, for the purpose of prosecuting the sealing industry;

And Whereas on the Fifteenth day of March inst. the said ship, when in the vicinity of Horse Islands, White Bay, was destroyed by an explosion and fire;

And whereas, as a result of the said explosion and burning of the said steamship, several members of the ship's company, and others, are missing, and presumed dead, and many of the survivors are suffering from injuries;

And whereas I have thought it fit and proper, under and by virtue of Chapter 21, Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of Enquiries Concerning Public Matters," to cause an enquiry to be made into and concerning all the circumstances connected with the loss of the said steamship on the occasion aforesaid, and into and concerning the deaths of and injuries to members of the ship's company, and others.

Now know you that I, by and with the advice of my Council, do nominate and appoint you, the said Honorable Sir William H. Horwood, Kt., Isaac R. Randell, Esq., Master Mariner, and Martin G. Dalton, Esq., Master Mariner, to be a Commission under and by virtue of the said Chapter, to enquire into and report to me upon the loss of the said steamship *Viking* and all matters connected therewith, including, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, the management of the ship, her condition and equipment, and all other matters which you may consider relevant and material.

And I do hereby confer upon you, or any two of you, the power of sum-

moning before you any party or witness, and of requiring him or them to give evidence on oath (orally or in writing, or on solemn affirmation) and to produce such documents and things as you may deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which you are appointed to examine.

Given under my Hand and Seal at the Government House, St. John's, this twenty-third day of March, A.D., 1931.

By His Excellency's Command.

(Sgd.) A. BARNES,
Colonial Secretary.

The first interim report is signed by His Lordship the Chief Justice, and both Commissioners, dated the 21st day of April, and reads as follows:—

To His Excellency the Governor in Council.

May it please Your Excellency:

We, the Commissioners appointed to enquire into and report to Your Excellency on the loss of the steamship Viking and all matters connected therewith, beg leave to submit the following interim report:

We would respectfully inform Your Excellency that from the evidence already taken before us it has been proven that the powder carried on board the ship was contained in tins (or corrugated sheet iron containers with seams pressed together) so insecurely fastened, that in the course of handling the tins, powder escaped therefrom and was found on the deck of the ship.

Our purpose in immediately reporting this fact is to enable Your Excellency to consider as early as convenient whether the importation of powder should be permitted ex-

cept in wooden water-tight kegs or packages having inside a linen bag or other container capable of preventing the escape of powder, and having printed on the outside of the keg or package the word DANGER.

We would also respectfully ask Your Excellency to consider whether Regulations should not be made to prevent gun powder or other explosives being taken or carried on board ship or elsewhere except by a permit from an Inspector of Explosives, who should be satisfied that all necessary precautions are being observed and that no powder should be allowed on board any vessel except under a permit, and that before the permit is granted the Inspector should ascertain that there has been provided as a receptacle for such powder a safe magazine or closed room in the hold or other safe place in the possession of an officer specifically designated for the purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) W. H. HORWOOD,
I. R. RANDELL,
M. G. DALTON.

St. John's, April 21st, 1931.

On the day following the receipt of the report by me the report was submitted to a meeting of Committee of Council, and the subject-matter of the report carefully considered and discussed. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and Mr. J. C. Pratt were called to the conference—the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because it was a marine disaster, and Mr. J. C. Pratt because for many years he has been practically the sole importer of explosives into the port of St. John's.

Not only the matter of importation of explosives, but its handling and storage in St. John's, the location of

the St. John's explosive storage magazine, their control and management and various other matters appertaining to the importation and storage were considered. As a matter of fact these and all other matters appertaining to the importation, unloading, transportation, storage, delivery and transhipment of explosives were left to the Committee for investigation and report to Council. It was felt by the Department of Justice that existing legislation vested full powers in His Excellency the Governor in Council to deal with this matter by regulations made in accordance with the provisions of the Statute, and that consequently special legislation in connection therewith will not be immediately necessary.

In view of the fact that this morning's News has a front page heading, "Interim Report Viking Disaster Enquiry," and then in its editorial columns has certain references of a political character to Mr. Eric A. Bowring who has been one of the important witnesses in connection with the tragedy, and also, I am informed, the local Managing Director of Bowring Brothers, the owners of the Viking. I feel I should take this opportunity to state as Minister of Justice and Attorney General, that the question whether Mr. Bowring does or does not at these meetings support the Government or oppose it, will not under any circumstances be permitted the weight of a feather in determining the question whether the evidence discloses such condition of negligence in connection with the Viking as to justify the initiation of proceedings with a view to the indictment of any person who may be considered to have responsibility in connection therewith.

If there is one thing more than another of which as Attorney General and Minister of Justice of this coun-

try I feel proud, it is that during the years 1914-1919, when the responsibilities of that office were upon me, then particularly heavy because of War conditions, and since my resumption of these responsibilities in the autumn of 1928, there has never been an instance in which personal friendliness or personal hostility, political friendliness or polititcal hostility, or any other consideration other than British honor, British equality and British fair play has in any way whatever controlled or influenced to the slightest degree the handling of the administration of criminal law of this country. Nothing that Mr. Bowring or any of his associates can say, either for me and this Government, at to-night's public meeting or otherwise, nothing that the Daily News can say, either in political support of Mr. Bowring or otherwise, will be permitted to affect in the remotest manner the question whether criminal proceedings should or should not be instituted against him or other directors of Bowring Brothers Ltd., or any other persons involved in the Viking disaster. It would be improper for me to make an statement at this moment as to whether any steps will be taken or not, and if any steps are taken what the nature of these steps will be. This is a matter which will be considered when all the evidence and all interim and final reports of the Commission of Enquiry come before the Department of Justice for consideration. I merely want to emphasize the point that nothing that Mr. Bowring can say about the Government at tonight's public meeting and nothing that the Daily News or other newspaper can say, will in any way influence the decision.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, might I ask what this speech has to do with the matter before the House? It refers I suppose to a meeting to

he held tonight under the chairmanship of Mr. Eric Bowring, and what I want to point out is that this House is supposed to know nothing whatever of that. One would think that the Prime Minister would have more respect for his office, if not for himself, than to deliver a political tirade of this nature in the House of Assembly.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with my friend. The whole matter is entirely out of order, and the speaker should not have been allowed to continue. Previously members of the Opposition have been held up for technicalities, and I say the Prime Minister should not have been allowed to continue without being called to order by the Speaker as he should have been.

HON. MR. SPEAKER.—The Opposition should have raised an objection.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, as regards the latter part of the Prime Minister's speech, I regard it as more in the nature of a threat.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question with reference to the high explosives magazine which is situated at the Battery. I should like to know when the recent enquiry was on if any investigation was made with regard to the safety of this magazine? I am informed that this magazine has been there now for over one hundred years, and hundreds of tons of high explosives are stored in it at a time. This is a continual menace to the whole city, and one of these days the whole city will be blown to atoms as Halifax was some time ago. Perhaps that might not make so much difference, as we are blown up financially anyway, and it might be just as well to be blown up physically as well. However, while the Commission is still on the subject

I would ask that they make this part of their enquiry.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, might I ask another question? It will be remembered that when the Viking disaster was fresh in our minds we were informed by the Prime Minister that legislation would be introduced to turn over to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund the balance standing over from the Burin Disaster Fund. No notice of this legislation has yet been given, and I wish to enquire if it is going to be introduced.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I did not say that legislation would be introduced. What I did say was that I anticipated that the Committee would be approaching the Government on the matter. The Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Reuben Horwood, has been out of town for some time past and so nothing could be done on the matter. The Government intend to act entirely in conformity with their wishes, and as soon as any notice is received from them I shall be glad to inform the House.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Criminal Law" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the constitutional practice of this House, particularly in relation to the Address in Reply. It seems to me that we should continue that part of the business of the House and bring it to a conclusion before we embark upon any pronounced policy of the Government. In this connection I am further fortified in that opinion with the expressed words used by Mr. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada, and passed in the House of Commons at Ottawa. He was asked about the policy of his government respecting unemployment and he replied that he could not give any pronouncement until the Address in Reply was disposed of. Here are his exact words:

(Reads)

Then Mr. Mackenzie King, in replying later, supported the stand taken by Mr. Bennett, and said as follows:

(Reads)

Thus we have not got a better object lesson in support of my contention than the procedure of the Canadian House of Parliament. Consequently, I think it is an act of courtesy to His Excellency the Governor to be relegating the Address in Reply until the dying days of the session and proceeding with other business.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—I might say that I am not prepared to rule on it today. I have not looked into the matter, but if the House is prepared to go with the other business I am prepared to give a ruling at the next sitting. Meanwhile I would like to hear the views of members of the House on the subject.

MR. PUDESTER.—The rule is to let the Order go by until you are ready to produce your ruling.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—Quite a number of matters have come before the House affecting the policy of the Government before the Address in Reply was disposed of, and I understand this has been the practice for some considerable time in this House.

MR. PUDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, That may have happened so far as Bills of very little consequence were concerned, but I will guarantee you, Sir,—and you can go back over the records of this House—that there never was a time when Supply, Budget and Loan Resolutions were presented for discussion before the Address in Reply was removed from the Order Paper. In the British Parliament the Address in Reply is removed from the Order Paper after five days. These financial matters are connected with the policy of the government to a large extent because it is the business of the Government to find out what they propose to do for the ensuing year, and the Address in Reply is always passed before that policy is proceeded with. A few days ago the Prime Minister of Alberta referred to a question of policy of the Bennett Government at Ottawa. The matter was referred to Senator Robertson, Minister of Labor, who told the Prime Minister of Alberta that no policy could be enunciated until the Address in Reply was removed from the Order Paper. This is the rule in every English Parliament and Premier Bennett of Canada is right, corroborated as he was in his contention by Mr. Mackenzie King, Leader of the Opposition there. The present procedure here never happened in this country before, particularly when we have Supply, Loan Resolutions and the Budget brought down in the House at the same time.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—I am prepared to put the motion to the entire House.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Go through the Notice of Questions first and we can come to the Motion for the Address in Reply afterwards.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I think this is a matter that is axiomatic and one that calls for the unanimous consent of the House. The Speech from the Throne is a declaration of the policy of the Government for the session, and until the Address in Reply has been passed the policy of the Government has not been approved of by the House. Bills dealing with policy are brought in and dealt with after the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne has been adopted. It is true that bills of minor importance, even though affecting the policy of the government, are given the unanimous concurrence of the House for short periods. That is done out of courtesy to the Government; but, Sir, business of major importance cannot be proceeded with until the policy of the Government has been accepted by the House. That, I submit, Sir, is axiomatic. At the time Mr. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada, made his declaration at Ottawa, Interim Supply to pay salaries of civil servants had been asked for.

I submit the position is quite clear and it is particularly clear when we come to deal with matters of finance.

The estimates should be brought in afterwards. To bring them in before the Address in Reply was finished would be absurd. The Minister of Finance should not bring in his estimates or supply until the Address in Reply has been dealt with.

The Speech from the Throne contains the Government's policy for the coming year and until it has been accepted by the House, the House should not consider any other matters of major importance.

Mr. Bennett in his remarks in Canadian Hansard asked for permission to bring in an interim supply bill. What happened was that the fiscal year in Canada ended on April 1st. This interim supply bill was asked for in order to pay the civil servants their salaries and this Bill was only brought in in order that the public servants might get their cheques, yet there was much discussion as to whether the House could entertain this bill before the Address in Reply was closed.

This is what he says:—

(Reads)

The Prime Minister of Canada agreed with his opponents that such an interim supply bill could only be accepted on unanimous consent of the House before the Address in Reply had been dealt with.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—In reply, Mr. Speaker, I think I may say that I personally am not looking to either Bennett or King for what to do. I think myself the best thing these gentlemen can possibly do is to stay where they are. What I am looking for is something to facilitate business, something more informative.

If I wanted to be sarcastic I might say I would like to see how Mr. Bowring intends to manage the finances of the country in the future.

A few days ago one of the members of the Opposition, Mr. Puddester, I think it was, said that the proper procedure for the Finance Minister this year would be to bring in the Estimates, Supplies and the Budget all at once, and in order to oblige the honorable members of the Opposition this was done.

Now we are being referred to Bennett and MacKenzie King. I don't

care what these gentlemen are saying in Canada, this is Newfoundland. The best advice I can give these gentlemen is that they pay their bills; that they pay to Newfoundland the \$200,000 they owe us.

Yet these are the men from whom we are asked to take dictation; these men who are dishonest. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think the Opposition are only quibbling. They are filled up with a little Dutch courage because there's going to be a public meeting tonight. I'll go to any public meeting with you any time, any where.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, in this connection I would like to say that I have been Deputy Speaker of this House for four years (though perhaps I shouldn't say so myself) and I did advocate that the Estimates and Budget be presented together, but I did not advocate that this should be done before the Address in Reply had been removed from the Order Paper.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Speaker, I may say that it is impossible to give Mr. Byrne the answer as asked for, but I can give him even more information than he requested. I was connected with the Department at the time and have, therefore, accurate knowledge of the subject.

In the first year we sold 9,000 barrels of potatoes, the second year 30,000 barrels, and the third year, however, sales fell off rather badly.

The way we manage now is, we get in touch with the people who wish to get the produce, and with the producers, obtaining the amount required and such like particulars, then put them in touch with each other and let them do their own bargaining.

Last year we sold 1700 barrels of potatoes, 143 barrels of parsnips and carrots.

The railway or steamship services transported about one-half of this produce.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the members of the Government to certain questions of mine on various order papers, which remain unanswered. To the Colonial Secretary: Nos. 64, 66, 68 and 162. To the Prime Minister: Nos. 97 and 156. To the Minister of Public Works: Nos. 96 & 248. To the Minister of Finance and Customs: No. 284. To the Minister of Agriculture and Mines: No. 125. Most of these questions have been on the order paper for several days and I feel that it is time that the answers were tabled.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to Question No. 147. I have asked for a reply to this question a number of times but have never received one. We asked these questions and we want them answered and it is the rule of this House and every House, that all grievances which as a rule are outlined in questions, must be settled before supply is taken up. The question that I have asked deals with reparations.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, question No 64, asked of the Colonial Secretary, which I have previously referred to, deals with a matter of financial importance to this country. It has been on the order paper since March 26th and should be answered before any matters of Supply are brought into the House.

The motion was the Address in Reply was then read and passed.

On motion, the Address in Reply to the opening gracious speech of His Excellency the Governor was adopted, and it was ordered that the said Ad-

dress in Reply be presented by the Whole House at the convenience of His Excellency.

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 affecting certain Votes in the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions affecting certain votes in the Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, the day I introduced the resolutions regarding the 10% reduction in the civil service I explained the matters in connection therewith, and the Resolutions now before the House speak for themselves. The 10 per cent reduction affects all branches of the civil service with the exception of those outlined in the Resolutions. Old Age Pensions will not be reduced. Last year an additional \$20,000 was voted for this purpose. The same applies to pensions of civil servants. The amount of \$240,000 to be applied to the relief of the poor, such as widows, children, etc., will remain the same, but the salaries of the officials of the Public Charities Department will be reduced 10 per cent. We are not reducing the allowances for orphanages, hospital grants and charitable institutions, neither are we reducing the votes for the teachers' pensions fund. Insurance premiums on Government buildings thruout the country amounts to \$16,600 per annum. The records show that the past ten years the Government has paid out in fire insurance premiums the sum of

160 or 170 thousand dollars and have only received the amount of seven or eight thousand dollars, which was the damage caused by two small fires. The proposal now before you is that the premiums be cut in half, thereby saving approximately eight thousand dollars per annum. The steamship subsidies are being cut; the war pensions would remain the same, and as said before, that so far as the railway went all those except mechanics, laborers, engineers, firemen and conductors would receive 10 per cent reduction. These are affiliated with the Canadian Brotherhood and for that reason their salaries could not be reduced.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there is anything further that I can add, I feel sure that the Government will be criticised on this 10 per cent reduction, but the condition of the country calls for it and today we have to cut our garments according to the cloth.

True, Mr. Chairman, I know as a politician that it will be thrown back in our teeth that we squandered a lot of money, but I also know that our predecessors in office squandered just as much, and as far as that is concerned, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other. With regard to the Commissions we have appointed. I would like to take this opportunity to say that their duties will be finished by the First of July coming and they will go out of existence from that date.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Does that include the Agricultural Commission?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That is under serious consideration. There is one thing I would like to say and that is we are frank about it anyway, we are not

stealing money out of the Agriculture and Mines Department without any trace or record of it being found, as was done in the last administration. Don't talk to me about Commissions. I was in the Opposition for four years and there was more money thrown away and it was never accounted for, and now we are criticised because we do not permit that to happen.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You were going to collect some money?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—If you want to know about collecting money, I'll tell it. I'm going to collect some more. Our friends of the Opposition seem in an antagonistic mood this afternoon. Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in introducing this legislation this afternoon and I ask that these resolutions be passed.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Are we going to consider these simultaneously with the Estimates or consider them after the Estimates go through?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—We'll pass them now.

MR. EMERSON.—Do you mean that we have got to pass them right now?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Yes.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I submit that as these Resolutions have been introduced simultaneously with the Estimates, we should have a longer time to consider them. All the financial resolutions were introduced at the one time and now we are asked to consider them practically at once. They were brought down Wednesday and we adjourned until today so that we could consider them. On Friday, we spent the afternoon on a Select Committee on the Public Health Bill; on Friday night we had a meet-

ing of our own until one o'clock in the morning dealing with the Estimates, and I think we are entitled to some consideration. On the Address in Reply, we facilitated the business of the House in every way possible and we have no desire to obstruct in any way, and I think that we are entitled to go into the question of these Resolutions, the Estimates and Ways and Means more fully before we are called upon to deal with them at length.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I don't wan't to heckle, but the Opposition got from Wednesday to Monday. When I was on the Opposition we only got two days. However, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to go out of these Resolutions and go into Supply.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, we do not want to be here all the summer, and I don't see how you are going to close the House earlier by rushing these things through. We are not prepared to go on with these financial measures and we do not want to hang up the House.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—When I was in the Opposition, the Leader of the Government told me to go ahead and talk.

MR. EMERSON.—You misunderstood what I said. We will go on and talk but we have not studied this question in detail, so we cannot deal with it as we would like to. We can talk all right, but we don't want to do it, but give us a chance to study it and we can discuss it shortly.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I don't think that these Resolutions are at all fair. I think that men who are receiving from \$9,000 down to about \$2,500 should receive a larger percentage of a cut than the ordinary clerk who is getting

\$60.00 a month or less. These men should not get a cut of ten per cent. They have to support their families and dress decently to appear at the office. I am sure that the Minister of Finance and Customs will appreciate that and realize that the burden of the cut should be placed on those higher up who can afford it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—In reply to the honorable gentleman, I might say that I am prepared to make a deal with the Leader of the Opposition. He intimated here, in a political way, that he doesn't want to see the poor men's salary cut.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—No, no; that is not right.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Pardon me, he says that it is not fair. I will withdraw all these Resolutions for a ten per cent cut if the Leader of the Opposition will agree to put on twice as much Income Tax and Business Profits Tax. Instead of a man paying 5 per cent he will pay 10 per cent, and a business instead of paying 8 per cent will pay 16 per cent, and we will allow the civil service to go on as it is.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—What would be the benefit of that?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition says here as a politician so that the members of the civil service who read what he says will be discontented, that only the higher up should be cut. Well, I say, as another politician, that we won't touch the civil service at all, but will double the Income Tax and Business Profits Tax instead, and it is ignored by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You must remember that you are responsible; we

are not responsible. "Thou art the man." You will be judged, not us; and I think that you found that out since you got into power. I think that the request of the Opposition is only fair play.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE CUSTOMS.—You are beginning to squeal now.

MR. PUDDESTER.—We are not squealing; the squeal comes from that corner up there behind the Speaker's chair. It is not from the Opposition that the squeal comes, but from the Government.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—We are not squealing.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You squealed ten years ago when you were on the Opposition and you threw an ink bottle across the House.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—There was good reason for it.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You must have been thinking about the sunny slopes of Jamaica. You squealed ten years ago when your Company was getting money from the people. How much dividend did you pay from your Company?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—What business is that of yours? You had a lot of money in it. You put your money into the Daily News and made about \$180,000 in two years. Why didn't you put your money into the fisheries of the country, and then you could talk about it.

MR. PUDDESTER.—We were never sued in Court for income taxes. You started this and we can reply. I spent all Wednesday night getting our criticism on the Budget ready for the people; on Friday I was on a Select Committee and on Friday night we

had a party meeting until one o'clock in the morning, and Sunday is a day of rest. All of our party were not present at this meeting and we want to consider this matter as fully as we can..

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 tomorrow.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs" with some amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the said amendments were read a first time and, with unanimous consent, 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 passed without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to the Canning of Rabbits and other Food" with some amendments in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting

the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips," with some amendments in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 28, 1931.

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

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I have to inform the House that Lady Bennett, wife of Sir John Bennett, has passed away. I desire, therefore, to move the following Resolution:

RESOLVED—That this House desires to record an expression of its deep regret at the death of Lady Bennett and extends to her husband, Sir John Bennett, K.B.E., who for several years was a prominent member of this House, an expression of sincere sympathy.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest personal feeling that I rise to second the Resolution proposed by the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister. Only those who were favored with the personal acquaintance of Lady Bennett are able to realise her many sterling qualities. She was essentially a lady of the old school, and believed that a woman's place was in the home with her husband and children. In her younger days, particularly, she was indefatigable in doing good works, and no de-

serving cause was ever refused her support. I desire to associate myself with the Resolution and to express my heartfelt sympathy to Sir John Bennett, his sons, and daughter, for the great sorrow they are now going through.

MR. GREENE.—Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a petition from the residents of Main Street, Bell Island, on the subject of a well. The petition has been largely signed and has been forwarded to me for presentation. I give the petition my heartiest support. The section is one of the most populous on the Island, and water for drinking purposes is most difficult to obtain. As will be seen this has a great effect in affecting the health of the residents. I request, therefore, that this petition may be accepted and referred to the Department of Public Health.

Hon. Dr. Mosdell presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill "An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare."

On motion this Report was received and it was ordered that the said Report be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, on motion, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said Report.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, In line with the Report of the Select Committee, perhaps it would be just as well to decide and have an understanding what parts of the Report are to be embodied in the present Act. As far as I understand, the Select Committee decided to have a full debate on the new Sections of the Bill

which they regarded as controversial, and it might be just as well to know the controversial ones. You take Part (1) from page (2) to page (7). This is entirely new. Is it the intention of the Committee to read the whole part of the sections and read the recommendations of the Select Committee; or, supposing we begin to read Part (1) section (4). I thought it much better to deal with the contents of each section, but if you like I will give you a summary of Part (1).

I have gone into the administration of the Department as it was discussed in Select Committee and the Estimates in respect to Public Health and Public Charities, or, as it is known under this Bill, Public Welfare, will remain as set down previously. Of the officials concerned there will be the present Secretary of the Board of Governors, which is now disappearing. We will use that Secretary as a stenographer at headquarters. There is no change and no increase in cost there.

It will be found necessary to work in under the provisions of the Act as at present a Probation Officer, who will be paid at the same rate as the present such officer is paid. It will be probably necessary to transfer the man who takes charge of the ambulance. With respect to the professional members of the staff, they will come under the Bureau by virtue of the provisions of this Act and they will be paid as now, on a voucher from the Bureau.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I think it would be of advantage to know what the total cost of administration of the department will be and showing where increases and decreases are to be made or hoping to be made.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, as to whether the set up provided for under this Act would lead to an increase or a decrease, I will provide a memorandum for the Committee. The Part (1) being considered now deals with the central set up of the Bureau. The provision is that that Bureau shall consist of all the members of the Executive Government plus the two Executive officials concerned with carrying out that policy as the Bureau may decide upon. The functions of the Bureau are to review all the problems that may come under the notice of this particular office. Some objection has been raised as to the size of the membership of the Bureau on the ground that it would be too unwieldy. There are two considerations to have this set up, one being that the same sort of organization was tried out in one of the Provinces of Canada in respect to their Education Bureau and which consisted of the members of their Executive Government plus the Superintendent of Education, and this system was found to work out very well there.

The other point is that with that set up and as matters of public health and public welfare represent important affairs of public policy it is necessary for members of the Executive Government to be in close touch with what is happening from time to time. Some considerable fear has been expressed that under this Act there may be very considerable increased expenditure upon the services represented. We make the point now that no such increase is intended to be made and we will make quite sure that no unnecessary expenditure will be made in this connection.

The staff of the Bureau respecting matters of public health and public welfare together with the control and management of services and institu-

tions are of an allied nature, and the position today is that these services and these institutions are scattered around amongst different organizations. Confusion would result. As a matter of fact this has happened before and the failure has been due solely to inefficiency.

Reference has been made to the office for the purpose of looking after the professional staff on these institutions. In this respect the Bureau for Health will have full power. All the supplying for everything excepting such technical supplies as drugs, medical equipment, etc., will be in the hands of the Department of Public Works; but with regard to the staff, the Bureau has powers similar to those of the Board of Governors of the General Hospital. Under the General Hospital Act the Board has power to dismiss or engage any of the staff, from the lowest menial upwards. It is, however, now proposed to place this power in the hands of the Governor in Council and to have all appointments effected under this new arrangement, under Part 1 of the Bill.

Regarding Old Age Pensions: As yet Old Age Pensions are only partly granted, though actually it often happens that a duplicate of assistance is given and this should, of course, be avoided; for though one realizes that the amount given as a pension is very small, still these amounts must be spread over as much ground as possible; so that no one person benefits from two sources, while another receives no help whatsoever.

Another provision, and a rather important one, of Part 1, is the appointment of a Business Manager for generally running these institutions. It would be his job to see to all supplies, other than those of a technical nature, their buying and issuing, and

generally looking after the institutions and check up on them so as to ensure their being run as economically as possible.

With regard to Section 5; this Section makes provision for the Colonial Secretary being Chairman of the Bureau, just as at present he is Chairman of the Board of Health.

This, gentlemen, is a brief resume of Part 1 of the Bill, and if there are any points I have omitted I will be pleased to answer any question in that connection.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, there is perhaps one section of the Bill more remarkable than another, the section to which I refer is Section 5, sub-section 2.

(Reads)

Under this section the Colonial Secretary, who is a political mouthpiece, is also secretary of the Bureau, and on principle I object to this. I am prepared to permit the Hon. Dr. Mosdell, though a member of the House, carry out the working of this Bill for the rest of the term of this Government, but I feel that after that the Bureau should be placed outside the realms of party politics. The Colonial Secretary is a member of the House and should not be a member of the Board.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I quite agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Under Part 2, Section 13, the Secretary for the Board must be a medical practitioner. Last year this difficulty was avoided by making Dr. Campbell Assistant Secretary and paying him his fees. This is wrong; utterly wrong, and mustn't go on.

Just at present there are three members of the House who are members

of the Board, and I object to that on principle.

I quite agree that Dr. Mosdell is the only person able to put this Bill into working order, and as he insists on remaining a member of this House I submit to dictation and I agree that he remain a member of the House for the remaining eighteen months of the Government's term, if it lasts as long, which I don't think it will; but not after that time. I imagine that 18 months is long enough to get the scheme in working order, and as I said, the Hon. Dr. Mosdell is the only one man capable of putting the Bill into operation.

I do not agree, however, with the Colonial Secretary being Secretary of the Board. I am not referring to the present Colonial Secretary, but to future Colonial Secretaries.

If this Board is, and I understand it is, going to look after pauper relief, sick poor, illegitimate children and other things of that nature, I think the position should be made a permanent one outside of politics.

The Bill itself seems a good one and should be a great benefit in many respects, providing the cost of operation is not too great.

As I previously said, I think that a Board of twelve is altogether too many and too unwieldly. A quorum would consist of a majority, which in this case would be seven members of the Board, and when you take into consideration the number of executive meetings that these men will have to attend I think you will find it almost impossible to get them together to attend meetings of this Board. I agree that on the Board there should be certain members of the Executive, but do not think that all the members of the Executive should be on the

Board. I think that the Governor in Council should have authority of appointing the members and then if these members misconduct the affairs they can be overruled by the Governor in Council. Apart from that, I think that the principal of the Bill is a good one, provided that it will not cost the country too much.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, as to what is to be done about the Bureau, that is a matter of policy that will be laid down by the Prime Minister. As to the remarks made by honorable members in connection with Hon. Dr. Campbell, I would like to point out to them that there is no one as familiar with the working of the Bill as Dr. Campbell, and the fact that he happens to be a member of the Government is an accident; but I would like to inform the House that Dr. Campbell has devoted tremendous energy and a great deal of his time to this Bill.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I was wondering now if the Purchasing Department of the Public Works Department bought in the best markets at the cheapest prices?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—That is the practice.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Oh no, it is not.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, our business manager gets the very best prices possible. We confine our purchases to the best possible sources; we do not purchase indiscriminately and we get the best possible prices. I would say here now that the Board of Health gets lower prices on groceries than any individual in this town.

MR. EMERSON.—Can we place our orders through the Department?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, certainly, we would be only too glad. But, seriously speaking, there should be no complaint from that source. The Board of Health gets very good prices. Maybe the Opposition has had a change of heart; they may have become angels. I tell you we do not patronise only our biggest supporters, as you did.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—You said that you do not buy indiscriminately.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—No; we buy from certain firms and we get satisfaction.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Dealing further with this subject, I asked a question on the Order Paper some days ago—

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Did you really ask a question?

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, yes; and there are a lot of questions that have not been answered yet that we want answered. This question deals with the purchase of gauze, it is question No. 320, and I direct your attention to it. I would like you to explain how there were 50,000 yards of gauze purchased in 1929 at 7½ cents a yard. The next year it was changed from Stafford's to Connor's and they supplied 30,000 at 5½ cents a yard; two and a half cents cheaper. The next year the order was given to T. McMurdo Ltd., and the price paid was 3.86 cents a yard. I asked that a sample (I take it that you could find a few old ends left around) be brought down here so that we could compare the samples and ascertain why there was a discrepancy in price. Why there was 20,000 yards less purchased than the year before, and why 24,000 yards was purchased in one day at 7½ cents a yard?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the honorable member I would point out first of all that he is just a little wrong as regards the 30,000 yards. That was quite a day's work. There was an average of 48,000 yards a year. It is true that we paid 7½ cents the first year and now we are paying 4½ cents a yard. I will endeavor for the satisfaction of the honorable member for Bay de Verde to bring down all the linen we have up there. I asked the superintendents of the various institutions to send me along samples of the gauze that was bought in 1929 from Stafford's at 7½ cents a yard. It was found that the mesh was very fine and it was considered that a cheaper gauze would do just as well. I consulted the Superintendent of the General Hospital and he thought that a gauze of a coarser mesh could be used just as well, and Connors' supplied this at 5½ cents a yard.

I think I can explain that the reason we got it for 5½ cents a yard was because a large quantity was bought. I submitted samples to the Superintendent of the General Hospital, and the one approved of we succeeded in getting for 5½ cents a yards as against 7½ cents for the year previous. This year we obtained samples of various kinds. These were submitted to the Superintendent and the one he selected cost much less. This buying of gauze of a cheaper nature and coarser mesh was instrumental in saving eleven hundred dollars. That is my explanation, and I hope it is satisfactory.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, my experience in connection with the inspection of milk has been that for two or three years the Public Health Department employed me as prosecutor. Mr. Lawlor, the Inspector of Milk, used to go out

every morning on the streets and if he felt like it he could take a quart or pint of milk from a milkman, seal it up and bring it to the Department to be analyzed. In the first year that I was so employed, there were three hundred prosecutions; in the next year there were one hundred and fifty cases, and in the following year there were only three or four. Inspection by Mr. Lawlor was so good that there was no dilution of milk and the barns were not so dirty that dirt got into the milk. As a result there was a great improvement in the milk. I think that this inspection should be rigidly maintained and if a case comes up, no matter who it is, they should be prosecuted with vigor.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Chairman, could you tell me if the General Hospital and the Sanatorium and the other institutions get frozen meat or fresh meat?

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—I don't know. You see, it does not come under our control.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister presented a petition from the Grenfell Association applying for a Grant of Land at Cartwright.

On motion this petition was received and it was ordered to be referred to a Select Committee to report as to whether the Rules of the House

have been complied with; the Committee to consist of Mr. Speaker, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Winter.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Standardization for Export of Dried Codfish."

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Hon. Leader of Opposition gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Insurance on Crews prosecuting the Sealing Industry" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the Newfoundland Hotel.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the Report of his Department for the year 1930.

Mr Speaker left the Chair at 6.05 until 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair shortly after 8 p.m.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Relating to Life Insurance" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages" without amendment.

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the International Grenfell Association reported as follows:

To the Honourable the House of Assembly:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of The International Grenfell Association begs to report that it has considered the matter to it referred and that it finds that the Rules of this House have been complied with and recommends the introduction of the attached Bill.

(Sgd.) A. J. WALSH,
P. J. LEWIS,
J. A. WINTER.

Whereupon on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill "An Act respecting the International Grenfell Association" was introduced and read a first and second time, and ordered to be referred to a Select Committee for consideration.

The Select Committee was appointed as follows: Mr. Downey, Mr. Earle, Mr. Godden, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, the day I introduced the Estimates in the House I went into details and have very little further to add at present except to point out to the members on the other side of the House that I will supply in detail any information that may be required by the members and any minor changes will be supplied by the heads of the various departments as we proceed with the debate.

MR. PUDDESTER—I would like to ask the Minister of Finance how much money is left over as balance of loans unexpended.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—On April 4th there was a balance of three quarters of a million unexpended but that has all been allocated for different purposes.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I notice that last year the vote was \$11,366,196.23 and this year the total is \$11,467,146.06 or an increase of \$100,949.83. Notwithstanding the cuts in the Civil Service the vote now asked for is \$100,000 more than last year. May I ask the Prime Minister who forced him to take this action? Was it his government or was it his party? If he won't answer himself may I answer for him? The truth is that the Executive Government decided to bring in the estimates calling for the full

expenditure but when the party meeting was called the party did not stand for the increase in expenditure. The reductions were enforced by the opinion of the party. The party sent the estimates back to the Government to be cut. What the Government should have done then was to cut the estimates to the bone and bring them down with the reductions printed in them in book form and not resort to the extremity of introducing a bill authorizing reductions. It is too cowardly to talk about.

The country cannot afford to spend twelve million dollars and it is just as well to realise it now. The Resolution that has come before the House is mere camouflage. It is trying to throw dust in the eyes of the people. They are told that something may turn up and then the reduced salaries will be restored. The Resolutions gave authority to the Executive Government to do this. And it is a most undesirable state of affairs to place in the hands of the Executive Government the powers which belong only to the House. The House is the proper place to do things like that. The Bill not only empowers the Executive to restore the salaries cut off but it is retroactive and enables the Executive in time of political expedience to do things which they should not have power to do. The House should vote the money and not delegate its powers to the Executive Government. The Governor in Council is the servant of this House and should not be in existence if it has not the confidence of this House. Why should power be delegated to the Governor in Council?

MR. SCAMMELL—Why are you talking like that? Move a vote of want of confidence and see how it will get on.

MR. PUDDESTER.—We will see here next year if it has the confidence of the House.

MR. SCAMMELL.—You leave that to us.

MR. PUDDESTER.—The House of Assembly holds the purse strings of this country and it is for us to vote monies.

MR. SCAMMELL.—You have only one right, and that is the right of reducing.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Well, we will avail of that right and we will give you plenty of opportunities to reduce. We have no power to increase but we have power to reduce, and if you want resolutions to reduce we will accommodate you. We will move a resolution on every line in these Estimates and move that they be reduced. We shall go through these Estimates and help the Government come to the conclusion that they have not been able to come to. "In multitude of counsel there is wisdom." We realise our responsibility and the honorable gentlemen over there should realize their responsibilities. I am sincere in what I am saying. We should get together and reduce further. We cannot increase. We are heading for disaster as fast as we can and the sensible men over there on the Government benches should realise that. It should have been started years ago.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That's the trouble.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Sure that's the trouble, and I predict that there will be eleven and a half million spent in the Estimates next year, and as we go through these Estimates now I will show you what you did last year.

Take those subsidies; are you cutting the subsidies? Are you not going

to pay the Railway these subsidies? You will cut the Railway \$200,000.00.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—We took 25 per cent off; not \$200,000.00.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You are not going to pay the Railway that?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. The subsidies were cut \$97,000.00; that is not \$200,000.00. It does not mean that the Railway will not receive these subsidies, but they will receive the subsidies according to the service they perform.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You mean if it is found necessary to tie up the boats you will not pay them?

MR. EMERSON.—Has it been done before?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No.

MR. EMERSON.—What is the idea of that?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—We are not going to pay them when they are not operating.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, will the Hon. Minister explain where the saving will be. It will be just a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul—pardon me using the name 'Peter.' The position is this: You pay to the Railway certain subsidies every year. This year you are not going to pay them. Last year there was a deficit and this year there is going to be a deficit greater by the amount of the subsidies that are cut. If there is a deficit of the Railway there is a deficit on the whole country.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I don't see how that will apply. If there is a de-

ficit this year of a half a million dollars and we decide to restrict the services, we will not operate the boats next year, how are we going to have a deficit next year?

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, if you don't operate the boats you don't need to cut the subsidy. You said if the boats were tied up you would pay no subsidy.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—We are taking 25% off.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, if you reduce the service it does not mean that you will reduce the expenditure 25 per cent, and you cannot reduce the service 25 per cent, that is a matter for the Railway Commission. In any event if you run these boats at certain times, if you want to cut the services by twenty-five per cent, that is that there will no ports cut down, you may save coal, but you will not save in wages to the crew, you will not save in repairs, in wear and tear or on insurance.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—You will save on all three.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert on these matters, you know more than I do, but it is not a fact that when a boat is continually being gotten ready for sea it is more expensive than when she is running regularly?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, oh yes, it is. In any event, cutting down these services by 25 per cent will not save 25 per cent in the running of these ships, but that is only a detail. As the honorable member for Bay de Verde pointed out, these reductions should be voted in the Estimates.

There is on the Order Paper a set of Resolutions for a reduction of ten per cent in the various salaries paid to civil servants. Supposing these Estimates pass as they stand and the Resolutions do not pass, what will happen to your Budget Speech? Where would you be then?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I guess I would be out of luck.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with you. I think that the suggestion of the honorable member for Bay de Verde is a very good one. We should have the Estimates alone, and every vote should be considered on its merits. You will be worse than out of luck, you will be out of Government if these Resolutions do not pass. That is the position, and I put it to the Committee that these Estimates as they are now should not be before us. I take it that these Estimates are going to go through, but that will not stop our criticising them. It does not take away from the fact that you bring down the Estimates one day and the Resolutions to reduce another day.

These Estimates should be in the form where they can become law when the House closes. I don't propose to deal with the form of these Resolutions on the Order Paper, because their form needs serious consideration. There is one thing about these Estimates that the Minister of Finance and Customs cannot boast of and that is that there is no serious item where he is cutting down on a service. He is cutting the poor man who is earning \$90.00 or \$100.00 a month, but there is no serious attempt to curtail expenditure which is costing thousands and thousands of dollars. There is not one single instance which the Minister can point to where there is a serious curtailment.

He has told us of the very serious financial condition of the country, and if we take the Estimates as they stand today it means an expenditure of eleven and a half million dollars for the next year. You are going to take off ten per cent from the poor unfortunates who have small salaries, but you are not going to curtail in any serious measure any of the larger services such as the railway and the steamships. You say we are practically bankrupt and still you will not cut out a motor car. I was going to make some remarks on the question of the Resolutions but I have decided to defer them until the Resolutions come up for discussion; but is is the one sad aspect of your Estimates that calls for comment and criticism, namely, that you have not shown any earnest desire to curtail any of your huge extravagances that the country is called upon to pay for.

MR. PUDDESTER.— Mr. Chairman, a day or two ago I asked the Minister of Public Works as to the functions performed now by the members of the Board of Works. I understand a purchasing agent has been appointed which necessitates the elimination of that Board. There are six members on that Board who are paid \$250 a year each; the Minister acts as Chairman. Now I understand the Board has not met since January 1st last, and I, consequently, do not see the necessity for having that Board in existence. According to the Act the Board acts in an advisory capacity and for a number of years acted as a purchasing agent for the Department and for the passing on of supplies for the different Government institutions.

As there is a gentleman now functioning as purchasing agent, I fail to see why the Board should be in existence any longer and why this

House should be called upon to vote them \$1500 a year. I think, Sir, this is an excellent opportunity to have this vote cut out of the Estimates, as it is not now necessary. These six men will not do any work and will not be called upon to do any work, and I have much pleasure in moving now that this vote be deleted from the Estimates. I think this is a good time to begin a curtailment in that Department and I feel sure that the six men who are getting this \$1500 can very well do without it and this country will be \$1500 the richer.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to second that motion. Feeling sure that the Minister of Public Works is very much in earnest in the way of economy and now that he has been given a purchasing agent, I have no doubt but that he is very pleased to have us make this motion. These six men already referred to simply act for themselves and their particular friends and I feel certain that the Minister of Public Works will take advantage of this ideal opportunity in making a saving for his Department.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Chairman, I would really like to oblige the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Puddester, because I am sure they are always sincere. I am also sure that Mr. Puddester was sincere when he was a member of a government which was in office from 1924 to 1928. During that period they had a Board of Works of six members and they paid one member, who represented St. John's West, a considerable sum of money for the purpose of keeping the Department advised and making sure that nobody but their supporters got any patronage. Now the Board of Works is an advisory Board, but there are more things in the Department for them to do besides

giving out patronage. That is the smallest part of our work.

It is very embarrassing sometimes for members of the Board to give patronage because it happens, through no fault of their own, they are in business themselves, and for that reason I have no desire to embarrass these members and that is why we appointed a purchasing agent. But there are other duties which the Board has to perform; other questions arise in which I require the advice of the Board.

The Board has a great many things to discuss apart from any matters dealing with patronage, and I only hope that when the Opposition come into power, if they ever do, that they will not pay a gentleman of their party \$500 merely to go down to the Department and see that there is no member of the other party receiving patronage.

MR. PUDDESTER.—That's alright, but let's get more serious. You are making a burlesque of it. We're not going to get anywhere if you are going to treat every vote as a burlesque. Perhaps \$1500 isn't much; maybe it falls like manna from heaven; but \$15000 means a lot to this country. We're going to clean out our stables before we go any further.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I'm sick of all this nonsense about fifteen hundred dollars. We're talking about saving fifteen hundred dollars, but we're spending four and three-quarter million dollars on the Civil Service, and if a cut is suggested in the Civil Service all we hear is "the poor Civil Service." The Opposition is not sincere; they are only using this trash for party purposes and it's in their papers every day. We want economy, and if the Opposition are going to

talk of cleaning stables, well, let them talk of cleaning stables, well, let me tell them that one of their members spent between thirty and forty thousand dollars of the public money to be elected in 1928.

Now let us get down to business. It is my job to bring in this legislation and I'm doing my best, and if the Opposition is going to talk about cleaning stables let me tell them that when we got them they were dirty and they're still stinking. If we are going to discuss business, let's do it intelligently.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, I don't think a vote of \$250 each for the six members of this Board is unreasonable. The Board is far from useless. It manages a great deal of business for the country in practically all respects and there are no attempts whatsoever to get business for themselves or their friends.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I think in the heat of the argument many things were said which we misunderstood. The Minister of Finance does not seem to like what we are saying, but I may say we have 180 pages to consider and he can't expect us to go through these 180 pages without some severe criticism.

I am afraid in the acrimony of the immediate moment the Hon. Minister of Public Works and my friend, the member for Bay de Verde, took the matter rather too personally.

It is no use arguing about this \$1500, it is only a flea-bite compared with other items. It does not mean anything, only as a matter of principle everything has to be cut. And if he cares to admit it, no one knows this better than the Minister of Public Works. We are talking in millions and we have to cut everywhere and we should have done it years ago, and everyone knows it.

HON. MINISTER POSTS & TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since my connection with this House I have ever been accused of taking money for which I wasn't giving service. I was asked to go on this Board and I accepted membership, and if it any satisfaction to the public then I'll resign from this Board.

MR. FITZGIBBON.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to reply to the remarks of the members of the Oppositon regarding the Board of which I am a member. I was also a member of this Board when the Warren Party was in power.

We give greater service for our money than any of the other officials, and I say this without fear of contradiction.

We are paid only twenty dollars a month, yet hardly a day passes but I am consulted with regard to some matter for the Board; not a week goes by but there is a meeting of the Board often going on until after midnight. A great deal of the country's business is transacted by this Board, to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Not a post office, or such like building, goes up but we are consulted on it, and for all this we receive \$20.00 per month. I don't think that this is a very extravagant wage to pay the members of the Board considering the amount of work they do.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I desire to confirm what the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has just said. He did not seek a place on the Board, and it was only under pressure from me that he agreed to accept the place made vacant by the death of the late Mr. Grimes.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to cast any reflection on either Mr. Halfyard or Mr. Fitz-

gibbon or any other member of that Board, but merely say that in my opinion this Board is an unnecessary expense and should be abolished.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the vote for the Government Engineer's Office. We want an opportunity to discuss the vote for the Highroads, and will either do it now or when the Highroads vote comes up for discussion. The Government Engineer receives a salary from that Department of \$4,600.00 a year, and it is a well-known fact that he is also paid \$1400.00 a year as a Highroads Commissioner. He may be worth \$6,000.00 a year. Since the Government has taken over the Railway Mr. Hall has had very little to do in connection with that from an engineering standpoint. Mr. Robinson, the Assistant Engineer, gets a salary from the Engineer's Department of \$2,200.00 a year and an additional salary from the Highroads Commission of \$1400 a year, making in all a total of \$3,600.00 a year. I have no objection to his receiving a salary of \$3,600.00 a year and feel that his work probably deserves that salary, but I do think and contend that instead of paying these gentlemen one salary from the Government Engineer's Department and another salary from the Highroads Commission, that they should be lumped together and voted in one salary by this House.

Next on the programme is the Masonry Superintendent, who gets a salary of \$2500.00 a year and an addition of \$500.00 a year from the Highroads Commission. These amounts should also be voted as one salary. In connection with the Masonry Superintendent I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this gentleman last year ran a car at the expense of the Government and the upkeep of that car cost the country

\$2,508.00, which in my opinion is an unnecessary expense. I do not think that any private citizen who is driving a car would ever allow it to cost this amount to operate. There is another car, "C. 101," and it would pay the Minister of Public Works to keep his eye on this car which is continually going back and forth over the roads on Sundays and holidays as well as working days, and most of the time it is used for joy-riding. It would be a great save if instead of having this car tearing along the roads on joy-riding expeditions, it was kept in the barn on Sundays and holidays. These are examples of unnecessary expense that should be cut out, and when the previous Government was in power there was no member in the House of Assembly who so strongly criticised the expenditure in this connection than the present Chief Commissioner of Highroads, Mr. Hibbs.

If we are going to discuss the allocation for the Highroads now, I want to place on record that the amount of one million seven hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars (\$1,755,000) is altogether too much to spend in one year. When the Monroe Government expended \$365,000 on similar work the Minister of Public Works was the first person to stand up and abuse them and criticise it. There was an answer to a question tabled today which showed that Dwyer's Road, a diversion from the Hodgewater Line to the Trinity Bay Line, which measured one and one-fifth miles, cost this country \$12,106.00, and I say here that there was absolutely no necessity whatever for this diversion. There was a perfectly good road going through Whitbourne and it only took motors a matter of five or six minutes to go around that road, and I feel sure that nobody cared because of the amount of the time.

It is a difficult country? It should never have been done. If it was done for relief purposes or to avoid destitution, all right; but if the Hon. Minister were on this side of the House he would denounce in no uncertain terms the fact that it had cost three or four thousand dollars a mile, and this diversion cost \$12,165.00. When the building of this road was being considered he should have said "No." This diversion only saves five or ten minutes run. He spends \$12,165.00 on this road. I heard it said by a man not connected with politics in any way that the Highroads Commission has enough machinery to dig the Panama Canal.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I know that Mr. Puddester would like to see the expenditure reduced and I am surprised to see that he has permitted Page 7 of the Estimates to pass without comment. I am not trying to exonerate myself, but I do ask Mr. Puddester if he is sincere when he talks about cutting the Government Engineer's salary, and he allows to pass without notice the fact that the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control receives \$5,000 a year for bailing out booze. I say that that is a disgrace. That salary was voted by the Monroe Government. Then you criticise Mr. Hall's salary, a first-class engineer. Why, these people at the Board of Liquor Control would not earn their salaries in five years. If you go back to Page 7 and make the motion to cut these salaries, I will support you.

MR. EMERSON.—Make the motion yourself.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Puddester severely criticises the Highroads Commission because Mr. Leelands had received

\$2500.00 on his car. Maybe Mr. Puddester can remember when a supervising engineer got \$7,000.00 to spend on his car, and he may remember that I was the one man in this House who insisted that the Government buy him a car, and now they say that it is a crime. \$2,500.00 for his car, and he saves about \$11,000.00 on the building of bridges and such things. I think that the Opposition and Government will agree that no more competent man could be found. He covered 35,000 or 40,000 miles last year and that is why the cost is so high. It is better to pay \$2500.00 and save \$11,000.00 in seeing that bridges are constructed under expert supervision.

I would like, if my honorable friend wants to discuss Highroads matters, for him to discuss them from an intelligent point of view. I do not want to cast any reflection on Mr. Puddester, but I think that his memory is getting short, failing perhaps. He says that the greatest amount that the Monroe Government spent was \$365,000.00. Well, if I remember rightly, they spent \$1,250,000.00 in one year. At one time they had 5,000 men on the payroll. We never had as many as that, although I will admit that last year we had more men than we could handle, but because of economic conditions we had to give employment, and if Mr. Alderdice were the Prime Minister he would have to do the same thing unless some miracle occurred, and miracles are very rare these days.

With regard to this Road, it is true that we built a connecting road. It is a highroad, a main trunk road, and in future people coming from Bonavista Bay and Trinity Bay will not have to go six or seven miles out of their way. I admit that the one and a half miles could have been done cheaper, but we had to give the men the work,

and if Mr. Puddester is not too forgetful he may remember asking me if I could fit some of his men in there, which I did and that helped to swell the cost. I don't think that there should be any kick about the Government Engineer receiving \$4,200.00 and \$1,600.00, as I think that Mr. Hall deserves and earns every dollar of it. We get far greater value for this than we do for the \$5,000.00 and two \$4,000.00 that are paid to the members of the Board of Liquor Control. On some construction jobs the Government Engineer saves his salary ten times over. I say without fear of successful contradiction that the Government Engineer saved us \$50,000.00 last year. He is in a better position to do so than these men who are handling the distribution of liquor. I suggest that they be cut down, and get a couple of clerks to do the work at about \$2,000 each.

This road we were speaking about cost quite a bit of money, but your Government spent \$16,000.00 on one mile, it was not a mile, of road. There was not a mile of new road built until this government came into office. This road was a road built out in the wilderness; it is a different proposition if the road was there already and you had only to build it up. I myself, personally, checked up and found that the Monroe Government spent \$16,000.00 on one mile of road.

MR. EMERSON.—Where was that?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Between Middle Bight and Kelligrews.

MR. PUDDESTER.—What did that road near Spreadeagle cost?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, it cost considerable money. There were very heavy gorges and heavy fills. This was not an or-

inary road; maybe this route should have been avoided, but it is a very difficult road.

MR. PUDDESTER.—How much did three miles cost?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I can't tell you.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Didn't it cost \$51,000.00, survey and all?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Oh no, oh no.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I would like to remind the Hon. Minister that he cannot excuse himself by referring to other governments. I am not defending the Monroe Government. They made a lot of mistakes; we all make them; but we are not here to discuss the sins of the Monroe Government. You have been two and a half years in office and you have to defend yourself. Referring back to Page 7 which the Minister referred to, I move that—if you will allow us to revert back to this, Sir—that the salary of the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control be cut down to \$4,000.00 and the two Commissioners to \$3,600.00.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I have much pleasure, Sir, in seconding that motion.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The first motion is that this vote be reconsidered.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we should accept those challenges without knowing what they mean. This means that the Chairman of the Board will get \$4,000.00 less ten per cent and the Commissioners \$3,600.00 less ten per cent. The Chairman of the Board was taken from a good job in the outports as Magistrate at a substantial salary and the salary offered him was not con-

sidered too high at the time, and now you suggest taking \$1,400.00 off his salary; is that fair? Unless it is shown that he has failed in his duty, I don't see why he should be picked upon to have his salary reduced. I would like to point out that when he took over the job he took over an ugly mess and he has cleaned up that mess very well.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the member for Placentia East. It may be all very well to take up challenges, but what of the victim? Imagine Mr. Mifflin's feelings when he gets up tomorrow morning and sees that there has been \$1,400.00 taken off his salary because the member for Fogo took up the challenge of my honorable friend the member for Bay de Verde and cut the salary of one of the most trusted and reliable men in the civil service.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—There is another very trusted and reliable man, Mr. Keating.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I was not saying anything about Mr. Keating.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I think Sir I may term what is going on here as a burlesque and a farce and it is time that the comedy should be cut out. Members on the other side should be sincere. They talk about retrenchment but when a reduction of ten per cent. is put on salaries they are not prepared to support it. They say their job is to reduce but they are not prepared to reduce the salary of the head man in the liquor department who gets \$5,000 a year. Now referring to the salary, or salaries I should say, of the Government Engineer. That Sir is another joke and a huge cod. He is voted \$4,600 a year here as

Government Engineer and he gets \$1,400 more, without authority from this House, as Deputy Head of the Highroads Department. Then we have a man named Cochius getting \$4,600 a year, another named Needles so many thousands more in salaries from the Highroads Departments besides what they get for motor cars and none of it voted by this House, although the people of the country got to pay the bills. The Government Engineer is not worth \$6,000 a year, I maintain he should not be paid it, neither should his chief assistants. They are getting more than departmental heads. I think it is scandalous and should not be tolerated. If we have any authority here we should vote the salaries for the Highroads Department as well as for the Engineer's Department. Imagine men like Needles and Cochius getting more salary than the heads of Departments. I say Sir the whole thing is ridiculous. The same applies to the liquor department where three men are getting \$13,000 a year and don't earn it. The thing is a farce comedy and when I get into my own Estimates I will discuss the matter more fully.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

Mr. Chairman, just a word or two by way of explanation. I do not see anything wrong in the suggestion that the salaries of the Government Engineer's and Highroads Department should be voted in the House. May be they would be much better off if that were the case because we have to remember that as highroad officials they would not be entitled to pensions; but I do not think that this House would seriously consider the cutting of Mr. Hall's salary. I feel sure the Opposition members would not cut it.

The Government Engineer acts as Chief Commissioner of Highroads and has very arduous duties imposed upon

him and anybody who goes to Mr. Hall's office can see that. Perhaps he has one of the most important jobs in the whole civil service and I think we should think twice before reducing his salary. Regarding the suggestion of Mr. Lake as to having the salaries for the Engineer's and Highroads Department voted here I think it is immaterial. I do think that Mr. Hall is in an entirely different position from Mr. Mifflen, Chairman of the Liquor Department. Mr. Mifflen is not over-worked and should be reduced although we will get abused for that from the Opposition members.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I say that Mr. Hall is not worth \$6,000 a year and Mr. Cochius, Neelands and the others are not worth many thousands they are getting. This is a damn curse to the fishermen of this country and I for one am not going to stand for it. I am going to see this whole matter through before this session closes. I am talking common sense and on behalf of the fishermen and the people who sent me to this House to represent them. It is high time Sir for the Minister of Public Works to cut this funny talk and get down to business, and it is time that these immense sums of money paid out to officials for highroads was taken charge of by this House. I am sick of it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—May I ask the Hon. Member to whom he is referring.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I am referring to you and it is time these extra salaries were cut out for Highroads including the one you are getting yourself.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Do you want to create a scene?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of Order.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—

Under the Rules of the House when a commotion arises the Speaker is entitled to take the Chair, and now that order is restored I would ask that the Committee of the Whole House continue to discuss the Order for Supply.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

Mr. Chairman, continuing my remarks on the subject now before the Chair I would like to say that I want no more unseemly interruptions and am not standing for any either. I have done just as good work on behalf of the people of this Colony as anybody in this House and I have done just as hard a work as any other member of this House to reduce expenditure. I am not ashamed of my record as Minister of Public Works or as Chairman of the Highroads Commission and I defy any man to point the finger of scorn that I have done wrong as a public man. When I get up to speak I have my own individuality to express myself and do not want to be dictated to as to how I shall talk. I am not appealing now to St. John's galleries or to any other galleries. The people whom I represent and who I have to appeal to know me full well and have confidence in me and I have never done anything to cause them to lose that confidence. Referring again to the Liquor Control Department I fail to see why two Commissioners should each receive \$4000 a year or \$400 more than Deputy Heads of Departmental offices. The latter gentlemen have more responsibility and more work and I say it is not fair. I do not insinuate that these Commissioners are not doing their duty, but it is absolutely unfair to

pay \$13,000 a year for three men to run the Liquor Board and at the same time talk about cutting the salary of such an important man as Mr. Hall, so that when we come to speak about economy why not we be just about it.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Hon. Minister that I am impervious to his remarks. I don't know if I am in order or not but I now move that the vote for the Engineer's Office be passed over until we come to the Highroads vote and the two be passed together.

MR. EMERSON—I wish to second that motion.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have great pleasure in complying with the wishes of any Minister of the Crown even if it is made in heat.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to amend my motion. I move that the salary of the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control be reduced to \$4,400 and those of the other two Commissioners to \$3,600 and the ten per cent. cut apply after that.

HON. MR LEWIS—Mr. Chairman, I wish, Sir, to associate myself with what Mr. Lake has just said in this connection, and I agree entirely with him. This matter is too broad to be considered in the light of party politics. The question of reduction is the greatest one that the country has faced for years and though it is bristling with difficulties it must be faced. The knife must be used wherever possible and where it will be least felt. I will vote with the opposition in reducing the votes as the Committee goes along. I think that the salary of the Government Engineer is too high. His present duties are lighter than when the railway was not government owned, and yet he is

paid more money. It is wrong, and I will vote to have it reduced. The same applies to Mr. Cochius. The appointment of this man was a travesty. He should never have been brought here. It is an imposition on the taxpayers to have to pay his salary and I will vote to have his salary deleted from these estimates or from whatever department he is paid. There are more capable road builders in the country than this man.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, the Monroe Government built the Hotel and now we've got to sell it and it's after costing the country over \$600,000.00.

The Monroe Government saddled us with the Highroads, which is after costing the country millions, and we're being told that we're being repaid through the duty received by the customs on new cars brought into the country, but if things go on as they are going there aren't going to be any new cars come into the country.

In addition to the Highroads we have the liquor mess. They brought in prohibition; who wants prohibition, I don't and I don't care who knows it. It's only a cod any way. I know the people who talk about prohibition. Yes and the next thing I found them drinking whiskey; they are only a bunch of hypocrites.

We're talking about cutting salaries, but on the Liquor Board two officials were appointed at salaries exceeding those paid the Deputy Heads of Departments of the Crown, and what is more these men were moved in over the heads of many more deserving civil servants. Look at the late Collector of Customs, Mr. LeMessurier and the present official Mr. Hutchings, and in the Department of Finance we have Mr. Keating, one of the most trusted of our officials. Mr. Keating

is no great friend of mine but he's served the country for forty years and no one in this House can point a finger of scorn at him. No more loyal servant of the Crown exists.

Look what prohibition is after doing to the country, we're drinking more now than we did before and it's got to such a pitch that I doubt if we can do without it. What happened when we closed up the rum shops. In 1914 we imported 30,000 gallons and now we are importing nearly 60,000; that's what's after happening. Look what prohibition did for America, ruined every decent individual in it.

Why only the other day I was reading a criticism in the Evening Telegram, of a book just then published, this was the autobiography of a notorious crook, a bootlegger, Al. Capone. This man was enabled owing to prohibition to make about thirty or forty million dollars.

Those who are advocating prohibition are only a set of hypocrites, why, gentlemen they drink more than the people they're talking against. They drink everything and they drink it everyhow they even take it in milk, I have seen them do it.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why I want the salaries of the Highroads official voted in the estimates is because I don't want the department to become a permanent one for if it does we'll never be able to remove them.

This country doesn't want a Highroads policy. We were saddled with a Highroads Commission and owing to the economic conditions we were forced to keep on with the Highroads. But if to-morrow things brighten up we wouldn't want to be saddled with a Highroads Commission. That is why I want these salaries voted for if not they will assume the standing of

civil servants, and we won't be able to blow them from their positions.

Now we've had quite a frank discussions and we're after getting through a lot of work.

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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Criminal Law" 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 four o'clock on tomorrow afternoon, April 29th, instant.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 29, 1931.

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

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Standardization for Export of Dried Codfish" was in-

troduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relations to the Newfoundland Hotel.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, as I said previously, these Resolutions deal with certain privileges of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities. Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Ltd. is in liquidation and Sir William Lloyd has been appointed liquidator.

Pursuant to an order of Mr. Justice Kent's, the Hotel is for sale by tender and this has been advertised both in Newfoundland as well as outside.

Sir William Lloyd informs me that several possible purchasers have communicated with him and there have been enquiries as to whether certain privileges allowed the original company would be given the purchaser of the Hotel. Sir William informs me that whether or not this would be permitted would make a great difference in the purchase price. I may say that it is quite possible the Hotel may not realise sufficient to relieve the Government of their responsibility to the bondholders. I instructed Sir William to get in touch with the Deputy Minister of Justice and arrange the legislation necessary for the purpose of bringing the matter before the House.

The part referred to is contained in paragraph 14.

(Reads)

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I am speaking without any consideration of the matter, but offhand it seems to me that if things took a change and brightened up and we had a large tourist traffic then this hotel would be in a strong position and it does not seem quite fair that this Hotel should not be excepted from certain taxes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Newfoundland Hotel" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Newfoundland Hotel" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.
Mr. Chairman, Section 71 of the 1925 Act reads as follows:—

(Reads)

This means that if a person is on trial on a charge of manslaughter arising out of a motor car accident, the jury is not confined to bringing in a verdict of manslaughter. They may now hold the accused guilty under Section 71 of the Highway Traffic Act and if he were found so guilty he would be barred from being prosecuted further in respect to an offence arising out of the same facts. This was done at the instance of the Department of Justice with the collaboration of the Judges of the Supreme Court so as to expedite and make easy the handling of criminal cases of this sort.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I think that this Bill is a good one. It is more in the nature of a Bill dealing with psychology. In most motor car cases arising through neglect on the part of the driver, or the driver being drunk, or speeding, the jury looks upon manslaughter as a very serious crime and will not bring in a conviction except where the evidence is overwhelmingly against the accused. The idea of this is that the jurors may bring in a verdict under Section 71 of the Highways Traffic Act for which the maximum sentence is two years, for manslaughter the maximum sentence is life, in other words if the defendant is found guilty under this section, the jurors merely make a recommendation of mercy to the judge. You will all agree that most juries were sympathetic to motor car drivers in recent years. I think that this Act should have been brought in before, I often discussed this matter with other members of the legal profession and I am pleased to find that now the Government is bringing it in.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—case of a person being drunk in charge Mr. Chairman, what happens in the

of a car and kills someone in that condition? Would the Bill allow that person to be charged under the Highway Traffic Act?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Chairman, the object of this section is as so ably and learnedly pointed out by my Hon. friend, Mr. Emerson, and is quite clear. When a person is proceeded against on a charge of manslaughter arising out of a motor car accident, the jury may find the man guilty and the judge may impose the maximum sentence—life; now the jury having thought of the significance of this terrible crime may urge themselves to bring in a verdict of not guilty, they are very seldom inclined to convict under this section when the jury comes to an agreement that it is a minor offence, they may reduce it to Section 71. In the case of a man charged with the murder the jury may reduce it to manslaughter but in the case of manslaughter the jury cannot reduce the charge to a lower offence. This section gives the jury the right to reduce the charge to manslaughter to a lower offence in the case of motor car accidents.

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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Criminal Law" 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 afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 30th, 1931.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Facilitate the operation of the Newfoundland Hotel."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, this is a new copy of the Bill with the amendments suggested by the Hon. Member for Placentia East inserted. The Bill has only been received by me and I have not had time to read it over yet, but I understand that all the suggested changes have been made.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, is the Prime Minister anxious that this Bill should be read this afternoon, the reason I ask this is because the acting Deputy Minister of Justice called on me this morning to discuss the Bill but unfortunately we did not have a copy of the new bill to go over but he told me that he would draft a Bill for the House with the suggested changes

and I should suggest that if the Prime Minister does not wish to pass this Bill this afternoon in order that it may be presented to the Upper House, that the Committee would now rise and when we have had time to go over the Bill that the committee sit again and discuss the Bill.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—I had intended to pass this Bill this afternoon and send it to the Upper House, but if the Hon. Member for Placentia East is not ready for the Bill I will 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.

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. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, the amount allocated in this vote covers first, the reent of the High Commissioner's Office in London, second, all the salaries in that department covering that of Miss (stenographer) and several other stenographers and also that of Mr. Davies and Mr. Hutchings and is just barely enough to get along with.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—What position does Mr. Davies hold at present. Is he the High Commissioner or the Government Analyst.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Davies is now acting as Trade Commissioner on the same salary that he was receiving as Government Analyst.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION

I understand that Mr. Davies will soon be coming home.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

He will be coming home immediately after the Glasgow exhibition.

MR. EMERSON—When the question of the High Commissioner's office came up for discussion two years ago we were informed that it was the intention of the Government to change the High Commissioner's office and to appoint a Trade Commissioner in London.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

That is quite correct but it was found utterly impossible to obtain the services of a competent man to fill the position on the salary voted and Mr. Davies has fulfilled the office temporarily and is doing excellent work. I have no idea, if any clerk had incurred expenses in connection with any Newfoundland matter, the draft would go forward from here. If there was any personal expenses incurred by myself they are paid, there is not one five cents or one penny outstanding between myself and the High Commissioner's office.

MR. PUDDESTER—Would there be a draft on the Prime Minister's office for any personal expenses?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—It would be paid by myself or Mr. Carew or Miss Saunders.

MR. EMERSON—I accept the Prime Minister's statement but I would like to point out that Mr. Davies is out of the country and I understand that he is being paid his salary as Government Analyst. I think that he left the country to go to England to educate his children and is only coming back temporarily. I don't think that we want a chemist in that office but this is on a par with other appointments which the Government made. I have no personal objection to Mr. Davies but I don't think that public offices should be dealt like that.

MR. PUDDISTER—In 1928 before the death of the late Victor Gordon, the Government voted \$10,000.00 for the High Commissioner's office. I have the account here of the High Commissioner's office for 1929 and 1930 and I would like to get an explanation from the Prime Minister on a couple of things. There is an item here for James Murray, R.N.R. for £39, 17s. to Geo. Dawe as guardian of the child of the late James Murray.

....**RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER**—That must be some matter in connection with the Royal Naval Reservists, the High Commissioner's office controls various matters in connection with the graves and Beaumont Hamel and this should come out in another vote.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Chairman, These Pension votes are increasing year by year. When I first came into this House about twenty years ago, this vote was \$80,000.00; in four years it was \$90,000.00 and now it is \$132,000.00 and I never saw the time that it could be decreased.

MR. QUINTON—Are Mail Couriers Civil Servants? Do they work on contract or on a monthly wage. Last year I was looking for a pension for a mail courier who was in the ser-

vice for twenty years and who had worn himself out in the service of the country and I notice here that a man has been pensioned up to \$600.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—They are not strictly Civil Servants, any gratuities or pensions are given to mail couriers purely through the good will of the Executive Government, it would depend on circumstances, the length of time they have been in the service and general circumstances surrounding their case.

MR. SKANES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Quinton when he speaks of this \$600.00 vote if he is referring to Mr. Lock of Bonne Bay. This man has been a Mail Courier for over 30 years, and I can say that he has absolutely worn himself out in the service and that \$600 would hardly pay his medical bills. I want Mr. Chairman, to be perfectly plain, I say that some provision should be made for Mail Couriers, they are men who carry out their duties in rain or shine, and I think that after a life of hardship they certainly ought to be entitled to a pension or some sort of provision made for them. I disagree entirely Sir, with any Member of the Opposition who objects to giving of Pensions to Mail Couriers.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote for the Solicitor General be deleted from the estimates. We are asked now to pass a vote for \$5,000, and I move that that amount be reduced to \$1.00. I do not know what the Finance Minister thinks about it; but it will be remembered that when this office was re-created after twenty-five years of oblivion we were told by the Prime Minister and Attorney General, holding both offices, that we were going to save thousands of dollars by the appointment and

payment of \$5,000 to the new Solicitor General. For some reason or another there seem to be some doubt on this side of the House as to whether that promise was going to be carried out, and curiously enough that doubt has resolved itself into a certainty. We were asked to vote this salary for a ministerial position at a higher figure than for any other ministerial position. Now it is true that in England and in Canada the Attorney General receives a higher salary than even the Prime Minister and that is because the Attorney General has to abandon his practice for all practical purposes and attend to Government work. In addition to that the Attorney General is entitled to charge fees in connection with certain classes of civil work which augments his salary quite considerably. But then the Attorney General does not hold any other office. He is not also the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister in those countries generally holds the office of what they call in England, the First Lord of the Treasury, and at the present time I notice in Canada Mr. Bennett holds the position of Minister of Finance. Now I have no objection to our Prime Minister holding the two portfolios. I think that if a man has to give the whole of his time to parliamentary, departmental and political work to the abandonment of his practice then the country should provide him with a substantial salary. I have no objection to the Attorney General receiving a substantial salary and a certain amount of fees as well; but I have this objection to make to the present vote that you have in the department of Justice an Attorney General drawing \$4,000 a year; a Solicitor General drawing \$5,000 as salary and receiving fees bringing his total income up to about \$14,000, and an Acting Deputy Minister of Justice

drawing almost an equivalent amount. In salaries and fees the three offices of the Department cost the country \$40,000 last year. This, Sir, is to my mind absurd. The position is doubly absurd when you bear in mind that when this vote came before the House for the re-creation of this office we were told that the cost of the administration of Justice would be reduced considerably by the fact that the Solicitor General would be doing so much work without charge.

Now what are the facts? The first year of his appointment no vote for his salary was taken in the Estimates and the Prime Minister, in his capacity of Attorney General, informed the House that because of the salary of the Solicitor General the expenditure under what is known as the C. and C. P. Account would show a substantial reduction. Last year that Account was overdrawn by \$10,000. Last year also we voted his salary of \$5,000 so that it would not be paid out of C. and C. P. Account, still for the nine months since June 30th, 1930, your C. and C. P. Account is overdrawn to the extent of \$7,000 and you got three months to go yet.

Is that saving money I ask? And can it be shown in any respect that by the re-creation of this new office that you have saved one single cent? As a matter of fact I am yet awaiting an answer to a question in regard to the prosecutions which the Solicitor General was supposed to carry on in his official capacity and without fee and the answer I am still awaiting now for a month. I know that some of them were carried on by the Police and some carried on by other lawyers employed by the Department of Justice. Now I do not intend to deal with the fees charged by the lawyers who were employed by the Government and I will tell you why. The

blame does not rest with the lawyers; it rests with the Government. If you are going to employ lawyers, doctors and engineers in their professional capacities to perform services and if they fix their fees the option rests with you whether you will accept their services or not. If you accept their services, then you must pay their fees. The same thing applies to a matter I referred to some weeks ago when speaking on the Address in Reply such as a case like Dr. Anderson. If Dr. Anderson said he wanted \$5,000 to perform that service it was up to the Government to accept or reject it. If he was not prepared to do the work for the figure fixed by the Government, then it was up to the Government whether they should engage him or not. The same applies to the substantial fees charged by various lawyers. That, however, does not apply to the Solicitor General. There was no demand for the appointment of the Solicitor General and when the re-creation of the office was moved in this House we were told that the administration of justice would be cheaper and more efficiently and economically performed. I pass no comment whatever upon the honourable and learned Solicitor General's capacity, but I do say that the position has not resulted in any saving.

The other evening in the House when the annual statement of the country's affairs was presented by the Finance Minister everybody in the House was seriously concerned about the financial condition of the country, particularly over the extravagant expenditures which had brought us to the approach to insolvency. We had even a heated discussion here over the six members of the Board of Works who were drawing \$1500 a year.

I might be induced to say that this is a comparatively small amount in

an \$11,000,000 estimate, but if we treat these comparatively small sums without serious consideration you will find that they very quickly amount to very large sums in the end. There is not a person in the House but who knows that at the end of the half year or year the small bills amount up to such a sum that he is almost staggered at the total. The bills for two, three or five dollars amount up until you are surprised at their magnitude. Therefore, in connection with these comparatively small amounts as applied to our Estimates of \$11,000,000, if you allow them to accumulate, without making any effort to cut down expenses, you will find they will accumulate to a very large figure. Now this vote here for the Solicitor General not only saves nothing for the Colony, but will cost you money, and I venture to say that if you had no Solicitor General you would have had the service cheaper by \$5,000. I, therefore, move that the vote of the Solicitor General in the Estimates be reduced by \$4,999.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of seconding the motion so ably proposed by my learned friend. I spoke at some length on this matter on the Address in Reply and I do not think that if this vote for \$5,000 is reduced to \$1, as proposed, it will prevent Mr. Bradley from being able to eke out an existence in this community. As has been pointed out by my colleague, in addition to his salary of \$5,000 the honourable and learned Solicitor General is drawing down \$8,000 in fees. Now if he cannot get along on \$8,000, without the \$5,000, I venture to say that that is more than he ever earned before.

There is absolutely no reason for the recreation of this position of Solicitor General. In addition to the \$5000 which has been already mention-

ed, here are the figures of some other fees received by him in this capacity.

From the Health Commission \$1000, the Railway Commission \$1500 and other Civil and Criminal matters, and then there is the Consolidation Commission and the Highroads Commission and many others. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it can be argued that this Honourable Gentleman will suffer greatly if this position is cut out. This is no pleasure for me, but I feel it to be my duty as a member of the profession to second this motion.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Chairman, last year, when the position of Solicitor General was being made I remember I asked the Prime Minister would it save the country any money. I was told it would save the country more than \$20,000.00. It has not done so, but it has increased the cost of Administration by \$5000. I beg to support the motion for I fail to see what sense there can be in creating this position.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

With regard to the amount of \$1400 just mentioned by Mr. Winter, in relation to the C. & C. P. account, I may say that fees paid the Solicitor General are no more than those paid Mr. Winter himself by the Monroe Government. Regarding the \$1400 just mentioned this amount was made up by fees for work done by Mr. Bradley before his appointment.

These Bills were perfectly regular and quite in order and were examined and paid in due course. With regard to the next point made by Mr. Winter, may I say that it is impossible to expect any man of any legal standing to accept a salary of less than \$5000.00. No professional man could be expected to give up his practice, for that is what he has to

do, and take a chance on having, after 3 or 4 years, to go back to an empty office and start all over again to work up a practice. To expect such would be unreasonable. Regarding the work done, taking item by item, or as the lawyers would say, letter by letter, conference by conference or perusal by perusal these bills are the same as they would be in the case of any other legal firm, the only difference is that the Solicitor General's fees are 13% less than those of any other firm.

I feel sure that Wood & Kelly or to mention another eminent firm Blackwood & Emerson would charge quite as much as the Solicitor General and I may say that the firm of Blackwood & Emerson know all there is to know on this subject.

It is a far better manner to get the work done by a Solicitor General than to be engaging casual men for casual business, for you can not expect a casual man to give such attention to the work as the Solicitor General is able to.

During the past year there have been very many heavy charges against the C. & C. P. account. The past year has indeed been an exceeding busy one for the Department of Justice. As evidence of this let me draw the attention of the House to the fact that all through the year the Penitentiary has been filled and latterly it became necessary to remove some seven prisoners to Harbour Grace because of the lack of room here. For the same reason we have had to remand many, and in one case where some boys were summoned I found it better not to prosecute the lads owing to the conditions at the Penitentiary; it was indeed a heavy criminal year.

Another case involving much expenditure was the case coming in from my own district. So much has

this case cost up to date that I thought it cheaper to have the case tried at Corner Brook by a special session of the Supreme Court on Circuit. The case occasioned much expense by reason of the transporting of witnesses to town and their expense while here; and also it is impossible to bring these witnesses to town, including as they do many doctors and nurses, without seriously inconveniencing the medical services at Bay of Islands.

Regarding the Deputy Minister of Justice, I may say the same arrangement has been entered into with him as under the Monroe Government and I feel that in this respect the Monroe Government acted very wisely. It is indeed impossible to question the capability of the Deputy Minister of Justice.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—If this vote is reduced to one dollar as intended we will make it up by paying it out of money voted for supplementary supply.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to draw the attention of the House to Mr. Dunfield's position, at present. His position is quite anomalous. Last year I understand that, as Acting Deputy Minister of Justice he received a salary and fees bringing his income into the vicinity of about \$12,000.00.

I think that Mr. Dunfield would be quite willing to accept the position as a permanency at a reasonably salary, at present he has to give all his attention to his Department, he has as a result no private practice. Yet at any time it is quite possible that the Government will inform him that his services are no longer required. He has no standing, he is not a civil servant.

He does not know when he may have to go back to his private practice. I

feel sure that Mr. Dunfield should be given the option of taking over the position at a salary less than was paid him last year. I think it is the duty of the Prime Minister as such and as Minister of Justice to make Mr. Dunfield this offer. Mr. Dunfield has indeed proved himself capable. During the past year he has not only worked hard but he has worked very intelligently and his services are of the type required in this department. You cannot expect him to accept \$3,600 a year but I do think if some decent salary were offered him he would have some inducement to remain in that position and give his services to the country.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that the Hon. Member for Placentia East concurs with me with regard to the services performed by the acting Deputy Minister of Justice, and I would be very glad indeed if it was possible to secure his services permanently for a salary of \$5000.00 a year. I will get in touch with Mr. Dunfield and point out to him the benefits which Mr. Emerson has outlined, such as his right to a pension and if Mr. Dunfield is prepared to accept the position as a permanent Deputy Minister of Justice I would be very glad to give him the appointment and would feel that the Department would be getting a capable and efficient official.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, Before voting on this allocation I would like to ask the Prime Minister what is the position with regard to the expenses of the Boland case. Will that be charged to general contingencies or to C. and C. P. account.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Referring to the question asked by the Hon. member for Bay de Verde.

The Thistle case has not yet been disposed of.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I was not referring to the Thistle case but to the Boland case, which is over; and I cannot see why that has not been charged to C. & C. P. account instead of general contingencies. If it had been charged to C. & C.P. account it would have shown an overdraft in that account of \$12,000.00 instead of \$7,000.00. There is absolutely no use in trying to keep down the C. & C.P. account by charging these things to general contingencies. Up to the present time the overdraft of this account shows \$7,000.00 and if as I said before, the expenses in connection with the Boland case were charged to this account as they should have been, it would show an overdraft of \$12,000.00, and now in the Estimates we are only voting \$5,000.00 for this account, which I say is ridiculous. If with two and a half months still to go and we have an overdraft of \$12,000, what is the sense of voting only \$5,000.00 for this account for next year.

With the motion re Solicitor Generals salary I am in perfect accord. My point is this: If Mr. Bradley as Solicitor for the Railway and was appointed in January 1930 at a fee of \$1,000.00 a year which was retro-active to June of the previous year, is also a member of the Railway Commission and must give considerable time to the duties imposed upon him in this respect. He is also a member of the Consolidated Statutes Commission and of the Highroads Commission, and other things as well, and for these he is drawing down an additional salary of \$10,000 a year, I say that Mr. Bradley cannot do the work supposed to be done by the Solicitor General and fill all these other positions at the same time. He

received from the Railway \$1,500.00 and \$500.00, or a total of \$2,000.00. \$1,000.00 from the Consolidated Statutes, \$500 from the Highroads Commission, and \$1,000.00 from the Public Health Commission, while everybody knows that being a member of the Railway Commission and Solicitor to that Commission is almost as much work as one can handle with satisfactory results to the country. In 1929 we were promised by the Government that the appointment of a Solicitor General would save the country \$20,000.00, and I said at the time that if that could be saved the country then he would be entitled to his salary. If the appointment was to save the C. & C.P. account \$20,000.00 per year then he would be more than welcome to the salary, but he cannot do the work if he is to be a member of the Railway Commission, the Public Health Commission and other Commissions. It is an utter impossibility and absolutely unfair to pay him \$15,000.00 a year for filling positions whose work he is not able to carry out, and I say if he takes \$5,000 a year as Solicitor General and \$10,000 a year for other positions he cannot do justice to any of them, and the time has come when he must do either one thing or the other, either give up the Commissions and do his work as Solicitor General, or give up the position as Solicitor General and attend to the Commissions. As I said before, if I thought we were going to save \$20,000 a year on C. & C.P., I would be satisfied for him to fill the position of Solicitor General and receive the salary as voted.

When you consider that the Solicitor General is being paid more for that one position than the Heads of Departments, such as the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Finance and Customs, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, then I say it is out-

rageous. The Solicitor General is not worth one-third of what he drew from the country. There were statements brought into this House showing that ten or twelve prosecutions had been conducted since his appointment and only five of these had been conducted by the Solicitor General himself, while the others were conducted by other members of the profession at an additional expense to the Colony.

You should have considered this when the twelve prosecutions were on. He could not do both, of course. I realise when there is a dual case it is very hard; I do not cast any reflection on the man, on the capacity of the man, but he has too much work to do: let him cut out the Commissions and stick to his job.

MR. SKANES.—Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk by the Opposition on these Estimates. I don't think that the Opposition is doing right in holding down this House. If I want to be personal I can, but I don't want to be. Mr. Chairman, is this about me that the Opposition are talking? But whether they are or not, I know as a matter of fact that they are trying to create a disturbance in the Government ranks. I am going to stand on my feet for some time and I am going to give you all that is coming to you; if you want it you will get it.

First of all, I am entitled to speak as well as the Opposition and the Opposition today are looking for the Government seats and they are using every possible endeavor to get back again in power so that they can have another million slush fund. That never happened in the Spires Government. He is like the man who said "Forgive me, father, for I know not what I've done"—that is Mr. Puddester. He is like a man who is nailed to the cross,

and he comes in here and tries to persuade the people to say that he is a little god. He did not say anything like he is saying now when he was in the Monroe Government, and I'm not going to stand for any nonsense in this House of Assembly from Mr. Puddester or Mr. Emerson; and I tell you, Mr. Alderdice, that Mr. Puddester is trying to get your seat and become Leader of the Opposition. You can tell that to your friends. I heard it, it is true; I am just as honest as any man in this House, and I tell you that it is true. Mr. Puddester is trying right now to work himself up to Leader of the Opposition and I will go further and say that he is trying to get the rank and file of this country to do it for him, but Mr. Alderdice is a better man than Mr. Puddester ever will be.

You can talk about whatever you like, but I tell this country from my seat in this House, and it can be broadcast throughout the entire country that Mr. Puddester is really trying to do that and there are movements on foot to burst this Government, but as Mr. Puddester said that we are blown up financially, I say that you are blown up, you are puffed up. When you talked about the magazine in St. John's East why didn't you explain yourself? There is an oil factory right opposite my house but you didn't mention that. It is an eyesore, it is in a place where it should not be, and if you make a motion to remove it to Signal Hill some place I will support you, sir; but I am fed up on your bluff, torment and agony. If you come across to me you will not go back. I am fed up on this House of Assembly stuff, and I am attacking you this afternoon, Mr. Puddester, you and your newspaper rag. That's what's wrong with this country, writing articles about Newfoundland that are

broadcasted throughout the world; that is what is making Newfoundland what it is today; do you agree with me, sir?

MR. PUDDESTER.—Yes.

MR. SKANES.—Mr. Chairman, I want to see fair play and this Government, as far as the laborers and workmen of this country are concerned, have always given them consideration. No one has worked as hard as our Prime Minister, Sir Richard Squires; he has given every consideration to the laborers of this country.

Now, I would like to refer to Mr. Tobin, another big puffed up, blown up, Opposition member. I heard him remark that he met me on Duckworth Street the other day. We were talking about potatoes. Well, if you eat more potatoes you would be a fatter and wiser man. I am not afraid of any man on the Opposition, but I want to be fair and I do not want to be bad friends, but they should give us some credit. Don't blame everything on the Government; but that is your attitude and you came here to break up the Government and it's just as well for you to try to break your own necks as to try to break up this Government.

Now, Mr. Winter, as far as I am concerned I think that he is a good man; he is all right . . .

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. I think that Mr. Winter should take his bow.

(Mr. Winter takes his bow, amid applause).

MR. SKANES.—I suppose Mr. Moore is not too bad altogether; but, Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell Mr. Alderdice that what I said in my previous remarks is quite true and Mr. Puddester is looking for his seat.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, after the illuminating debate, I move that we proceed with the Estimates.

MR. PUDDESTER.—What's that? ..

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—I move that we proceed with the debate without casting any reflection on yourself or Mr. Alderdice.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to identify myself with the motion for the reduction in the salary of the Solicitor General. This is a very serious matter, one of spending public money for services, but I don't want to delay the House by reiterating the facts expressed by the mover and seconder of this motion. I want to go on record as emphatically supporting this motion for a reduction. This \$5,000.00 is not justifiable in any way. When we consider the case of the poor working man who is earning \$75.00 a month and they have to lose ten per cent of that, I think that it is certainly inhuman and uncharitable; and then consider one fortunate individual who for certain reasons, we do not know the facts or why he was put in such a position, and draws down a salary from the Department of \$15,000.00 a year, I don't see how any member of this House can stay in his seat and see a vote like this go through; and I think I would be remiss in my duty if I did not go on record as supporting this Resolution to reduce the salary of the Solicitor General from \$5,000.00 to \$1.00.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Chairman, I want to identify myself with regard to this reduction in the vote to the Solicitor General. We were given to understand when this office was created that it would save the country considerable money. Since this office was started Mr. Bradley has drawn down

a salary of \$5,000.00 a year, but he has been identified in a pecuniary way with other Commissions and as the Prime Minister pointed out, the office of Solicitor General is a very difficult one and entails considerable work on the part of the man who occupies that position, I think that the Solicitor General should devote his entire time to his office of Solicitor General. We find from answers to questions that have been tabled that money to the extent of \$15,000.00 or \$16,000.00 has been spent in connection with this office, and, as Mr. Puddester said, we should either cut out his salary or cut out the Commissions, and I suggest that there are many members on both sides of the House who are in favor of cutting down that vote. I have a list here in the answer to a question asked the Minister of Justice showing that quite a lot of money has been paid to different lawyers.

(Reads)

and several others. I have very great pleasure in associating myself with the Resolution now before the Chair that this vote be reduced \$4,999.00.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask if there is any intention of filling the Sheriff's place. It seems to me utterly wrong to carry along a vacancy of this kind for so long, and it may be the means of causing a hardship in the profession, particularly when Mr. Carroll is out of town. Yesterday I had a case come under my own notice. I employed a sheriff to levy an execution, and now he can't make a return because the acting-Sheriff is out of town on the Boland case. I admit the amount in this case is not a large one, but still an occasion might very easily arise where it would be very serious. Looking at the matter from the general point of view, I would like to point

out that the position is one of considerable responsibility and ought to be filled at once.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree. For weeks there has been no sheriff around town and consequently work amongst the profession has been practically at a standstill. It is a most pernicious principle and ought to be remedied at once.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I desire to support the motion proposed by the honorable member for Placentia East, as I think it only right and proper for the members of this House to set the pace for economy. I do not think any of us in this House are depending entirely on our sessional indemnity, and, after all, it will let the people outside see that we are not protecting ourselves and our pockets at the expense of the smaller-paid civil servants.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the vote of \$40,000.00, my motion is that it be reduced to \$32,000 or \$200 per man. I think that in a crisis like this we must be as fair and just as possible and this 10% reduction will look much better in the eyes of the country if we treat ourselves a little more harshly than anybody else. The civil service of the country may be costing too much, and there may be men in it who are underpaid and overworked or overpaid and underworked, but if economy is to be the order of the day, it will make a much better impression if we were to begin with ourselves. Some little time ago I received a communication from a civil servant who was receiving \$83.33 per month. This man had enclosed a budget of living expenses, and it really was difficult to see how this man could contrive to support a family. To be perfectly frank, I can't see how we can touch the salary of any man

earning under \$1000.00 per year. For a person living in St. John's to support a family on that calls for the strictest economy. Reductions today are necessary and essential, but it is not much use passing votes in the Assembly if bills are going to be run up as soon as the House is closed, and if next year we find that four or five hundred thousand dollars has been overspent and voted in Supplementary Supply. I move, therefore, that the sessional indemnity be reduced from \$40,000 to \$32,000, and that the then sessional indemnity of \$800 per member be subject to the proposed 10% reduction shortly to come before this Chamber for consideration.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman in supporting the motion before the Chair, I think it would be a great pity to have a division of the House over this vote. I feel quite sure that members of the Government will agree with the Opposition in connection with this matter. As there is need for economy, and civil servants are to be cut ten per cent on their salaries, I fail to see why members of this House should not show their bona fides and accept a reduction of \$280 from their sessional salaries.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to identify myself with what has been said in regard to this motion. In a few days we will be called upon to cut poorly paid civil servants, and I think that every member of this House should be prepared to look pleasant in getting our sessional indemnity cut. We should all be prepared to take this position. If the salaries of civil servants have to be reduced because of the financial stress of the times, it is only fair to the country that we in this House should lead off. Surely no member of this House can be consistent and take the stand that it is alright to cut

the salaries of others and protect ourselves. We got to be right and honorable about this thing and not look after our own self-interest first. I am perfectly satisfied to take the cut of \$280 off my salary and I am sorry that the civil servants have to suffer a wage cut.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Chairman, I want also to associate myself with the motion now before the Chair. I endorse the attitude taken by previous speakers, as I feel that every member of this House should have no objection to have his salary reduced by \$280, particularly as the Finance Minister is anxious to have as small a deficit as possible next year and in the light of the fact that we are undertaking in this House to cut the salaries of other civil servants. As pointed out by the honorable member for Bay de Verde, some years ago those gentlemen who represented outport and city constituencies, respectively, received \$300 and \$200 per session, but now that conditions have changed and things are beginning to lower in price, I think it is only fair to the people outside that we should at least show our sincerity by starting with ourselves and cutting our sessional indemnity. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

MR. STRONG.—Mr. Chairman, may I be pardoned, Sir, for making a few remarks before the motion is put. I would like to challenge the gentlemen who have spoken on this motion and who are all residents of St. John's. Now if I were living in the city of St. John's today and bringing in a motion of this kind, I would advocate the attending of the session of this House and cut out the salary altogether. Anyone who knows me is aware that I did not have to come into politics to get a living. I worked hard for a living and am not ashamed of it, and I

intend to continue to do so. Now I notice that the two outport members of the Opposition did not speak on this motion. I presume that was for a very good reason. Anyone who knows what it costs an outport man, representing a northern constituency, to come to St. John's to attend a session, knows that he does not get one cent out of his sessional indemnity for his own use, and I am prepared to prove that.

Personally, I came here six times since last year, outside of my own business and the last time I was coming it cost me \$35 before I reached the railway line by dog team and it will cost me \$35 to take me out again. So I do say it is all very well for you members living in St. John's to talk about reducing the vote when you can attend to your own businesses and attend here as well.

I do not mean to say that they have no district business to attend to, but it does not cost them proportionately to an outport member living in an outport. However, I doubt if the members opposite are sincere. I can see Mr. Puddester smiling. He knows what the game of politics is. Some people like to appeal to the galleries when they are speaking. The other right Mr. Puddester was challenged that he was not prepared to move for a reduction of the salaries of the Liquor Commissioners. He accepted the challenge and moved for a reduction of the salaries; but I want to call attention to the fact that when Mr. Emerson go up and pleaded that the salary of Mr. Mifflin should not be reduced, Mr. Puddester afterwards withdrew his original motion and made another motion which gave Mr. Mifflin \$400 more. I say that Mr. Mifflin, Chairman of the Liquor Control Board, had too much salary then and he has got too much now. I have been re-

ferred to as a junior member of the House, and I am proud to have been referred to as such. I do not claim to be as well versed in parliamentary procedure as Mr. Emerson, but I have a certain amount of brains and can see through a number of the gentlemen on the other side of the House, especially when they make propositions with regard to a reduction of the sessional pay, and if the Opposition were in earnest how is it that the two outport members on the other side of the House did not advocate it? They know, of course, as well as I do, that they do not get a cent out of that \$1,000 for their own personal use.

I had no intention, when suggesting the cut in the sessional pay of members residing in St. John's, of including the outport men. They know, as I do, what expense it entails to come to St. John's for the session and the time occupied. I notice that Mr. Moore and Mr. Abbott have nothing to say on this. If I were a member residing in St. John's I, too, would have no objection to the proposed cut.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this subject but since I have been spoken off by Mr. Strong I would like to state that I made the suggestion and I am prepared to accept the cut of \$500.00, or even accept \$250 for the sessional pay. I count it a privilege to represent my district and I realise that it costs quite a bit to come to St. John's even counting the fact that I benefit from a free railway pass, still I have to neglect my business. I would like to say that never in the long time I have the honor to represent my district have I benefitted to any extent. I have no post nor been on any boards, nor in any way obtained any business, and I challenge anyone to prove that my

name is down against one cent of government money.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Chairman, I realise the expenses and time occupied in attending the session at St. John's, but if the House is really genuine in its desire to cut down expenses I will most certainly give the motion my support.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I see the vote for the doorkeepers is twelve hundred dollars. Last year there were 27 of them. Wonderful! What is the good of them? I think it would be better to have fewer men and pay them more. Twenty-seven men for four doors. Why is it the Finance Minister asks for a vote of \$1200 for the doorkeepers and messengers when he knows they'll have to pay 27? They will have to ask for a larger Supplementary Supply.

I notice that the vote for reporting is to be reduced to \$5,000.00. I would like to know if the Finance Minister is certain the work can be done for this amount. I understand that it is intended to cut out the Hansard and take a synopsis of members' speeches. I don't think it is a good plan to try a synopsis. Let me tell you you'll have more trouble getting a synopsis than in compiling the Hansard. The Hansard costs about \$5,000.00. The more we talk the more it costs. I would like to tell the Finance Minister that the first year of the Monroe Government this taking a synopsis was tried, and we had no end of trouble, so much so that in the end we had to go back to the Hansard. The Opposition members will always be complaining that something is left out of their speeches and you'll have all kinds of trouble. It's a hard job to synopsize reports and give satisfaction. The Monroe Government had to abandon the idea; even a newspaper reporter of ten years experience would find it a difficult job.

I notice the cost of printing the journals and the Hansard for 1929 was \$13,793.00 and the cost of the Hansard is being cut to \$5000.00. I would like the Finance Minister to be sure of this and not have to be voting more money for this purpose in the Supplementary Supply. Last year this supply was for over half a million; this year it is estimated at five million. I hope this figure will be sufficient.

If I may make the suggestion, I think a considerable sum might be saved on the binding of the journals by having them half-bound. The cost of binding is very considerable. In Canada the journals are only half-bound and the Hansard is bound in cardboard.

(Reads)

I don't think you will save any money by this method, and believe it will be a great mistake to depart from the present system of reporting. Another item that I think there is altogether too much money spent on, is the printing and binding of the journals. There is an account that shows that one hundred journals cost \$600.00 for the binding. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to the Internal Economy Commission, which in my opinion is one of the most fertile fields in the Government for unnecessary expenses. There is an item there headed "Delivering hansards—\$35.00," or, in other words, some individual was paid the sum of \$35.00 for delivering a few books around town. It would certainly pay the Finance Minister to scrutinise all bills in connection with the Internal Economy Commission.

This is the first time that I ever saw refreshing drinks charged to the Government. If members required these drinks they should pay for them themselves and not out of the pockets

of the people of the country. Another matter that I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to is that of wreaths that were sent to deceased members of both this House and the Upper House. I think that if the members want to do these things they should pay for them themselves, and I know that last year the members of this side of the House paid a subscription of \$3.00 per man towards the buying of three wreaths, but I see an amount of \$95.00 was paid the Valley Nurseries for the purchase of wreaths. It is about time that the Internal Economy Commission was refused the authority to sign these Bills and I think that Mr. Keating ought to be authorised to scrutinise such Bills and refuse to sign them. There are other votes here which are really too personal to mention, but run into thousands of dollars, which I feel sure should be cut out.

Another amount which I see stated here and I think is outrageous, is the amount of \$4,000.00 paid to L. R. Curtis for drafting Bills, and \$1,300.00 paid Mr. Dunfield for the same purpose, which work should have been done by the Law Clerk.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 1st, 1931.

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

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. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to table reply to question 343 asked by Mr. Emerson. I regret I was not in the House yesterday when the questions were asked.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I will ask the members of the House to refer back to page 8 of the estimates. The last time we were debating this question we were at the Government Engineers salary which was \$4,600 by statute and an additional \$1,400 from the Highroads.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think, Mr. Chairman, that if we are going to discuss this vote that the Minister of Public Works should be present.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I think that it is disgraceful; here we are discussing estimates and there is hardly a member of the Executive present, neither Dr. Mosdell, Dr. Campbell or the Minister of Public Works.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, we will pass on to the Department of Colonial Secretary who is present in the House.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Are these subject to a ten per cent reduction?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

MR. EMERSON—Who is the filing clerk?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
C. Carew I think the name is, the staff consists of S. Taylor, C. Carew, the messenger besides Mr. Carew and Miss Saunders.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I do not like to mention the name of a lady, Miss Saunders, I know that she is an expert reporter, probably the best in the country, I notice that last year she drew \$3,700.00 from the country and I suggest that this is too much. If she is paid \$1,500.00 as Secretary to the Prime Minister, I suggest that this would take all her time. I agree that the Prime Minister should have expert assistance at hand but I think that \$3,700.00 is too high.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is too high. Miss Saunders is a very capable business woman, she has passed all the law examinations prescribed by the Law Society except the final which she has been unable to take owing to very heavy pressure of work which prevented her giving the necessary time to study for it.

During the past two weeks I had requests from the Commissioners in connection with the Viking Enquiry for her services which I was unable to accede to owing to pressure of business. This young lady could leave here and go to any place in Western Canada or Eastern Canada, and with her ability and experience she could earn considerably more than she receives here. Her brother is, I under-

stand; in the U. S. A. and it a very highly qualified electrical engineer and she herself has a London Matric certificate.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect in regard to Miss Saunders' services and the suspicion is that when Mr. Alderdice takes over the office of the Prime Minister, Miss Saunders will leave with Sir Richard Squires and follow his fortunes and Mr. Alderdice will not find such expert help when he arrives there.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, that is what happened when I went into office, I cannot conceive of any Prime Minister having the same private secretary as his predecessor in office, the usual practice is for the private secretary to resign with his chief. When I went out of office, Miss Saunders was summarily ejected from the position of Supervisor of Debates and Mr. Randell Jeans was appointed in her place.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Didn't she continue on there as a reporter?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, the reporters collapsed and they asked her to help them out and they paid her to do the work which the Government paid them to do.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, now we voted \$3,000.00 and the supplementary supply calls for a further \$7,000.00. I think this office costs rather a lot.

Every one of the clerks of the Colonial Secretary's Department have received extra pay for preferential services of some sort. The Deputy Colonial Secretary was paid separate fees for immigration work. While I am on the subject I would like to ask the

Colonial Secretary if the money collected on passports is paid into the Exchequer Account or not? I would like the Hon. Colonial Secretary to give the House this information.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I shall be very pleased to table the fullest information if the question is asked.

MR. PUDDESTER—Reads.

Under the head of bye-elections. Isn't this part of the work of the Department? and if it is why should extra money be paid the members of the Department merely because there happened to be a bye-election last year?

I object to the way in which every little thing is used for obtaining extra fees, every little service to the Government—extra fees, and when there are bad times now, it is really awful.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to Page 5 of the Auditor General's Report, Section 33.

(Reads)

Now I ask, how was this money obtained? And it was obtained in all the Departments. Who authorizes all this. I understand your Finance Department doesn't. Yet the Auditor General says some of this is not authorized. I think we might ask the Auditor General what particular departments are guilty in this respect. Now how were these payments obtained? They weren't obtained by Order in Council.

I see here that Mr. Mews received \$3045.00.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, this amount was paid Mr. Mews for work connected with immigration work which he has been doing for the past fifteen years.

When this work was done at the Finance Department Mr. LeMessurier

was paid \$1000.00 for doing it. Mr. Mews was not paid a cent and when he made his claim he felt he was quite justified.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Chairman, I do feel that Mr. Mews was entitled to this fee. He had previously made application to the late Government for this amount and as it was not felt that he was entitled to it he had been refused.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I think that the trouble is that Mr. Mews did not look for this until he found that some one else had received money for a similar position I cannot understand Mr. Mews working for 15 years without making a claim if he felt entitled to do so. That is the trouble in the various departments. It has ceased to be a case whether the fee is deserved but whether you can obtain it.

If there is one thing more than anything else that is causing resentment throughout the country, and justifiable resentment, is the fact that you are handing out bonuses in every Department of the civil service. Look at the list of payments upon which the Auditor General in his report makes caustic comment and you will agree that the position now is that, civil servants are looking upon their salaries as mere retaining fees and every time they do what they think is extra work they look for extra pay for it.

I say, Sir, it is perfectly outrageous to give this three thousand dollars to Mr. Mews for what is called extra services. Mr. Stirling, Mr. Halfyard and Mr. Pippy of the Colonial Secretary's Department also got extra pay on account of Immigration, I am told by the Minister.

I am further informed that all this extra work was done during the regular office hours of the Department. So that the people engaged on this Immigration work had practically nothing to do and I challenge the Colonial Secretary to get up and state the class of work these officials did to justify these extra payments, and, as I said before, if they did perform extra services, why did they not make their claim within the past fifteen years and not wait until the Liberal Government gave them some money? Perhaps the Attorney General will explain the extra services performed by Magistrate Fitzgerald at Grand Falls for the \$250 he got, and, perhaps, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will explain the reason why \$600 extra was paid Mr. Badcock and the Minister of Public Works may explain why \$400 for extras was paid Road Inspectors Bambrick and Parsons and whether the payments were authorized by Order in Council?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that Mr. Badcock was paid this amount because he is Secretary of the Fishery Board. He was also paid this amount by the late Government. The two Road Inspectors were paid by Order in Council to meet some wages due them by the late Government. The same applies to Mr. Carter, the Auditor for our Department. He was paid extra by the late Government and now he was paid through Order in Council. Otherwise the Department has not paid one dollar for overtime since I have taken charge of it.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells us that they have paid the back bills of a previous Government. Why did the Government wait two years to pay these bills, if they were due? The

fact is that the late Government refused to pay these amounts and the Order in Council of the present Government went over the Minister's head. Now if the \$600 referred to was part of Mr. Badcock's salary, why is it not down in the Estimates? According to the Auditor General's Report this is an over-payment.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, that will be explained when the Estimates for that Department come up.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I was dealing with over-payments in connection with all the Departments. Here are four clerks connected with the Marine and Fisheries Department who were paid for overtime since last year. I want to know why the money was paid, and when you say it was due to them by the late Government, why is it that you waited for two years to pay the money. If it was not due, why pay them at all, and if it was due you should have paid them two years before. While on this matter of over-payments I would like to know the meaning of paying moneys out of the various departments to clerks of the Auditor General's Department. It happens that when a clerk from this Department goes to any other Department to audit accounts he is paid extra for it.

I would like to know if such payments are authorized by Order in Council or by the Ministerial heads of the Departments and why such payments are charged up to any particular departments? It is the most serious aspect in connection with our public accounts, especially when such bonuses are paid out to these clerks of the Auditor General's Department without even an Order in Council for the payments.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the Hon. member that for a number of years these assistant auditors have been engaged from time to time by the different departments chiefly for checking up returns coming in from the outports. I had a frightful job to get them to do the work in my department and they refused to do it without being paid extra. I call it an absolute outrage to pay them extra.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I might say that I refused to pay Mr. Carter for auditing the returns of my Department and he was paid by Order in Council. He is not doing the work now. It is being done by a clerk in my Department.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, these auditors are supposed to be the watchdogs of the Public Treasury of the country and it is positively wrong that they should be paid out of any other Department but their own. I think the system is rotten.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, the returns of my Department are now being audited by one of my own clerks.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, do you think that is right with a possibility of a serious discrepancy occurring in the accounts of your Department? I think that work should be done by the officials of the Auditor General's Department.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, I presume this refers to Beaumont Hamel and other overseas grounds and graveyards. I was wondering when and from whom the reports on these grounds are received.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, the War Graves commission reports to the High Commissioners Office in London and they report back to this country.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, the reason for my asking this question is because people have been complaining about the condition of the grounds and the condition of the Bungalow on the grounonds at Beaumont Hamel.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, there is an organization in England that looks after all these grounds and they have been made the touring route of nearly everybody who visits them. The person in charge of Beaumont Hamel is Sergeant Brown who does excellent work under very trying circumstances. Cooks books of tours which contains illustrations of tours and are sent to the United States, England, Italy and all other parts of the world have a special recommendation in them concerning Newfoundland's Memorial at Beaumont Hamel. It was the intention to start a sort of Patriotic Organization in London to handle and keep up the war ideals but unfortunately it was never developed.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I suppose the Imperial War Graves Commission have to look after the tombstones, graves grass, etc. so I cannot see how it is going to be reduced from \$10,000 to \$6,000.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—
Mr. Chairman, for a period of years there was esablished an endowment for this purpose and this year our allowance will be paid up so that \$6,000 will be sufficient.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, we are estimating \$50,000 for unforseen expenditure and it will be a great

deal more than this. Supplementary supply for \$85,000 had to be introduced this year. I understand that the Colonial Secretary has charge of this vote. Do you really think that \$50,000 will be sufficient?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, it may not be, but I can assure you that if it goes over \$50,000 it will be nothing like it was last year. Last year we had some exceptionally high figures that won't be present this year.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the expenses in connection with the Boland case was included in the C. & C. P. account which should show as \$7,000.00 if it included these expenses but owing to duplication of questions it did not appear. For example if a voucher is given for a train fare, or for the expenses of a witness, it will be paid by Mr. Godden and charged to the Department of Justice. In this connection I might say that Mr. Godden looks after all the expenses of the Crown Witnesses, such as Board and Lodging, which is all charged to the Department of Justice and afterwards transferred to the C. & C. P. account.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, do I understand that we only see the debits and that the credits have not been made in this account.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Yes.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I think that when we ask for an account to be tabled the whole account should be shewn not only the debits but the credits as well.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, under the heading office of the Prime Minister, we have additional expenditure ac-

count Bank of Montreal at the Imperial Conference \$2,198.11. When we asked that the expenses of this Conference be tabled it was done so and now we find this additional amount.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, this amount was in connection with extras on account of Mr. Carew and Miss Saunders as the amounts allocated for their expenses was not nearly sufficient to cover them and when they found it necessary they went to the Bank of Montreal in London who advanced them sufficient to cover their expenses and transferred the amounts to the Bank of Montreal at St. John's.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, were the Hotel bills of the Secretary paid by the Imperial Government.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, the actual Hotel bills such as food, etc. were paid but the incidentals such as laundry and other things which amount to a great deal were not paid for by the Imperial Government.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I know that as I spent some time in London myself last year but at the same time I do think that when an answer to a question is tabled in this House it should show the expenses that are asked for instead of which we find an additional amount of \$2,198.11

I notice here three large amounts in account with the Viking Disaster for the 'Foundation Franklin.' What are they for?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—They wanted \$750.00 a day.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, it cost \$3635.00 for the Sagona and

\$3630.00 for the Franklin, the Sagona did all the work and the Franklin did nothing, I wish the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would pay attention to this. What was the original sum asked for the Franklin?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—\$5,250.00 was what they asked.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, that vote is \$50,000.00 more than we expected.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, that is on account of the Viking Disaster, the earthquake, etc. You never can tell what is going to happen that will increase this vote.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, as far as the last Imperial Conference is concerned, it cost four times as much as the previous Conference, it cost more to bring the staff over to this last Conference than the whole previous Conference cost.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, maybe Mr. Morine, Mr. Higgins and Mr. Monroe were better able to pay their expenses than the people who attended the last Conference as my staff.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, in view of that answer, we will ask for the details of both Conferences.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, there is one point in connection with this expenditure by the Colonial Secretary's Department that has come up for discussion and it would appear at first that the figures had been juggled. I don't think that has been done but the whole thing is that the Ministers in charge of these votes do not know what is going on and I would suggest something to them to show that they

are wrong. In the Railway passages account there is an item for \$2,889.00 and we are told that these have to do with the Boland case and in the contra-account of the Colonial Secretary of General Contingencies we see \$5,622.00 for the Boland case. The Attorney General told us that payments were probably made by the Department of Justice and the whole thing was handed over to the Colonial Secretary's Department. That is impossible, if a check for \$10.00 were issued by the Department it would appear in C. & C. P., the check was made out to the Railway for passages.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is clear.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, no, I am making it clear, checks for passages, hotel bills and witnesses who could afford to pay their own hotel bills, could go down to the Department of Justice and get some money. When the whole case was over and to make C. & C. P. better, lawyers fees, doctors fees were lumped together in the sum of \$5,000.00 and transferred by Order-in-Council to C. & C. P. That is what happened and I am making it clear, it was transferred from one account to boltser up the other.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the Government Engineer's office which we discussed in committee on these Estimates before. Mr. Hall receives a voted salary of \$4,600.00 and \$1,400.00 in addition from the Highroads. Mr. Robertson, his assistant, receives \$2,200.00 and \$2,000.00 not in the Estimates. The Accountant receives \$1,700.00 and an additional \$1,000.00. The Masonry Superintendent, Mr. Whelan, receives \$2,500.00 voted salary and in addition gets \$500.00. I would like to point out that it is not the intention of the Government to

make this a permanent Department, in a few years we hope to be clear of all this construction work.

We propose to leave Mr. Hall's vote of \$4,600.00 in the Estimates and only pay him \$1,000.00 out of the Highroads vote, the Accountant, Mr. Dicks, gets \$1,700.00 here and gets \$1,000.00 from the Highroads. This is a very busy Department of the Government, last year they handled 180,000 cheques. He is getting \$1,700.00 and we are reducing the \$1,000.00 to \$900.00 and he will be subject to the ten per cent reduction. Mr. Robertson is getting \$2,200.00 and \$2,000.00 from the Highroads, he is now cut down and he is getting \$1,400.00 to make him like a Deputy Minister so as to speak.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I think this expenditure in connection with the operation of Highroads is getting beyond us. Imagine \$1,750,000 spent last year in connection with that Department. Now I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if a man left his job with the Highroads Commission and went to Canada but he was not taken in a University there because he lacked the necessary qualifications, would he be taken back again by the Highroads Commission here when he returned or would he be considered at all?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, he might be a useful man, but I would like the Hon. member to give me the name of the case he refers to.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I will give you his name privately. Another poor man cannot do that because he has not got the pull with the Government or the Highroads Commission. I say, Sir, it is not good enough. Every man should be made stand on his own feet. With regard to

the enormous expense of running motor cars last year by Mr. Cochius and others, I would suggest to you that you sell the family cars and provide coupes which would suit the requirements of the Department and put an end to this joy riding and family berry picking jaunts at the expense of the producers and working people of this country.

The other day, Sir, I drew your attention to a truck that goes over the country roads when there is no work to be done. Now I will draw your attention to a red coupe that is seen very often operating at full blast on Sundays, holidays and night time. This is a dire waste of the public money and I hope the Minister of Public Works will take this hint to heart and put a stop to the practice.

What value do you place on the machinery owned by the Highroads Commission—\$110,000.00 that is \$55,000.00 a year and in addition you have to add \$36,000.00; quite a large burden to carry quite a lot of valuable machinery, enough to build the Panama Canal.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact in Canada, to do the same amount of work, they would have about three times that amount of machinery. This machinery is absolutely necessary to carry on the business of looking after the road economically.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister of Finance to consider a suggestion made some time ago. As has been already said we have to vote the money for the Highroads Commission. Now I don't want to burden the estimates unduly. Instead of calling it the Government Engineer's office, and I may say that as this position is really nothing now

we might as well retire the Government Engineer, if necessary at full salary, and call it the Highroads Commission office. This would accord an opportunity of voting these salaries in the House. I remember the late Mr. Warren suggested something of the same nature in regard to the Board of Liquor Control. I make the suggestion that the method could be employed in dealing with the Highroads Commission and at the same time we would have the Commission's salaries under our control.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, this thing is being carried too far, we don't know what we're giving the money for nor what is done with it.

We have just heard a list of salaries read and in nearly every case the list of salaries as supplied to the Minister. The Minister doesn't know what is going on and I'm not blaming him either. It is, however, a disgraceful condition of affairs to be in.

This thing is happening everywhere; pay a man \$4,00.00 as a salary and expect him to work eight hours a day and no matter what his job is you can't say that he can do this job and another, because if he gets another job, as so often happens, he must do it in the same time, and if he can't and it is impossible for him to do so, get it done, he promptly makes a claim for overtime. That is just what is happening and if you'll fix up this matter in your Department we will take care of the lawyers and you'll find they don't get all those fees they are credited with getting.

Now with regard to this mystery car No. 2525; this car cost \$2,508.00 to run for the past year. In the past year this car has travelled over 35,000 miles and this is impossible.

35,000 miles in a 200 day year is 175

miles a day and would take all day providing the person driving it had no business to transact and I submit it wasn't done, not while the car was on business and therefore it must have been doing joyriding.

This car is used by Mr. Whelan and if this car really did 35,000 miles then it would be impossible for Mr. Whelan to do any business inspecting his work and still do 175 miles every day—nonsense unless the car went joyriding on Sundays and that's what happens and that's what causes so much expenditure. I don't say Mr. Neelands is responsible; he's a good worker. Now see about your trucks and cars and see that on Sunday they are in the Highroads shed and not out on the roads joyriding.

It is impossible for a car to do 35,000 miles; it can't be done if there is any business going on and for the man in charge to justify his salary. We know that Mr. Neelands do justify his salary and that he does work hard and it's impossible for him to do 175 miles a day and still do his business. The amount of money spent on this car is staggering.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we were speaking about the Highroads Programme and the Minister of Finance and Customs informed us that there was no programme, is there any programme in connection with the finishing of the road from Gobbies to Terrenceville.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—It has not been decided on yet.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, surely after spending such a large sum on this road you are not going to leave it unfinished for the sake of nine miles?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, as I said

before there is no programme as yet and furthermore I would like to add that I hope there won't be any programme. The nine miles may have to be linked up for reasons that I will not state in this House, but what I would like to see is that nine miles of road left like it is. I quite see and appreciate the point raised by Mr. Emerson and I would like to see the Highroads Department wiped out altogether. Highroads may be alright in a place like Quebec where they get a tremendous revenue from visiting cars but in this country with a population of only a quarter of a million, I do not think there should be a Highroads vote.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I wonder why the Minister of Public Works now increases the salary of the patrol men from \$75.00 to \$90.00 per month I see the increase began in 1929.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Hon. member for Bay de Verde I would like to say that when I took over the position of Chief of the Highroads Commission the Patrol men were receiving \$90.00 per month and I thought that \$80.00 was sufficient but found out that the reason that these men had to use their own horses and that the \$90.00 was for horse and man.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, at a party meeting held in 1928 this matter came up and was refused. It was Mr. Hall who introduced the \$90.00 a month.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, this is just another case of the commissioners doing thing without authority.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

Mr. Chairman, the patrol men used to use small ponies of from seven to eight hundredweight each and I thought that they should use them

weighing about a thousand pounds so that they might be used for the purpose of using drags and thereby save expense and for that reason I think they are worth \$90.00 a month.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I think it would be better if we were to leave the Public Charities vote until such time as we have discussed the Public Health Bill.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the Prime Minister has anything further to say with regard to the filling of the position of the Deputy Minister of Justice.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

Mr. Chairman, up to the present time no; but we are trying to make an arrangement in which the Deputy Minister of Justice would look after the position of Solicitor to the Railway Commission and the important parts of the work performed by the Law Clerk.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to find that out, as I consider that the present Acting Deputy Minister of Justice would be an admirable person for the job, and if it was possible to get him to take the job I would like to see him appointed.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how many bailiffs are at present attached to the Supreme Court. Here I see them listed as Nos. 1, 2, 3. These have held the position of bailiffs for almost as long as I have been in practice, with the exception of Sheppard. There is to my knowledge Roil, Cross and Sheppard, and lately I have seen that Mr. Knight has been doing the duties of bailiff.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, I was not aware that

there had been any new bailiff appointed except under the extra pressure of work and then he was only employed for the time being and at the same rate of pay as the other bailiff. His bill is certified by the Sheriff's Office.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask is that I thought that Mr. Roil was getting pretty old, and while I would not like to suggest pensioning him, I thought that perhaps he might be looking for a pension.

RR. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. There is no necessity to add anybody else to the service at present.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it is proper for a member of the Opposition to recommend an increase in any salary, but the salary paid to the Registrar of Deeds & Companies has been the same for a great many years and it is common knowledge, at least among the members of the legal profession, that the work of this Department has increased a great deal in recent years, and in the last few years the business has doubled. There was a time when you could leave a deed in the Registry and you would not get it back for three weeks; now you place a deed there and you will get it the next day. The system there is most efficient and the work is very well done. I recommended this vote be increased last year, and I think that the discrepancy between the salary of the Register and the Deputy Registrar is too small. The Registrar gets \$2,400.00 and the Deputy Registrar receives \$2,000.00.

When Mr. Adams was the Registrar and was unfortunately unable to attend, most of the work devolved on Mr. Maddick. When Mr. Maddick was appointed Registrar he received \$400 more than his salary as Deputy Registrar. I don't think that the propor-

tion of the Registrar to the Deputy Registrar is as high in any other Department. I would like to see his salary raised, and even then the ten per cent reduction would have to come off. Mr. Maddick has converted that Department into a very efficient machine and I would ask the Minister of Justice if would consider increasing that salary.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. Winter that this salary is low and that the volume of business has doubled and last year there was two or three thousand dollars of arrears of fees collected. I had hoped to be able to increase this amount, but when the Estimates were being prepared it was found necessary to strike off increases wherever possible. This is the first thing I would like to see done, and secondly, the salaries of the Wardens of the Penitentiary increased, but under existing circumstances it was found impossible to do so at the present time.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair until 8 p.m.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. Dr. Mosdell, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, at the last meeting of the Committee enquiries were made by some members of the Opposition as to the cost of administration of this Bill. The cost will come to approximately \$820,000.00. This compares favorably with the \$622,000.00 now voted for the same work to the Public Health Department. This includes payment to the professional staff, supplies such as clothes and food. All the salaries of the staff are estimated allowing for the 10% reduction. The power of controlling the staff and other matters will remain in the hands of the Department of Public Works. The expenses as we figure from the information at our disposal will be about \$800,000.00.

I really cannot say yet what will be paid teachers, for bringing cases to our attention. However, I think there will probably be some small payment made them, possibly about ten cents for each case reported. This, I may say, is the method adopted in regard to the method of supplying of statistics. The payment in any case will be very small. The Public Health Bureau will attend to all fees to be paid and to any city or outport agents.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I understood, Mr. Chairman's that Wesleyville was one of our most prosperous places; surely there can't be any paupers there. Yet I see here that pauper medical relief was paid out there, and emergency cases were \$60.00, making a total of over \$2,000.00. On information received I heard that certain doctors made out their bills and had them paid and then they were sent to the relieving officer of that district to sign, and that was the first

time that gentleman had ever seen those bills. Now I wonder what was paid others. Is there any person whose duty it is to look after these matters?

Some time ago local committees were formed for enquiring into matters concerning pauper relief and such like affairs and this idea had proved so successful that the arrangement is being continued. The Board consists of four or five members and the Chairman is usually the Magistrate or a J.P., or relieving officer of that district.

In answer to a question it was stated that one doctor received a sum of \$5,337.00; before that there were four district surgeons at \$850.00 each. Why were they discontinued?

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Because they were of no earthly benefit. They were scattered all over the city and we found it far better to have the work concentrated and done by one man.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—The concentration did not save any money.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, apart from the District Surgeons, there were other large amounts paid in fees which really amounted to a dead loss. The total in addition to these fees was, I think, about \$4,000.00. In connection with last year's bill, it must also be taken into consideration that there were three bad epidemics, measles, scarlet fever, and influenza, which cost the Board of Health a substantial amount.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, in connection with the statement that I asked Dr. Mosdell to prepare and submit, I feel sure that the Minister will see my point. One year more and the next year less for doctors and services.

If he could give us comparative statements with figures showing how much has been paid in previous years under the old rules, and how much will likely be paid in future years under the new system. I think this is a matter of great importance and vitally necessary for our statistics.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, when the Select Committee met and discussed this Bill a similar question was asked me and I answered it by saying that the reorganization did not involve more than a total of \$800,000.00; this of course is subject to conditions but can only be enlarged upon by consent of the Governor in Council.

MR. PUDDESTEH.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to see a statement of the comparatives of running the Department during the past three or four years and of running it under the present system since the district surgeons have been abolished.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, even if it cost more under the present system, it would be worth it, as it is much better to have one particular doctor in constant attendance at the Board of Health.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I see an account for four doctors amounting to \$9,500.00. Have you dispensed with the four district surgeons? By that I mean if the commission recalling them was not issued, then you are still liable for the amount you were supposed to pay.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—The only difference would be they would be asking for money now for doing nothing.

MR. PUDDESTER.—The doctors claim that they were doing the work just as efficiently as it is being done today.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I can only speak for the office

of the Board of Health from the time that I became identified with it and from the reports given me by the Commissioner of Public Charities.

MR. EMERSON.—You don't contemplate any increase in the expenses or additions in salaries under the new system?

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, it may be a fluctuating amount and will depend upon the conditions prevailing.

Sub-section 7 has regard to vaccination and Section 8 to quarantine, and are in all respects similar to existing Acts, they are purely and simply a part of the consolidation. Shall we read them or shall we pass them? They extend from 256 to 274 inclusive.

Section 9 is really a re-enactment of old Acts from which they were taken part and parcel in an endeavor to curtail the spread of tuberculosis through expectoration.

MR. EMERSON.—Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to see that section pass and we could tell the police to stop spitting when they are supposed to arrest those who are so doing. You can pass along any corner where they are and the pavement is covered with spits.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—I will suggest that to the Minister of Justice.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, in the course of our deliberations we have heard a lot about epidemics. It seems to me that more attention should be paid to the water supply of the country. I think if more attention were paid to the examination of wells there would be a great deal less of these epidemics. I remember in my district I was asked to recommend to the Board of Works that a well which was right out alongside the street be covered. The water was nice and

looked very fresh. The cost of doing this was one hundred dollars and I said that I would do my best to arrange that payment be made. That evening one of the people asked me if I knew where that water came from and, on investigating, I found that this water ran from under a stable and into the road. I, in my ignorance, was contemplating putting a structure there to protect the water from the dust of the road, and the water was coming from a most impure source. That state of affairs is going on all over the country, and disease of all sorts is spread around through a bad water supply. In this particular vicinity water was scarce and one of the few sources of water was from under a stable, and I think that some sort of rigid inspection should be made.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman the Board started a great deal of propaganda along these lines, but very little was done. We are hoping to have a general survey of conditions throughout the country by a competent practitioner and while he was doing this he could also report on the water supply; but that will take a matter of years.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how a doctor passing through a settlement does not notice the water supply and where it comes from. I can't understand how these things are not reported; you would think that a doctor would notice it as he passed along.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, at the present time institutions like the General Hospital are controlled by a Board of Governors. They have supreme control. They can make all the appointments, and the power of suspension and dismissal is in their hands. This, however, is not as a rule carried out in practice. Under the

present Act the Hospital will not be under control of a Board of Governors but under the Bureau, with much more limited powers. Where the governors could appoint and dismiss without the sanction of the Governor in Council, the Bureau cannot do so. Moreover, certain offices are answerable directly to the Minister of Public Works rather than to the Bureau.

Now the only way in which the Hospital differs from other institutions is the formation of this General Council, which forms a sort of Clinical Association; the idea being to get the staff together and discuss details concerning the internal economy of the Hospital. This organization coincides more with the standard set up by other hospitals, and puts the Hospital more in line for equal outside recognition. This organization is provided for in Parts 292-3-0.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, after all there are reasons why a rule like this should be made in the interest of the institution and in the interest of the public. That is a matter for persons used to handling institutions of this kind. But before we submit as to whether this is the proper way to deal with the situation, I would like to know whether the members of the medical profession generally agree with this regulation.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, in arguing in favor of an open hospital, the honorable member for Placentia East overlooked the fact that there is a difference of opinion in a doctor in his ordinary medical capacity and a doctor in his surgery. There is nothing to prevent a man's family physician from visiting him at the Hospital. If a patient entered the Hospital after being treated by a doctor other than those on the staff, his case would be made known to the surgeon on the staff, who would be call-

ed into consultation before proceeding to make a diagnosis.

There must be in charge of a Hospital such as the General, a competent Superintendent and a sufficient staff of surgeons under him. We have such a sufficient staff and we have sufficient in training to take the place of these surgeons. The ones in practice constitute the most experienced in the medical profession in the city. Taking into account the arguments against the open hospital, I think the case is a strong one against the system in vogue up to the present.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Chairman, I think the whole thing revolves around medical ethics, and these call for consultation with a person's own physician in cases such as cited. If Mr. Emerson went to the General Hospital and his family physician was not a member of the staff there, we would look upon it as medical ethics to allow him in. I have never known a case where one was shut out.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman as I understand it, medical ethics mean that I, as a private patient may go to the Grace Hospital or to the General Hospital and my own doctor operate on me.

Now, what I want to know is, whether supposing I am a poor man only able to pay \$1.00 a day, and doing even that with difficulty, and I have to go to the General Hospital, in a public bed, I cannot have my medical adviser who may have attended me for more than 20 years, attend me; isn't that so?

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I think the honorable gentleman had very little to complain of. The General Hospital provides very good attention, and as owing to the position of the patient the Government has

to pay for him, then I think that point is really quite immaterial.

Mr. Chairman, these are some amendments as suggested by the Committee.

Part 12 refers to regulations for the establishment of private hospitals and manner in which these are to be conducted after establishment. There are exceptions made for the existing private hospitals. I think the part of the Bill will account for any objections that might be made and will prove entirely satisfactory.

Part 13 is really an effort to standardize our training for nurses. At present there are two of our hospitals training nurses and giving their own examinations and issuing diplomas. Part 13, however, is intended to standardise that training and make any necessary provision in order that our nurses, when they have completed their training here may find recognition abroad. An agreement has been entered into between the Nursing Superintendents of the hospitals with this end in view. At present there are two of our hospitals training nurses. One provides, however, a more advanced training than the other.

It is intended to adopt what is known as the minimum standard; by this is meant the standard required by Canadian and the other hospitals abroad for the graduation of their nurses. Some time ago one of our hospitals applied to a Canadian hospital asking that they recognize our graduate nurses. The reply was to the effect that our nurses have really no official status; various shortcomings appear to exist in our training; it is a fact that some subjects do not appear in our courses which are regarded as absolutely necessary in other hospitals. The agreement I previous-

ly mentioned provides for the adoption of this minimum standard.

Regarding Nonia, it is not the intention of the Bill to interfere in any respect with the Association which has done such great work. It has been remarked that Nonia employs none of our local nurses; well this is due to the fact that they are not qualified for the positions. These nurses are graduate nurses who have specialised in special subjects and it is indeed a fact that they do very good work, for the Public Health Department are seldom bothered with requests from the districts where they operate. In fact, it is quite unusual to receive any requests whatsoever from these districts. These nurses have usually graduated from one of the large hospitals and have taken a course—it usually takes about ten months—in public health.

The idea would be to cull the good meat from the ranks of the nurses in this country and give them a post graduate course in the Old Country of about ten months, at the same training school that the Nonia nurses are trained in, then they would be able to come back here and take up their duties as fully qualified nurses. I may say that when we discussed the matter with the Nonia people they were quite agreeable and said they thought the arrangement would be a very satisfactory one. The proceeding in the Old Country is to make allowance for the expenses of the post graduate training which costs, I think, about £50. 0. 0. The appointment of Newfoundland girls as Nonia nurses will not affect the present position adversely, but rather place it in a better position.

Part 15 is the one at present on the Statutes and is in connection with the work and duties of midwives. It pro-

vides for mid-wives for various sections of the country and will only allow those who had proper training in this class of work to take up these positions.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—What will happen to the people who are at present acting in this capacity.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, a proclamation will be issued and any person desirous of training who is at present employed as a mid-wife will be given the opportunity. The new proclamation will not come in force until those people at present employed have had sufficient time to become expert at this work.

Part 166 is in connection with the Tuberculosis service and there have been very few changes in this connection.

Part 18 deals with all kinds of narcotic drugs and poison and brings all the legislation in connection therewith into line with the legislation now in force both in the United States and in the Old Country.

Part 21 takes the place of, but is similar to, the present Act relating to insane persons. This act was originally drafted on behalf of the Commission of the Public Health.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—What is the present position of the two Boards or Commissions respecting the Insane Asylum.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, these Commissions have nothing to do with the running of the Institution, but look after the hearing of petitions from the patients and from their relatives. The Lunacy Commission is supposed to meet monthly and will only receive their fees as Commissioners in proportion to the number of meetings they hold.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Charman, I would like to point out that there are some patients in the Lunatic Asylum whose names are not known. That Lunacy Commision—I am not talking about that one composed of Mr. Hutchings, Mr. Fox and Mr. Gibbs, but the regular Lunacy Commission—is a joke. There are two or three people in there whose names are lost in antiquity. There is no method of registering them on entering or on their exit if they escape. Yes, as my honourable friend, Mr. Winter, has just said, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here." There really should be something done about it.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that there is a series of questions filled out when a patient enters that institution: Their name, religion, age, their nearest relative, where that nearest relative lives, his address, and no patient has been admitted during the last thirty years without that form being filled in and sworn to before a Magistrate, and I think that when all these facts are taken their names can hardly become forgotten.

MR. EMERSON.—That part of it is all right, but the point I make is that there is no record in the Asylum.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—That is where these records go.

MR. EMERSON.—Yes, but there is no book; what is the use of a lot of slips?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Don't you think that they are kept on file?

MR. EMERSON.—They are not.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Then what are they made out for?

MR. EMERSON.—You, as a member of the Board, might enquire.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I am not a member of the Board of Health.

MR. EMERSON.—You are.. not.. a member of the Board of Health? Why are you drawing fees for being a member? You are assistant to the Chairman of the Board of Health and you ought to know about these records. I tell you that there are men in that institution whose records are lost and whose names are unknown.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Well, that is the modus operandi with regard to a patient going in there, but if there is neglect on the part of the Superintendent or the staff we are not answerable for that. I understand that the records go in there and they are sworn to previously before a Magistrate.

MR. EMERSON.—I know that the records go in there, but it is then that the weakness comes to light; and such a condition should be investigated, and that is where the Lunacy Commission should do its work. That is where their responsibility comes in and as far as they are concerned it is a joke.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honorable doctor if any report has been handed in from that Lunacy Commission in the last six months. We have been hearing lots of fairy tales from doctors, and I think that anything about these institutions should be told here and not in barber shops or beer shops around town.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, no report has been received. It would not come to the Board of Health, as it does not come under its jurisdiction. Recently we investigated the situation as regards Magistrates and others seeking admission for patients to this insti-

tution. They used to be sent along to us when there would be no room and we would be saddled with the expense of keeping them until they could be admitted. This cost a lot of money, but with respect to things inside the institution we have no control.

MR. EMERSON—Who has?

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—The old Lunacy Commission who were paid their salaries by the Department of Public Works.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, it is very important to have a good Board of Lunacy Commissioners. It should be considered a very serious matter, and here we find that there is a Board of Lunacy Commissioners who draw their salaries and do not even meet.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Section 503 provides for the composition of that Board.

(Reads)

MR. PUDDESTER.—Why is it so important to have a barrister on it?

MR. EMERSON.—Because he is always sane; there would be one member always sane.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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

Operation of the Newfoundland Hotel."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 tomorrow.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon, the 4th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 4th, 1931.

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

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Marine Disaster Fund.

Mr. Tobin 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 Finance\$5,201,031.08
Department of Colonial

Secretary (Civil Govt.) 124,412.50
 Department of Justice 387,857.75

The said Resolution respecting the Justice Department being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolution was agreed to.

On the motion for second reading of the Resolution respecting the Finance Department it was moved by Mr. Alderdice and seconded by Mr. Emerson as an amendment that the vote for the Finance Department as reported by the Chairman of the Committee on Supply be reduced by the following amounts: Membership Board of Works, \$1,500.00; Solicitor General, \$4,999.00 and the House of Assembly, \$8,000.00—total \$14,499.00.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment: Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Byrne, and against it:—Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. Dr. Campbell, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Brown, Mr. Earle, Mr. Fitzgibbon, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Godden, Mr. Strong, Mr. Greene, Mr. Smith, Mr. Murphy, so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion to concur with the Committee, the House divided and there appeared in its favor: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. Dr. Campbell, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Brown, Mr. Earle, Mr. Fitzgibbon, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Codden, Mr. Strong, Mr. Greene, Mr. Smith, Mr. Murphy, and against it:—Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Puddester, Mr.

Emerson, Mr. Winter, Mr. Qu'nton, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Byrne, so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On the motion for second reading of the Resolution respecting the Colonial Secretary's Department it was moved by Mr. Alderdice and seconded by Mr. Tobin as an amendment that the sum of \$687.50, the vote for the two Moving Picture Censors, be deducted from the vote of the Colonial Secretary's Department as reported by the Chairman of the Committee on Supply.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment: Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Byrne, and against it:—Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Dr. Campbell, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Brown, Mr. Earle, Mr. Fitzgibbon, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Godden, Mr. Strong, Mr. Greene, Mr. Smith, Mr. Murphy, so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon on the original motion to concur with the Committee, the House divided and there appeared in its favor: Rt. Hon: the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. Dr. Campbell, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Brown, Mr. Earle, Mr. Fitzgibbon, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Godden, Mr. Strong, Mr. Greene, Mr. Smith, Mr. Murphy, and against it:—Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Byrne, so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Facilitate the Operation of the Newfoundland Hotel" 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. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the educational votes I should like to point out that they are the same as last year with the exception of the teachers augmentation which has been increased by \$12,000. This sum will be divided per capita amongst the various religious denominations.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, by a reduction of ten per cent off the salary of Teachers what does it save the Government?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to know what the salaries are without referring to a mass of statistics, but I can let the Hon. gentleman know tomorrow.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, was it not only last year that the Carnegie Institution grant was increased from \$15,000 to \$25,000 and our Government Grant increased from \$10,000 to \$15,000, making a total of \$40,000 for the Memorial College and Normal School; and is it not a fact that men like Dr.

Paton and Dr. Hunter are not on the Pension list or the Augmentation list?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Yes.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, do you think it is fair that these men should be subjected to a cut in their salaries?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure; but in the case where people have come from England on a two, three or five year contract they cannot be subject to a reduction. However, that is a matter to be worked out by the Bureau.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I merely mention this so that the Prime Minister can get the necessary information for us on that point. I have heard rumours that we would likely be endangering the Carnegie fund by a reduction in the vote and I hope the Prime Minister will be able to furnish the necessary data when the matter comes up again.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, we were told by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago that Mr. Badcock was paid \$600 extra because he was the Secretary of the Fishery Board. Now I understand he is voted \$500 every year here for this work, so that he must have got that \$600 in addition to the \$500. Would the Minister explain?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, under Minute of Council August 10th, 1926, I was authorized to pay that \$600 for statistical work done by Mr. Badcock. He has been paid that every year up to this year, but now it is dropped. The same condition applied to the payments to Messrs. Bambrick, Parsons and Carter.

MR. EMERSON—Would they appear in the Auditor General's Report?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—No, I don't think.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that they do. On page 6 under 33b Mr. George C. Badcock was paid \$600, Mr. Bambrick \$400, Mr. Parsons \$400 and Mr. Carter \$300 and the Auditor General, commenting upon these payments, has this to say:

(Reads)

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman the Auditor General also suggests in his report that definite arrangements be made by the Minister with regard to this payment of \$600 to Mr. Badcock. Have any definite arrangements been made?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—No.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, what contingencies was he paid out of, General or the contingencies of your own Department?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—The contingencies of the Department. It is now dropped.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I don't object to busy Ministers leaving the House. I know they are often very busy, but I cannot understand the ordinary members leaving the House in such large numbers that the business of the House is hampered.

The Minute of Council is dated April 4th, 1931 and is addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

(Reads)

This authorized you to pay these men in 1928, 1929 and 1930, and I maintain you were perfectly correct in refusing to pay them, they gave no services and I notice that if the Min-

ister of Marine and Fisheries will look farther back he will notice that they were paid as inspectors under grants from the districts.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I take it that you are satisfied that this will be cut out in future.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, yes unless some other matters are brought to light. What I object to is the way civil servants receive extra fees. Why should civil servants be paid from the Colonial Secretary and then again from another department, civil servants are paid salaries and these ought to be sufficient.

I mean, Mr. Chairman, that a man is paid a salary from the Public Works Department and receives fees from the contingencies of the Colonial Secretary's or some other department.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I must say I am very much obliged to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for placing the new light on the wharf at Bay de Verde. I did not even have to make a request for it, but the Minister himself went to the District and when he saw the necessity of it had the light installed, and I can assure him that the people of the District appreciated it very much, and will further appreciate it when he puts the light on Blackhead wharf.

MR. TOBIN—Mr. Chairman, with respect to the two lights installed at Torbay, I would like to point out to the Minister that in their present position they are not of any advantage to the fishermen. One of them is at Gosse's wharf and it would be much more advantageous if it was transferred from that wharf to what's known as the "Doctor's Wharf" at which point practically all the fishermen from the north side land, and I

feel sure that when the Minister realizes the importance of this he will have it attended to.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I will have this matter attended to.

Mr. Chairman, before we pass over these estimates, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Opposition for their kind references to me, particularly in the case of the Viking Disaster. I think that special reference should be made to the men who took such a great part in that disaster, I mean, Dr. Patterson, who played an outstanding part, Dr. Moores, Dr. Blackler, Dr. Fawcett of the Imogene and Dr. Martin, the officers and crew of the various ships, Sagona, Prospero, Imogene, Beothic, Eagle Ungava and Foundation Franklin. I would like also to refer to Otis Bartlett, the operator at Horse Islands who worked incessantly to keep us in touch with the latest developments, the operators of the Postal Telegraphs Department, the operator at Fogo, and the operators on the different ships and the staff of the Department of which I have the honour to be the head. I would like to make special mention of Wm. G. Johnson who played such a manly and heroic part in standing by his companions until they were rescued and I feel sure that he will receive the consideration which he deserves. I would thank also Rev. S. Pickering and the officials of the radio station 8 W.M.C. at Wesley Church for their courtesies and co-operation. I would like to thank the Prime Minister and the Government for their untiring efforts days and night and the Prime Minister for giving me a free hand in this arduous task.

I would like to tell the House that without the assistance of the Govern-

ment and Sir. R. A. Squires, the Prime Minister, the efforts at rescuing these shipwrecked men would not have been brought to such a successful conclusion. Sir Richard Squires was always ready, it did not matter at what hour of the day or night I phoned him, he was always ready to give me every consideration.

We have been faced with a great many disasters since I assumed office, first of all we had the Earthquake Disaster on the South West Coast which caused such a havoc and left so many people utterly unprovided for. I may say in connection with that Disaster that I hope in a week or so that we shall be able to contribute a part of what is left from that fund to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund. There was also the ten ships that drifted off this port with I am glad to say the loss of only one life. There was the hail storm disaster at Lumsden in which three fishermen lost their lives.

Mr. Churchill of the Board of Works was sent down there and he handled the situation very well. Let us hope that we will have no more disasters, particularly no more like that of the Viking where 25 Newfoundlanders and two American citizens lost their lives.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I am sure every member of the House concurs with the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in giving our hearty thanks to any of those who helped in any way to alleviate the sufferings of the victims of the disaster. It seems to me at this time it might be proper to draw attention to the report of the Committee on the stranding of the Caribou. It is most concise and exceptionally well written and I am sure that every member has already read it. It might not be out of place for me to read an

extract from it with reference to light-houses.

(Reads)

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the warning given in that report ought to be taken seriously. It might have been a very serious accident indeed as far as the Caribou was concerned.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, as this vote covers agriculture, and in which provision is made for the salaries of the now famous five Commissioners, I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to continue this so-called Agricultural Commission? We were told the other day in the House by the Finance Minister that this Commission would be abolished. The Report of the Board of Agriculture tells us inferentially that they did not do very much and that their services could be dispensed with. In looking through that report I notice that the net result of their activities was that they endeavored to keep the blight off potatoes and the flies off the turnips. Now seeing that their efforts did not materialise in that direction, and in the light of the fact that they did nothing else to justify the \$2700 a year each they received as salaries, I move that this vote of \$13,500 be stricken out, leaving a balance of \$1,250 for the encouragement of Agriculture.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, last year the Minister had a vote of \$20,000 for the encouragement of agriculture and you spent \$40,000. Now you cut the vote down to \$15,000. How do you expect to pay your five Commissioners \$13,500 and do any encouragement for agriculture on \$1250 that is left out of the \$15,000?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—By overdraft on the Department.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I think that is an absurd position to take.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—We hope to do away with this Commission.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, now even the Finance Minister and the Minister of Agriculture will admit that is absurd; but if they will cut out that vote for Commissioners, who perform no work, that vote will pass without further comment.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I have spoken so frequently and so condemnatory of this vote that I feel rather diffident in saying anything more about it. Here you are asking for a vote of \$15,000 for the encouragement of agriculture and you are paying five Commissioners \$13,500 out of that money. Why, the position is a most ridiculous one. These are Commissioners who are members of this House and who have nothing to do for their salaries as Agricultural Commissioners. Another aspect to which I would like to draw the attention of the Finance Minister is that you have on the Order Paper resolutions for the reductions of salaries of civil servants, and these five Commissioners are not mentioned in that because provision is made that they do not come under that. They are exempted from the cut because their individual salaries are not voted. They are paid whatever the Governor in Council says they shall be paid. \$2700 today and maybe \$3700 tomorrow.

Now, if the vote for the encouragement of agriculture is to be subject to the ten per cent cut you will have nothing left out of the \$15,000 vote, because the Commissioners get \$13,500 of it. What are you going to do about that? There has not been a time since this House has met when matters of policy or finance has been dealt

with that this question of paying money to these Agricultural Commissioners has not come up. The mere mention of it is anathema to every man in the country, and there has not yet been a single Minister of the Crown to get up in this House to defend their action.

As a matter of finance, large sums of money are being paid these Agricultural Commissioners, and though the matter has been argued at length none of the Ministers of the Crown have attempted to defend the appointment, and I challenge the Government to defend this Commission and state what they are doing, or have done, to earn these payments. I challenge the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to defend them, and now when the Finance Minister states that we are on the verge of bankruptcy and brings in this cut in the civil servants' salaries, we are voting this Commission this sum without having explained to us what they are doing to justify their positions.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this matter to which I have previously referred. I understand the present Government was elected largely on their promise to encourage Agriculture in that section of the country known as the "garden of Newfoundland." As I see it, this is rather encouragement of laziness. Regarding this Garden of Newfoundland to which I have referred, I may say I have the honor to represent a section of it.

I ask that one of the members of this Commission get up and tell the House what they have done to justify themselves. A few evenings ago one of the members of the Board of Works (the member of the West End, to be exact) explained what had been done: now I would like to hear one of the Agriculture Commissioners do

this. It is really a scandal; it's disgraceful the things that are going on.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would just like the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to get up and tell the House what this Commission is doing that we should vote \$15,000.00 for its salaries. I can't see what was done last year for the encouragement of Agriculture. We've talked about public accounts; now let the Minister tell the House why we should vote \$15,000.00, only sufficient to cover salaries. We'll only have to vote another \$15,000.00 if we don't. How is he going to get out of the hole? \$15,000.00 to pay the salaries of five men, one of whom has volunteered to give up the job on July first. We need four other volunteers.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words replying to the criticism of the Opposition. I would have spoken before only I did not think it would be of any avail, as they are neither sincere nor consistent. The other evening I heard them criticise Mr. Needlands. I am satisfied that Mr. Needlands is as hardworking and as energetic a man as it is possible to find. Mr. Needlands could quite easily do the 175 a day the Opposition refuse to credit him with. He could drive 30 miles an hour when on construction, and Mr. Needland's working day is certainly of more than seven or eight hours duration. He will work 12 or 15 hours. I admit that he will have stops of some duration on a major span bridge. An hour's stop may be necessary as it is often necessary to supervise the location of the pier and other matters on minor span bridges; however $\frac{1}{2}$ an hour would be sufficient. As to meals, well any working man knows that meals can be carried with you and eaten in the car while driving.

I have heard Mr. Needlands charged with the failure of the Grand Bank pier. This is not so; I have been on the pier more, probably, than any other member of this House, and I say that Mr. Needlands is not responsible for this disgraceful job. It was caused on account of the flow and ebb of the tide, or what we call the undertow, which pulled the piers away. Railway irons were used, and snapped immediately, and it is owing to the magnificent job done on the concrete part that the whole did not break up.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture has not satisfied us as to the Agriculture Commissioners.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, the honorable gentleman should be congratulated on not perjuring himself by trying to do so.

I notice that the business manager is getting an increase of \$300.00 a year. Why is that?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, his duties and responsibilities have been extended considerably and his job is now one of much more importance.

MR. EMERSON.—Does he stay in the office any longer than he previously did?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, his duties include the checking of all bills and the checking of all requisitions issued by storekeepers at the various institutions, and if he considers the items requisitioned for should not be granted, the requisition is cancelled. He also has to check the prices that have been listed by the various city stores for supplies and see that none of the bills which these suppliers send in exceed

the price marked that are specified when the original prices are given.

Very often he finds these prices wrong and for months at a time I have had bills lying on my desk, with cheques attached to them, but the people refused to take them, in the hope of getting more money, but eventually they do take them. Mr. Eaton, the business manager, is a very efficient man and his increase is more than earned by the able manner in which he handles the position, and I cannot see any reason for the members of the Opposition to be quibbling over such a small increase which is more than justified.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, the next item I see here is a supervising druggist. Can the Minister justify the creating of this job?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, the object of this appointment was to have some efficient person checking the purchasing of the drugs for the various institutions, and it was found that an ordinary layman such as Mr. Eaton, who was not familiar with the drug business, could not handle the job, and I feel that the amount voted will be more than saved by the appointment.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, two thousand dollars (\$2,000.00) seems to me to be a lot of money for this position. Does he do anything else or has he any outside business interests, as I should not think it would take him more than an hour per day to supervise the purchasing of the drugs?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, he has no outside business interest, and very often he assists Mr. Eaton in his work.

You will see that at the present time the fire insurance premiums are cost-

ing the Government \$16,600 per annum and the total amount of the public buildings insured in St. John's and other parts of the Island amounts to one million seven hundred and sixteen thousand dollars. I have checked up the insurance paid and find that in seventeen years the Government has paid the sum of two hundred and two thousand dollars in premiums and has received only thirty-five thousand six hundred dollars in fire claims, which in my opinion is bad business, and we have decided to cut our insurance in half.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, this seems to me a great mistake and I do not think that the insurance premiums should be reduced unless there was a system of writing off introduced by the Government. In the great fire of '92 a great number of the citizens of St. John's made the same mistake as the Government is making today. They had been paying insurance premiums and not having any fires had decided it was a waste of money and either reduced their insurance considerably or cut it out entirely, with the result that when the fire of '92 swept St. John's a great number of the people went bankrupt.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Is the honorable member for Placentia East an insurance agent?

MR. EMERSON.—Yes.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I thought so.

MR. EMERSON.—If the Minister becomes too flippant, I shall have to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to speak to him.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman, the innovation of iron stokers into public buildings where they could suitably be placed, has been the means of reducing the cost of

fuel about 50%; but certain buildings, such as the General Hospital and the Asylum are not suitable for these iron stokers, and consequently the cost of heating these institutions still remains the same. An example of the institutions where they are not installed are the General Hospital and the Insane Asylum, but in other buildings where we previously used hard coal at a cost of about \$30.00 per ton, we are now able to substitute slack coal and use it ton for ton with hard coal. This slack coal only costs us about \$9.90 per ton.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give us figures in this connection for some particular public building?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Chairman in 1929 the Departmental Building cost the Government \$650.00 for heating, but since the installation of an iron fireman in that building the cost has been cut in two, and this experiment has encouraged us to try them out in various other public buildings.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, while on this vote for public buildings, I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the small salary of \$225 a year paid the Keeper at Carbonear. The keeper at Harbor Grace receives \$890; Bay Roberts \$600; Grand Falls \$800, and Corner Brook \$900. Now when I asked for the appointment of this man I also asked the Minister for a small increase, and he promised to give it because this keeper at Carbonear has more work to do than the keeper at Harbor Grace or Bay Roberts.

The same applies to other public officials at Carbonear who have more work to do than those in similar capacities at Bay Roberts, but who receive less salaries. Now this keeper

at Carbonear is on the job all the time from daylight till dark, Sundays and Mondays, for this miserable pittance of \$225 a year and out of which he has to board himself. He wanted to leave several times, but at my request he held on there. Now I think that the Minister would be doing only justice to this young man by making his salary \$450, as this would only give him a living wage.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

I agree that his salary is small, but there are so many other similar cases that it is almost impossible to increase salaries these times.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, if there are similar cases, they are not stated in the list, or anything near as small as the one I have referred to.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works if any consideration has been given yet to the petition from the Wardens of the Penitentiary asking for an increase of pay?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Chairman, the petition was considered, but it was decided not to give any increase this year.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, On looking over the Report of the Penitentiary, I was forcibly struck with the saving effected by Mr. Thompson during the past three years since he took charge of that institution. According to the expenditure on maintenance account he has saved \$12,152, or an average of \$4,050 per year. That report speaks volumes for the ability and carefulness of Superintendent Thompson in managing that institution. Whilst I admit it is a poor time to raise salaries, yet one can pay tribute to a man in an institution who has made himself so interested in

charge of the work there as to save over \$12,000 for the country. I, therefore, take this opportunity to pay that tribute to Mr. Thompson.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

...Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in supporting Mr. Puddester in the tribute he has just paid, and I can only add that I cannot speak too highly of Mr. Thompson's work. While fair and just in his dealings with the inmates, it would be impossible to find a more economical manager than Mr. Thompson, and in this respect he sets an example to the manager of every other public institution.

The prisoners have been treated as well as they have been during any previous regime, and the saving that Mr. Thompson has effected is due entirely to his thriftiness and economy. I think the tribute well deserved, that Mr. Puddester has paid to Mr. Thompson, and have pleasure in supporting it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—

Mr. Chairman, I would hate to allow this opportunity to pass without saying a word or two. I did not intend to say anything, but the honorable member for Placentia East, Mr. Emerson, gave me my cue, when he said he did not intend to cast any reflection on these men. He does not cast any reflection, but I regret to say, some of the newspapers associated with the Opposition certainly did cast some reflection, and I am referring to the torrent of abuse that came from the Daily News and Telegram, without any justification, and when they wound up they hadn't anything to say. I will tell the story.

It started in the Daily News, of which Mr. Currie is editor, against my brother. I may not have any blue blood in my veins, but I certainly have got plenty of red blood, and I am not

going to let this opportunity pass without slinging this back in Mr. Currie's face. I have the right of free speech in this community and I am going to exercise it here in this House, and I am going to tell Mr. Currie who is so pure and upright in this community, that there was a time a couple of years ago when his paper didn't attack people for robbing the Savings Bank. He hides away out of sight and instead drives away at a young man trying to make good in his profession.

He didn't tell us anything about the money that was robbed from the Savings Bank a few years ago; and this institution, the Insane Asylum, was robbed right and left; money was stolen and half the goods that were sent in there never saw the inside of the place; but if anybody else commits a small offence he is jumped on. "People in glass houses shouldn't throw stones. It only goes to show that none of us can afford to talk ill about the other fellow. Mr. Currie is a travesty on this country; the most hypocritical imitation of a man that God ever put breath into. Money and everything else that was stolen from that institution, Mr. Currie never said anything about, and there were more officials went into that institution, and there was more money and more goods stolen from it than the public ever heard about. It was cloaked up. If he cloaks up instances where people steal public money, he is just as much to blame as they are.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, I was reading in the Prime Minister's paper the other day that I had manipulated the tariff so as to benefit manufactures with which I am connected. Well, Sir, that is entirely untrue. These duties were put on by the Tariff Commission of the Squires Government and I had

nothing to do with it. This paper is the mouthpiece of the Prime Minister, and I take it he endorses the sentiments expressed. Then I was compared to a "louse," that is the exact word that was used. I would tell the honourable members of this House, believe it or not, I never saw a "louse" in my life. I mean that I have never seen an inside "louse." I have seen them parading under the name of "men." The inference he drew was that a "louse" sucks blood, and that I was sucking the blood of the people. I remember when I was a boy reading stories about people drawing blood and mixing it, and then they were friends for life. This gentleman who wrote so eloquently about "lice" must know all about them. He may have drawn blood from a "louse" and become friends for life. However, I never mind these things; I think that it only tends to make friends for the men talked about, but I don't think that men should be compared to 'lice.'

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman I like to see people take their medicine when they are hit back at. I never referred to Mr. Currie as a "louse." I don't think that he is as good as one; you have only to look at the face of the individual to see what he is.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow. It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 5th, 1931.

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

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, as President of the Bureau of Education I beg to lay upon the table of the House the Report of the Superintendent of Education in Newfoundland from the Superintendent of Church of England Schools for the year ending June 30th, 1930.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Jamestown, Bonavista South, asking that the sum of two hundred dollars be allocated for the purpose of repairing a coastal wharf in that settlement. I present this petition through the courtesy of the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union, Mr. Scammell, and I ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for early consideration.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting the petition made by the Hon. member for Bonavista South. I trust that if there is a special allocation made for such purposes the Department of Marine and Fisheries will immediately see to the reconditioning of the wharf at * Jamestown.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Municipal Bill, as follows:

**TO THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE
OF ASSEMBLY:**

Your Select Committee on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921, respectfully beg leave to report that they have considered the Bill and make the

following recommendation in regard thereto:

1. That Sections 2 to 8 of the Bill as printed be adopted without amendment.

2. That Section 9 be amended by omitting the words "or parcel of land" after the word "building" in the new Section 220 substituted by that Section.

3. That Sections 10 and 13 be adopted without amendment.

4. That Section 14 be amended by omitting the words "and it shall reduce the rate of tax accordingly" at the end of the said Section.

5. That Sections 16 and 17 be adopted without amendment.

6. That Section 18 be amended by substituting the words "seven per centum per annum" for "eight per centum per annum."

7. That Section 19 be adopted without amendment.

8. That Section 20 be amended by striking out the words "for Sections 246 and 247" in the second line thereof and substituting the word "therefor," and by the addition of a third Section numbered 248 and reading as follows:

248 (a) City Tax assessed and imposed upon any property which prior to the enactment of the Principal Act was not within the limits of the City, or which was situated South of Signal Hill Road in the district called "the Battery" and which for any part of the period intervening between the date of such enactment and the date of enactment of this Act was not within three hundred yards of a City water main shall be deemed

to have been assessed and imposed for such period or portion thereof at the rate of one dollar per centum per annum of the appraised rental value of such property, and actual assessments and impositions to the contrary notwithstanding

(b) The excess of any assessments actually made over the assessments deemed to be made by the foregoing sub-section shall be stricken from the books of the Council, and any amounts paid to the Council by the owners of such property in excess of what would be due on the assessments so deemed to be made shall be credited to them on the books of the Council against future taxes.

(c) This Section shall not apply to property owned and/or occupied by any manufacturing company for the purposes of its business.

9. That Section 21 be amended by omitting sub-section (b) therefor and renumbering the remaining sub-sections (b) and (c).

10. That Section 22 be amended by the insertion of the words "except by sale for taxes at the suit of the City" after the word "however" in the eighth line of sub-section (a) therefor.

11. By the omission of Sections 24, 25 and 26 from the Bill as printed.

12. That Section 27 be renumbered 24 and adopted without other amendment.

13. That Section 28 be renumbered 25 and amended by the omission of the words "or any Councillor" in the third line thereof.

14. That Sections 29 and 30 be renumbered 26 and 27 and adopted without further amendment.

15. That Section 31 be omitted.

16. That Section 32 be renumbered 28 and amended by the insertion of the words "in his possession or control" after the words "insurance policies" in the fifth line thereof.

17. That Section 33 be renumbered 29 and adopted without other amendment.

18. That Section 34 be renumbered 30 and amended to read: 30. Subject to existing rights, the Council shall have the exclusive right of granting and extending franchises in respect of transportation, light, heat, power, water, gas, sewerage, telephone, telegraph and aeronautical developments and enterprises within the limits of the City and all kindred and cognate public utilities therein; provided that all such grants and extensions and the terms thereof shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

19. That Section 35 be renumbered 31 and adopted without other amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Dated at St. John's the 5th day of May, 1931.

(Sgd.) P. J. CASHIN,
ALEX. CAMPBELL,
JOSEPH FITZGIBBON,
F. C. ALDERDICE,
J. A. WINTER,
G. G. BYRNE.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 76 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund,'" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 76 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund,'" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 76 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, if this Bill has the unanimous consent of the House I would ask that it be read a second time.

In paragraph one the words "fisherman and seaman" are struck out and the words "seaman, fisherman, sealer or any other person engaged in a sea-fearing occupation" substituted.

Paragraph two states that the unexpended surplus of the South Coast

Disaster fund be transferred to the Marine Disasters Fund.

Next that all moneys received by me or the Managers of Newspapers or by others; this, for example, would include Magistrate Fitzgerald, for relief of sufferers of the Viking Disaster be transferrable to the Marine Disasters Fund.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I would like the Prime Minister to show the total amount of the subscriptions to this fund. I understand there should be a balance between what was spent and what was donated.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, that question should be answered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as up to the present the Committee have not presented any report. Personally, I received about \$2,000.00 and on my own responsibility I transferred this amount to the Marine Disasters Fund.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, regarding section 2. Do I understand that it is intended to transfer anything left over belonging to the South Coast Fund to the Marine Disasters Fund. I do not think this is proper. I think the money collected for this purpose should be used for this purpose only. I think the burden of money necessary to better the prevalent conditions should be borne by the Government. At the beginning of the session the Prime Minister made certain statements and both statements were published in the newspapers and this had a bad effect on the public. At any rate the amount collected does not nearly approach the amount of \$50,000.00 which we require. I understand that some of this fund was used for relieving the berri-berri epidemic on the

West Coast and I don't think this is right.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact I have no connection with this Committee except that they did me the honor to elect me the Hon. President when the thing was originally started.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I see that the first paragraph dealing with "fisherman, seaman" which it is proposed to change to "fisherman, seaman, sealer or any other person engaged in a seafaring occupation" is with a view to place any one suffering from a disaster similar to that of the Viking disaster in a position to benefit from the Marine Disasters Fund.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, yes, that is the intention.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, before this Section passes there are a very few remarks that I would like to make in reply to the honorable member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Puddester. I am a member of the South Coast Disaster Fund Committee and we discussed this question as to whether the people should be rehabilitated with the balance which we had on hand or whether we should pass it over to the Permanent Disaster Fund. At the meeting of the Committee no question arose with regard to the treatment of beri-beri cases to any extent out of the funds, as this would be undertaken by the Board of Health. We have a doctor in that vicinity and bad cases are brought to St. John's for treatment, and case which are not so bad are treated on the spot. There was no call for those purposes and no hint considered that such would be the case. But the point is that the condition of the people with regard to beri-beri and tuberculosis is getting worse, due to the disaster. They

were fully rehabilitated for the next summer, but the fishery for that year was a failure and the Government had to institute relief measures. Now they have contracted beri-beri. For a number of years there were no cases of this sort, and now there are cases there by the hundreds, and the outstanding cause is not only the shortage of regular food, but also the shortage of potatoes and other vegetables. All their stocks were swept away at the time of the disaster. There was a feeling in the minds of the Committee that they should rehabilitate the people with seeds, etc., so that they could sow them and raise vegetable, so that when another winter comes round they would be amply provided with the proper sustenance necessary to ward off beri-beri. If this was not done the situation that would arise would be very much aggravated and this trouble is very difficult to cure as it leaves the sufferer disabled if it not taken in time. Once such an epidemic got started it would be very difficult and very expensive to check it and everything possible should be done to prevent the spread of such a disease. But if the people go into another winter unprovided for, it will be a far greater problem. The Committee decided that if there was a balance of \$23,000.00 and it was turned over to the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund to be placed at the disposal of the dependents of the victims of other disasters, how could they justify themselves for the condition of the people for whom that fund was raised? I can see that there are many arguments for both sides, but it was the feeling of the Committee that they should turn over a large amount to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund as we would only need a comparatively small amount of money for this purpose, but they felt that if they neglected this undertaking they would be

subject to general hostile criticism and very keen criticism from the people of the area affected. It is only fair that I should make that statement and tell the suggestion of the Committee in connection with the balance of the fund raised for the South Coast Disaster.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I think that the explanation given by the honorable member for Fortune Bay is extremely clear, but it really admits the suggestion made by my honorable friend the member for Bay de Verde, Mr Puddester, that this fund should not be used for beri-beri cases. You may call it rehabilitation, but it amounts to using this fund for dealing with matters that, in spite of the fact that they are aggravated and were caused by the Disaster, should be dealt with by the Government. It also bears out the other statement of Mr. Puddester that the people would not subscribe to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund or the Viking Disaster Fund if they were led to believe that at least \$25,000.00 was going to be handed over to the Viking Disaster Fund by the South Coast Disaster Fund Committee. The Permanent Disaster Fund is in a bad way. This is greatly to be regretted, particularly in view of the fact that it was started in 1914 and is one to which everybody subscribes; it is nation-wide and is run extremely well, and it obtains by reason of its position considerable free advertising from the newspapers and it appears to be to be a great mistake if anything were done to lessen public interest in it, which I think will happen if the money which was promised to it were used to relieve beri-beri and other matters which should be dealt with by the Government and not by the South Coast Disaster Fund Committee. It is not a large amount, the Government will probably be able to get it; but if it

is a small sum, its affect on the fund is going to be great.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, as a member of the joint committee who considered the matter of handing over the surplus from the South Coast Disaster Fund to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund, I should like to point out that I consider this whole discussion altogether premature. The idea was merely discussed by the Committee but no decision whatever was arrived at. The suggestion merely was made but no decision whatever was made by the Committee. The whole discussion, I submit, is entirely premature, and I think it is a pity that the rumor to that effect should have been spread abroad. We, as a committee, have to decide first of all if the conditions of our trust have been complied with.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Just one word more on the subject, Mr. Chairman. I can fully sympathise with Dr. Mosdell in the difficulties he has to encounter in connection with the stricken area, but I would also like to point out that there are more beneficiaries under the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund in this area than in any other.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time, as follows:

Department of Colonial Secretary,	
Public Charities	\$ 311,537.05
Department of Marine and	
Fisheries	410,697.09
Department of Education..	1,013,065.03
Department of Agriculture	
and Mines	102,450.66

The said Resolutions respecting the Departments of Colonial Secretary, Marine and Fisheries and Education, being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

On the motion for second reading of the Resolution respecting the Department of Agriculture and Mines, it was moved by Mr. Alderdice seconded by Mr. Puddester as an amendment that the sum of \$13,750.00 be deducted from the vote for the Encouragement of Agriculture, this being the amount paid from this vote to five Agricultural Commissioners as salaries, at the rate of \$2,750.00 per year for each Commissioner.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment: Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Moore, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Byrne, and against it Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. Dr. Campbell, Hon. Dr. Mosdell, The Minister of Agriculture, The Minister of Public Works, The Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Earle, Lady Squires, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Godden, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Bindon, Mr. Strong, Mr. Smith, Mr. Murphy, so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion to concur with the Committee therein was put when the House divided and there appeared in its favor: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial

Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. Dr. Campbell, Hon. Dr. Mosdell, The Minister of Agriculture, The Minister of Public Works, The Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Earle, Lady Squires, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Godden, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Bindon, Mr. Strong, Mr. Smith, Mr. Murphy, and against it Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Moore, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Byrne, so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

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. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Chairman, I see by the Estimates that the probationers of the Hospital are only receiving a small amount per annum. Is it the intention of the Minister that the 10% reduction is to apply to these nurses?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Yes.

MR. QUINTON—Don't you think that in view of the hard work that these nurses do that it is a great hardship on them?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I do; but I would like to point out to Mr. Quinton that their salaries were increased last year,

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what position does Dr. Campbell hold at the General Hospital for which he was paid \$1800 last year from Contingencies? What are his duties?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—He is the visiting physician of the General Hospital.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, if it were found necessary to appoint this visiting physician, my contention is that the amount should have been voted as straight salary and not taken from Contingencies. If it was not for the fact that this amount appeared in the public accounts we would never have found out that the doctor was getting this extra amount.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister who the attending physician is that gets \$1150.50?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Dr. Fraser.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Finance Minister that last year \$2,900 was voted and that \$6,197 was spent. This included Dr. Campbell's amount of \$1,845, telephone \$534, printing and advertising \$1100, hire of a car \$1300. This year you will naturally have the same bills to meet in connection with the printing of forms, hire of car, etc., and you have not taken any Supplementary Supply. I fail to see why when you have a resident physician, two resident housemen and 6 visiting physicians you need an extra visiting physician. Up to 1929 he was not on the payroll at the General Hospital.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the House is entirely satisfied with the answer to the question. The Minister was asked the question directly and he refuses to tell us the arrangement.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—The position of the visiting physician to the General Hospital is a very

difficult one for a layman to talk about.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, the position is that for a number of years the General Hospital was run entirely as a surgical hospital; but from time to time purely medical cases kept coming in and Dr. Campbell was engaged to look after the medical side of the Hospital in contradistinction to the surgical side. He has given good attendance there; certainly he has given regular attendance and, consequently, the hospital has made considerable improvement, as before it was neglected; resulting in a considerable saving as far as the Board of Health was concerned. As a result of Dr. Campbell's activities there has been a much quicker turnover, and the average stay of a patient has fallen from 25 to 20 days. That has greatly increased our facilities and at a much smaller charge. Personally I don't think that any mistake was made in making this appointment, and it has brought about a reduction much greater than the amount paid Dr. Campbell.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, why didn't the Minister say so at first. Isn't Dr. Campbell's position really that of a glorified chucker-out?

MR. PUDDESTER.—Who is the attending physician at the Fever Hospital?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Dr. Campbell.

MR. PUDDESTER.—He was voted a salary of \$780 for this work last year; but if you will look up your accounts you will see he was not paid this \$780 salary last year, but he is down in Contingencies again and was paid \$1825.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—There was quite an epidemic of fever last year and that accounts for drawing on contingencies so much.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would also like to draw attention to the vote for Contingencies which is down in the Estimates for \$1,170 and you spent \$2,259 last year. Will the Minister of Public Works explain that? Did you have an Order in Council to pay that amount?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Yes.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I would like for you to produce the order. I question whether you can produce it.

With regard to this vote of \$8,000 payable to the St. John's Municipal Council in aid of lighting St. John's streets, I might say that up to last year there was always a similar amount paid out of general contingencies for lights—and they were few and far between—in such places in Conception Bay as Bay Roberts, Harbor Grace, Cupids and Port de Grave and Bay de Verde District. Last year the lights were discontinued because the members of Conception Bay were not satisfied to pay for the lights out of the district grants, because the grants are so small that they are unable to pay for lighting, and why should they have to pay now any proportionate share for lighting the streets of St. John's?

I see that we are to vote \$8,000 for the city street lights. Yet we don't get any vote for lights in the outport districts. Since the city is not incorporated, I don't see why the city members should not get this amount voted under district grants as other members do. I suggest we postpone this vote and discuss it later.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Chairman, regarding the settlements of Outer Cove Logy Bay and Middle Cove, may I say that these telephones are of great assistance. At present there is no resident doctor in the district of St. John's East Extern and it is necessary to despatch a man on horseback wherever one is needed. For this reason much time is lost.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS.—Mr. Chairman, the change was made on the retirement of Mr. Lloyd, the statistical clerk. It was of great importance to the money order department.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I don't think that this accounts for this large raise.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS.—Mr. Chairman, previous to Mr. Lloyd's retirement, Mr. Milley received \$2500, and he took over this job in addition at \$3600. These two jobs previously cost the country \$4600. Mr. Lloyd was pensioned at \$1600.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, the mail clerks on the cross-country trains leave here and go right through to Port aux Basques. It is true that they are off from Saturday to Tuesday, but for the remainder of the week they have to work continuously without getting any rest whatever and under frightfully hard and trying conditions. They are under a great physical and mental strain, and if the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs can in some way make arrangements satisfactory to these men I can assure him he will get every support from the members of this side of the House. The dining car stewards and others get rest, but the mail clerks get none whatever, and if the Minister could try and give them a little more pay and shorter hours, I

feel that it would be done in the interests of better service for the country.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the honorable member for Bay de Verde in his remarks regarding the duties of the mail clerks. The conductors on trains only go as far as Bishop's Falls but the mail clerks have to go all the way to Port aux Basques. They get absolutely no rest from the time they leave St. John's until they arrive at Port aux Basques, and they work under very trying and unfavorable conditions. I quite agree with what the hon. member for Bay de Verde has said with regard to the service given by these men. They are undoubtedly the hardest working officials in the mail service and should be given a great deal more consideration than they receive at present.

MR. SKEANS.—Mr. Chairman, I want to put myself on record as being in full agreement with the remarks of the honorable member for Bay de Verde in respect to the work performed by the mail clerks on the cross country trains. I, myself, was a mail clerk for nine years and am fully acquainted with the trying conditions that exist when performing the duties of a mail clerk. The mail clerk is on his feet from the time he leaves St. John's until he arrives at Port aux Basques, and he is the person who is held responsible if any newspapers or letters go astray. As the honorable member for Bay de Verde has stated, they leave St. John's and have to travel to Port aux Basques with no sleeping accommodation whatever.

They have nothing to eat but what they take with them, and they cannot get back to the diner for food. They have to work very hard and I would say, Sir, that travelling mail

clerks should be paid for their services. I think that during the first session of this House I said that mail clerks should be classed at \$110, \$130 or \$150, and I say again, Sir, that mail clerks should be given some consideration. I am heartily in accord with the sentiments expressed by the honorable member for Bay de Verde.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honorable Minister what happened the postmistress at Marystown? Is the operator doing the work of both? I notice you didn't increase the salary. I do not think that is hardly fair. There is quite a lot of business going through this office. When a change was made at Garnish the salary was increased and it is a whole lot smaller office.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS—I have received no complaint from that office, the work is being done just as efficiently, and I have received no application for a raise in salary. We have to effect economy wherever possible.

MR. PUDDESTER.—How long has office been changed?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND
Evidently within the past twelve months.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate what the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs says with regard to not increasing salaries when an office has been changed. This is the only way that we can get down to rock bottom and have the Post and Telegraphs Department a paying proposition. I am against giving increases when two offices are combined, and I think the operator should do the work of both. That is the policy I adopted in my district. There

is an office at Freshwater where one man is doing both jobs and is glad to do so at the same salary.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

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

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the editorial appearing in this evening's Telegram. It is headed "No Sacrifice for Government Members."

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that this article is entirely unwarranted and I want to object to the tone of this editorial. To begin with, it's not correct. This matter was not before the House yesterday; it was two or three days ago, and anyway the matter is not yet decided, it has to be debated and as yet the Prime Minister has not expressed himself on the matter. With regard to the Agricultural Commission, only the other day the Minister of Agriculture and Mines stated that this matter would be carefully considered. Mr. Speaker, I resent this editorial which I think is quite uncalled for; it's not good enough.

(Reads)

I would like to call the attention of the members on both sides of the House to this attack from the editorial of the Evening Telegram, and in this paper I may say that I have never yet seen anything of a constructive nature; all it does is try to degrade and destroy. The other

day, when I was feeling sore or at any rate pretending to be sore, I made some remarks of a similar nature concerning the editor of the Daily News, I purposely omitted to make any mention of this individual—the editor of this paper—because I didn't think it worth my while to speak about such an insignificant individual. Then they try to pull that sentimental stuff about the teachers across. Well, we all know the editor himself was once a teacher, and he was such a rotten failure at the job they had to make him editor of such a rag as this. He attacks everyone; not just the government alone. At the time of the election he attacked the Honorable Leader of the Opposition. Often he attacks Mr. Puddester. He accuses us of making mistakes. Well, every man makes a mistake now and then, he wouldn't be human if he didn't. He's afraid to appear on any public platform. Well, let me tell him that when there's another election, and that won't be very far away, then I advise him to disappear, or I'll cause him to do so or my name isn't Cashin.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not very well up on the rules of the House, but surely there must be some method of dealing with this rotten sort of thing. It's frightful that this man should be allowed to go on printing this poisonous stuff and if I knew what move to make I would certainly put the motion. I'm sorry to have to speak in this manner, but the occasion calls for it. We are all doing our best and this is what we get from this rotten individual. Well, let me tell him that I've never sunk so low that I've had to knock at a Prime Minister's door and ask him, for God's sake, to give me a job to save me from starving; and that's what he had to do.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman. I would just like to add a few remarks

to what the Minister of Finance has already stated. I don't want to detain the House just now and I'll have more to say when this matter is discussed later on. What I want to know is what is this Jefferies, is he a Turk? I think he must be one of those black Indians you hear about, one of the worst types. He's always making these rotten remarks about someone. Some time ago it was Mr. Alderdice, then later on he had something to say about Mr. Puddester and the Daily News.

The like of this stuff being printed isn't good enough. I say this paper ought to be censored. I quite agree with the Finance Minister when he was on the other side of the House he was subjected to the filthy abuse from this Jefferies.

I'd like to know who this man is, surely he can't be a white man, if he is there was a mistake made when the order was given. If he ever appears in this House he won't stay very long for if there's no one else to do so I'll throw him out myself and pretty quick at that.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair until 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Dr. Mosdell, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, we have now got as far as page 161. This part is new and has to do with the duties and authorities of the

Chairman of the Board of Public Health, and seeing that it is comparatively short I suggest that it might as well be read. This part aims at giving the chairman the necessary authority and describes his powers and duties, but there is nothing contrary to the usual procedure and policy of handling indigent cases. This is the only new part left and perhaps the opposition might like to have it read. The remainder of the Bill merely effects the consolidation of the existing law.

The next part is Section 25 and there is very little change from the old section except to harden the conditions principally in respect to the treatment of children by neglectful parents, this section broadens their scope of duty. Part 26 is a composite part. If the Hon. gentlemen will refer to the third schedule they will find that this part is made up of four existing Acts.

(Reads)

And certain other sections from existing Acts inserted by the Consolidation Commission. The first four pages comprise what is new in this section, the rest is a consolidation of existing legislation. Does the Committee desire to read through this section? The only reference to the Child Welfare is in a sub part of a section and provides the machinery whereby they become incorporated, this is section 692, the idea is to give all such organizations an official standing. There is a change in section 692 on the advice of the Select Committee, 692 is being made to read:

(Reads)

This saves the trouble of going through a lot of red tape. The same idea underlies this as Nonia, the idea is to give them official recognition at home and abroad, particularly abroad and so enable them to secure such benefits as possible from such

organizations as bestow such or give funds.

MR. EMERSON—Read the defining section, 582.

HON. MR. LEWIS—Before this section passes, it seems to me that some provision should be made for protecting the religion of children and I move this amendment:

(Reads)

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I agree that there should be some provision in this respect but I think that it should be inserted in the general provisions, or in the end of it say on page 620. We are now dealing with a part of the Act and I think that it should be put in the general provisions. I suggest that it be put in around section 708 or 709. Section 708 has been repealed by the Select Committee and I suggest that it should be put in there and it would apply to the whole Act. The Hon. member for Fortune Bay will remember that the Select Committee advised that 708 be cut out and I think that it might go in there.

FT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The wording of this amendment is:

(Reads)

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, if you would permit me, Sir, I would like to say a few words in relation to Part (19) of the Act and to assure the Hon. members opposite that this Chapter has had the fullest consideration of all of us representing districts which are particularly interested in logging. Last year before this Public Health Bill was anticipated some of us who were very anxious to embody some amendments in the Logging Act gave serious consideration to this matter. A Committee was formed comprising Mr. Strong, Mr. Earle, Mr. Starkes, Mr. Brown and myself. We got together and drafted some amend-

ments to the Logging Act and which amendments we thought would give fair play to loggers and in some sense meet some of the difficulties which appeared to be somewhat aggravated. We made a report, embodying recommendations, to the government and we subsequently found that some of the recommendations were covered in Part (19) of the Bill we are now dealing with; but they are some further recommendations which we made in the way of amending the Logging Act and which may have to be dealt with before this session of the House closes. As far as I am personally concerned I am satisfied that the scope of this section of the Public Health Bill is alright, but, of course, every member of the House has the right to express his views if he choose so to do.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I may say, Sir, that these parts have been discussed by those who profess to know something about logging and logging conditions, and they agree that this section takes care of the situation. As Mr. Scammell said we will see more of this in another form in a few days, but for the present this section takes care of the situation and we have nothing more to say about it as it is quite satisfactory.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, another section that has been under consideration is 420 and the only point raised is the question of the practibility of the administration of that Department. Sub-section 2 provides that 20 cents a month be collected from each man.

(Reads)

This will be used for medical expenses. The companies take the position that it is difficult to cover all the men or keep an exact check on the men as they are continually moving

from camp to camp, and some of them are counted in three or four times. They suggest that the basis of payment be the full cut divided by the average cut of a man and they are quite willing to pay on that basis; acting on this suggestion the Department of Justice drafted the following amendment which reads as follows:

(Reads)

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, this Act will take care of the loggers far better than ever before. Loggers in the past paid 20 cents a month for doctor's fees and I am sure that not one hundred men out of all that went in the woods for the winter ever saw a doctor, a doctor never visits these logging camps unless they are called and the men had to pay 20 cents a month and would never see a doctor. Conditions in the lumber woods are bad and they are getting worse and I am very glad to see this section in here to look after the loggers. Two days ago I received a letter from a Camp Inspector and he told me that he had visited a camp and had found men sleeping in a camp with six inches of water over the floor, conditions of this sort are not good enough and the amendment to the old Logging Act will take care of all this and I feel sure that the members of this House particularly the Opposition members will give it their fullest support; I feel that every member will give it his unanimous support so that we can make conditions better for those who go into the woods in winter to earn their livelihood.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, the difficulty is to accept the situation where the men pay double the money and the provisions here are very gentle and there is no method for the enforcement of the provisions of section 419. It seems to me to mean that if the employers do not make a con-

tract, they can make some other provisions, such as employing a young boy, with some experience as a chemist or with a year or two of pre-medical course over. I shall read the last part of 429, sub-section 1 on page 419.

(Reads)

They might do as they do on the sealing steamers, employ a young man who has been working two or three years with a chemist.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—How can the Hon. member read that interpretation into it?

MR. EMERSON—Well, if you are satisfied that covers it, well and good.

MR. BROWN—The employer is liable for accidents to his men.

MR. EMERSON—Under what, and for what?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—There is a penalty provided.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—That is not much good to a dead man.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, we give them the same consideration as employers on the sealing ships, mostly employers are ready and willing to engage a medical practitioner, but it is not possible always to get a medical man to go to these places but they do their best.

(Reads)

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, suppose they don't do it?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—The Board will take action, but we are not making any unreasonable exactions from anybody.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Chairman, I think the necessity is this, in my early days I was a physician in a

logging camp and 20 cents a month was collected from the men for my services, another year they decided to take a chance and not engage a doctor at all, and if a person was injured or cut his foot, it was decided to pay a doctor so much a visit, figuring that it would be so much cheaper and that is what this means. One year they might not have any accidents or sickness but if they take a chance they are liable for doctors fees, etc.

MR. EMERSON—Well, if the experts on the matter are satisfied, I am.

HON. DR. MOSDELL reads section referring to logging camps.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—244 feet would be 5 X 6 X 8.

MR. BROWN—Yes and that would be more than sufficient space for any two men.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, another section for the consideration of the House is Section 433 which deals with the provisions of the Logging Camps and only gives the Companies until the end of 1931 to fall in line with the proposed changes. The Companies ask that the date be extended for another six or twelve months in order that they might have time to abolish their old camps and make arrangements for new ones.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, would it be satisfactory to them to have that date extended and read not later than July, 1932.

MR. BROWN—Yes.

HON. DR. MOSDELL reads section 5.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, with regard to section 13 which permits the Assistant to the Secretary of the Board of Health to sit in this House, I must say that I am not in

agreement with it. I think that it is entirely contrary to constitutional practise and it is quite wrong. I do not wish to provoke any acrimonious discussion but I cannot refrain from pointing out that it is quite contrary to constitutional practise. The fact that we have five Agricultural Commissioners whose salaries are not voted by this House shakes any confidence we might have in what he says. I don't see the necessity of having the Colonial Secretary and the assistant Secretary to the Board of Health in this House. I don't see why the assistant receives fees based on any scale, he is not subject to the control of this House and he is entitled to remunerations from various sections of this Act. I must say that I don't agree with it, but I suppose we will have to submit when the Government is so large.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the position taken by the Hon. gentleman. If the man in charge of the Bureau of Public Health was controlled by Order in Council, so little attention would be given this problem that you could not hope for any progress. Whatever has been done by the Bureau of Public Health as regards bettering the condition of the health of the community has been done by team work between the Chairman and the Assistant Secretary, the achievements that have been possible could not have been done by any one or two men. The other day I got the totals of the amounts paid for medical treatment in St. John's from the accountant of the Public Works and when I got these totals we were agreeably surprised, I found that all payments from 1923 to 1930 are as follows:

(Reads)

Now, that is an accomplishment of which we are proud, it includes every

dollar paid every practitioner. This comes from the accountant at the Board of Works in answer to a question put the other day and shows a considerable saving and yet every care and attention was given by these gentlemen. We had a similar experience when we took office and we found that it was the practise to engage taxi cabs as required to take patients to the hospital and in one year it ran into \$6,000.00. We have an arrangement now where we have a contract with Mr. Stamp that for \$250.00 a month he takes care of all these cases and covers everything, except of course, where there are three or four cases arriving by the same train and we want to get them away from the station. He is doing under contract what cost over twice as much.

I would like to tell this House in this connection, that arrangements made at the Board of Health for public service are not of a political character and we request that we be given consideration on our merits and we feel that our decisions and our arrangements have worked out satisfactorily and economically.

Mr. Chairman, before you put the motion, I wish to thank the members of the Opposition for the kind way they have received this legislation and for what they have done to facilitate its passing. I wish to thank especially the Hon. gentlemen opposite who served on the Select Committee and did everything possible and gave so freely of their services and helped in a great measure to get it through with the least possible delay.

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 and on motion of Hon. Dr. Mosdell the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare" 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 tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 6th, 1931.

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

MR. STRONG.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present three petitions—one from Cook's Harbor in relation to protection for coast fishermen; another from Coachman's Cove asking for a breakwater for the protection of the fishermen there, and the third from St. Anthony respecting the keeping of dogs. With regard to the first, it relates to conditions which existed up to last summer and it asks that bank trawlers should not be allowed to fish inside the three-mile limit in that section. The covering letter which I have received regarding this subject says that during last season when fish was scarce, bankers from the South West Coast operated inside

the three-mile limit and some of the more prolific fishing grounds where the shore fishermen were accustomed to pursue their avocations were trespassed upon to a great extent, and they were practically driven from these local grounds. This letter states that on a particular ground off Cook's Harbor a banker anchored and in one day deposited the offal of one hundred quintals of fish. In consequence, the following year there was no fishing to be had until the fall season, despite the fact that this is a most productive spot for fishing.

This petition is signed by 300 fishermen of Cook's Harbor, Raleigh, and Ship's Cove, and they suggest that a fishery warden be appointed for the protection of the coast fishermen who do not wish to go to the banking grounds. I wish to refer this petition to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to which it relates and I trust the Fishery Board will deal as they think best with this matter.

The second petition is from Coachman's Cove. As anyone who is familiar with the district knows, that in rough weather it is very dangerous there for small boats, and this petition asks that \$500 be allocated for the purpose of building a breakwater. This petition is signed by nearly every elector in the place.

The last petition is from St. Anthony and relates to the keeping of dogs. This petition suggests certain measures, such as the impounding of dogs during the summer season when they are not required for draft purposes. As we know, there was lately passed in the House an Act relating to the keeping of dogs, and as this deals with the question it is unnecessary for me to say more on the question. I

refer the matter to the department to which it belongs.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Lamaline for a bell-wire. There is very little to say on the subject other than to refer the matter to the department to which it belongs.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Ireland's Eye. The petition is singed by nearly all the electors of this place and it expresses their wishes. The following are the number of signatures from the various places:

((Reads)

I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it belongs and that they do their utmost to accede to the prayer of this petition. I may add that these people took the trouble to hold a public meeting and if it is not possible to grant the whole of the petition, it will be pos-
-19 to do something with regard to part of it.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.
Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 76 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund'" 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 cer-

tain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Dept. Public Works.....	\$843,855.50
Dept. of Colonial Secretary (Dept. of Justice).....	325,674.00
Dept. of Customs.....	549,869.56
Dept. Pension Commrs.....	14,550.00
Dept. of Assessor.....	15,840.00

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, we have now covered practically everything in the estimates with the exception of the subsidies for the steamship services. There are practically the same as last year with a general reduction of 25% per cent. I have no doubt that the members of the Opposition will say that this is only a jest on my part. Their claim will be that the Railway will suffer to this extent, but that is not correct. It is our intention to curtail and save approximately \$97,000.00. This does not mean that the Portia will not get her \$40,000.00, or that either the Prospero or the Glen-coe will have their subsidies of \$40,000.00 reduced 25%, or in other words receive only \$30,000.00; but the services on both the South and West and North and East coasts will be reduced by 25%.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of

Finance and Customs what made up the additional amount of \$72,000.00 last year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—This amount was made up from outstanding amounts for subsidies that were owed the railway from past governments and dates as far back as 1926. In other words if that amount had been paid we would not now have to pay it. Last year when I brought in my Budget I did not know about these amounts and it was not until after the House closed that the Auditor General notified me that these amounts were outstanding.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Last year we took it for granted that your estimates were correct and reliable and at the same time you had an amount of over \$70,000 which was not shown and about which we heard nothing.

I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he contemplates running the "Swile" on the lower Labrador service this year?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I don't think so.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I really believe that if the Minister is sincere and earnest regarding the reduction of 25% that he could make no better move than cutting out from the service the steamer "Basque," which is costing the Government \$28,600 and giving no adequate service whatever to the District in which she is employed. I have heard from several people in the district that they did not want this steamer, and also I heard that it was a pre-election promise given by the Government if a certain person would not compete in the election. During the winter months the steamer Mala-

koff has to do the work of the Basque, and I say that when we are in the position that we are in today, our backs against the wall, that there is no justification whatever for the expenditure of \$28,600 on this boat. The Government is trying to reduce its expenditures, but is doing so at the expense of the unfortunates of the civil service who get barely enough to live on and now have to accept a 10% reduction. I would, therefore, like to move that the vote for this steamer be deleted from the Estimates.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition in his observations stated that he had reason to believe that this steamer was being run as the result of a pre-election promise, but I can assure him that such a promise if made would have to be made by myself, and I never made any such promise.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.

Mr. Chairman, if what the Prime Minister says is correct, then I will take his word for it, but perhaps it was an after-election promise, and at any rate the fact remains that the contract was granted.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—It was not necessary for our party to make any after-election promises.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, on the question of boats, whatever happens I cannot see how the government is going to save this 25%. If, for example, it means cutting down, say the Portia, by \$10,000.00, it will have to be remembered that the Portia is being run by the Railway Commission. She is sent out on a trip by the Commission from fortnight to fortnight, and I would like to know who is going to control them from sending these steamers when and

where they like. Is the Minister of Finance going to do it? Is the Prime Minister going to do it, or is the Executive going to do it? If the steamer Basque is under contract, then it will be impossible for you to reduce the expenditure on this boat by 25%; but I would like to first ask is she under contract?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, Then why not cut her out altogether? She is a rotten little tub, anyway, and not worth a quarter of the money that is being paid for her. If they have not got a contract, why is the figure in the Estimates? And if they have a contract how can you cut it by 25%? Can you bring in a programme showing that you are not going to cut the service in that vote? Is it that you mean that the steamer will stop at every third port instead of every second one? You have no scheme to present to the House and we have no explanation and we are asked to believe, as if we were a crowd of children, that this is going to save money. Now if it goes on carrying out the present schedule, it simply means that the railway is going to lose more money than it lost in the past and we have to meet the bill. There has been no explanation from the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister or the Colonial Secretary, who is head of the Railway department in the House, on this matter and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is going to have a further deficit in his department next year on this account. There is not a single minister in the House who has explained how this money is going to be saved. Surely you don't expect that a vote of this kind is going to pass the House until we get some explanation of it.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman, we are taking \$76,000 to cover May and June of this year so that we will be able to keep within our vote to be passed by the House in the Estimates.

MR. EMERSON.—Is this necessary?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—It is done to keep the annual payment within the fiscal year.

MR. PUDDESTER.—How much of that \$76,000 should have gone into 1929-30 account?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—As far as the department is concerned we were asked to make up in Supplementary Supply to meet requirements at the end of the fiscal year.

MR. EMERSON.—Do you mean that Supplemental Supply brought in last year was false? Supplemental Supply is supposed to be brought in here up to the end of June and which was not brought in by you the year previous.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—What you see there in Supplemental Supply is to meet our requirements up to June 30th.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, Supplemental Supply is brought into the House to take every minister along up to the 30th of June every year. That is what it is here for. Now there is no difference this year from last year unless the Minister brought in Supplemental Supply which was false. I wonder if there is any other Minister of the Crown who wants to make a similar statement that last year's Supplemental Supply was false?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—You don't seem to

understand what you are talking about.

MR. EMERSON.—Well, I am going to debate from my point of view. The Minister informs this House that an extraordinary thing has happened and that he was told apparently by the Finance Minister that his Supplemental Supply would have to take him up to June 30th and that it must be accurate and true. This seems to be an explanation from the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and last year his Supplemental Supply was not correct because he did not take Supplemental Supply to take him up to June 30th and he did not receive any instructions to do so. Perhaps the Minister can explain the position as to what was the amount of his Supplemental Supply last year.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I do not know one thing about Supplemental Supply for last year. Dealing with the present Estimates, I am giving you the statement as true to the best of my knowledge.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I think I explained that point to Mr. Puddester when I told him that the vote last year was short \$76,000, and I told him that it was not in last year's Supplemental Supply. It was not the fault of the Minister that it was not put in; it was the fault of the Accountant at the Post Office, and they had to use up out of the current year and that left this year short.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, As I suggested to the Minister last year if the different accounts had been brought down, then the Minister would never have balanced his Budget. The Minister contends that the whole of this \$76,000 was Supplemental Supply for 1929-30. If the Minis-

ter of Posts and Telegraphs had brought down Supplemental Supply for the steam subsidies last year, his vote would be \$162,000 overdrawn, notwithstanding the fact that the vote for his department was \$525,000. Now I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs how it was that he spent \$162,000 more than was voted for subsidies? There are very large steam subsidies—\$96,849.00.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Put the question on the Order Paper.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I don't care whether you answer or not.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, that \$96,000 was really Supplemental Supply for last year and is accounted for by the extra coastal boat on, and no vote was taken in the House for it. It appears that this \$76,000 has been passed on for a number of years and what you pointed out last year turned out to be accurate. Anyhow we are taking this vote now for \$76,000—which should have been taken last year—plus the vote for \$96,000. I may say that up to two years ago the coastal subsidies were of a disorganized nature and boats were put on indiscriminately. Every vote we have had on, with the exception of this one for \$76,000, was not the work of this Government, but that of our predecessors. Now we take a vote for \$76,000 to cover overspending for last year, not for this year.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—So that if you had provided for that in Supplemental Supply last year—which was not done, due to an oversight at the Post Office—your surplus last year would have been cut down by \$76,000.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.....Yes.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the earnings of the S. S. Portia were \$11,000 less than the expenditure last year for that ship. In other words, if you cut down the subsidy for that ship by \$10,000 you will leave her \$21,000 short for this year. Personally I do not see how you can reduce that service on the West Coast.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, during the time the Reid Newfoundland Company operated the railway, the ships came under the management of the General Superintendent.

Captain Dalton had no experience in the running of ships until he was given the job by the Monroe administration, and if there is any man who lacks experience in the position he holds it is Captain Dalton. He thinks he knows it all, like other people who got swelled heads. Regarding the steamer Basque, my opinion is that she should be cut out, and I have yet to hear any man from the South West coast say that this service is a necessary one. There was a twelve-year contract brought before the Government last year for this boat, but the Government did not pass it. They had intended to bring the contract before the House, but the contract did not go through the Committee of Council. Some members of the Executive Government thought it was not the right and proper thing to do, and then the subsidy was put in the Estimates to carry it on year by year. Nevertheless, if another Government happens to come into power that vote will not be found in the Estimates. We have the "Glencoe" and "Portia" doing service on the South West Coast, and that is sufficient, particularly in these strenuous times, and I do not think that this House is justified in putting through \$28,600 for that service from Ramea to Port aux

Basques. So far as the Opposition is concerned, we are going to hold dead against that amount going through.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I move, Sir, that this vote also be eliminated from the Estimates, because it is little more than duplicating the "Prospero." The "Earl of Devon" takes in a few harbors perhaps where the "Prospero" does not go, and if the Government are earnest and honest in their preachments of economy, here is a brilliant opportunity for them to economise. It is true the "Earl of Devon" operated that service during the Monroe administration, but it must be remembered she was chartered under different conditions then. She was chartered by the Monroe Government at \$125 per day with all costs paid; but she was chartered by the present Government at \$95 per day for the hull alone. This means that a considerable amount of money found its way into the pockets of certain members of this House, directly or indirectly. If the Government will not entertain the idea of cutting out this boat, they should at least get back to the original charter price. I think it would be far better to save money in that way than to cut the salaries of the unfortunate school teachers and the other low paid civil servants. I know of places in this country where services are triplicated by having a bay service, a railway service and a coastal service, and where people go to see the train arriving as a means of entertainment. Take the "Argyle," for instance, which not long ago carried 1600 lbs. of freight for the entire round trip; and conditions are similar all over the coast at the present time. The purchasing power of the people is not in evidence. You should make tremendous savings—at least \$150,000—in the directions I have indicated,

without inconveniencing the trade of this country.

MR. STRONG.—Mr. Chairman, referring to the Lewisporte-Cook's Harbor service, which should rightly be called the Lewisporte-Flower's Cove service, I want to contradict the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, who said that by doing away with this service it would not inconvenience the trade or the fishermen of the district that I have the honor to represent in this House. For about thirty years I have worked in that district in the conduct of the ordinary fish business of the country and very frequently when the S.S. Prospero was the only boat on that route I have seen it happen that when certain goods were urgently needed for the prosecution of the fishery, our fishermen were seriously hampered on account of having only one steamer making fortnightly trips, and very often the fishermen were without gasoline to operate their boats for ten or twelve days. On numerous occasions I have seen traps wrecked in the water as a result of heavy seas, and in this instance also were they handicapped because of the delay in getting material to make repairs to their gear. Perhaps, the Prospero would have gone up or down the coast a few days before, and it was of vital importance to those fishermen to secure line and twine to repair their traps in order to get the fish when it was running. Any practical fisherman knows that the shortage of gasoline and the loss of twine is able to put any fisherman out of a voyage of fish, and I believe that every gentleman in this House who has any practical knowledge of the fishery knows this is a fact. Therefore, I claim that there is no service in this country more justifiable, at least so far as my district is concerned, than the Lewisporte-Flower's Cove service which we are considering in the Esti-

mates today] White Bay district is one of the largest fish-producing districts in this country—it is second only to Burin district—and it is of vital importance to the people of this country not to try to make a saving in a way that would react against the principal producers of the country, and I claim that by making such a saving it would react against the best interests of the people that I have the honor to represent. I can see many other ways in this country where savings can be made. I can see quite near St. John's today where we could effect a saving that would not be an inconvenience to the producers of the country. Years ago before I became actively identified with politics in this country I heard talk of building of branch railway lines, which I think have been demonstrated beyond peradventure to the people of this country as one of the most non-productive expenditures ever foisted upon the people of Newfoundland, and today do I say that if we are going to retrench with regard to any of our transportation services let us retrench somewhere where there is no possibility of a reaction against the fishing industry of this country. Take the Bay de Verde branch as an illustration. I submit, Sir, that that railway is sinking more in one year than the Lewisporte-Flower's Cove service is in two, and as far as I can learn is of very little benefit to the people it serves. Take the Hr. Grace-Carbonneau branch. What people in that section want that service cut out, although it is not operated on a paying basis? Today you have highroads all over Conception Bay over which motor cars and motor trucks can pass and you can get to your destination by this method of conveyance just as economically, and certainly much more quickly, than by the railway. If a fisherman of Conception Bay needs gasoline or other material during the

fishing season, he can get it from St. John's in a few hours, even if the branch railway lines were never running. But I maintain that these conditions in Conception Bay are altogether different from the conditions that exist in my district where the fishermen cannot get the things they urgently require if they have not got a steamer to serve the district. The service to which I am referring takes in 18 ports at which the "Prospero" does not call, as well as serving the places this ship serves. The Prospero does not call at those 18 ports, for it would be impossible for her to do all this work and keep up with her schedule.

In 1928 I was asked by a number of my constituents to try and get the Prospero to call at these eighteen aforementioned ports. I replied that, in my opinion, this would not be feasible, and that I could not conscientiously ask to have the boat diverted to the ports as they would throw her off the schedule without showing real results for the extra work, and make it impossible for the boat to make her trip in the two weeks.

A few years ago the service I am now defending did run through this section and called at all these 18 ports excepting the section from Cook's Hr. to Flower's Cove, and at the request of large numbers of people, it was in 1929 again inaugurated.

In pointing out the value of this service, another point I would like to mention is, the fact that it is in this section that the Grenfell Hospital is situated; and while I am on this subject may I say that although I know this institution has been praised before, still I am confident from my own personal knowledge that the good done by Dr. Grenfell and his wonderful staff of workers will never be told, and I would like to take this oppor-

tunity of saying as one who was present in the early days of the inauguration of this work, that the work done by this Hospital is really wonderful.

Practically all the sick from that section of the country are treated there, and I think that when I say there are few cases from that district treated in the General Hospital of St. John's, those conversant with the facts will bear me out in this statement.

Now, down there, there are no roads for transportation purposes, and let me tell the House that it is a godsend, nothing less, that when just after the Prospero has left and, as frequently happens, a serious accident occurs or say somebody develops acute appendicitis, to know there is another boat only a couple of days away. We have no railway service up there, Mr. Chairman, and I say it would be unjust to the people I represent if this service were to be discontinued.

It seems to be the idea when retrenchments are necessary, to pick on certain districts. Well, I think that the branch railways are largely the cause of our trouble, and I don't see why my district should be forced to make a sacrifice because of that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are asked to vote \$8,500.00 every year for lighting the streets of St. John's. Well, down in White Bay we don't have any street lights. The people of St. John's have just as good eyesight as we in the outports have, and I see no reason why they should not pay for their own lights instead of taxing the whole country for them, and if not let them find their way around in the night like the owls, the same as we in the outports, who have to help pay for St. John's street lights without having any of our own.

Now, if I were to suggest seriously objecting to this vote for the City, the St. John's people, and of course their members, would think I was very presumptuous, and they would perhaps have a right to think so, but now that there are proposals for taking a public service away from the people I represent, well I am going to fight them to the limit.

I would like to take the honorable member for Placentia East, who suggests that this vote be cut out, for a trip to my district, providing he won't hold me responsible for the reception he gets. . I would not like to have happen to him anything similar to what happened in Western Bay some years ago.

Now, in conclusion, may I say that to best of my knowledge this particular boat, or rather service, turned in an income of \$14,000.00 last year, and you cannot expect a new service to be very successful until you have given it a few years to build up, and I think that it might be quite possible to build up a service such as this, and all I have to say is, that I am prepared to stand by what I have said, and that I am going to do my best to look after and protect the interests of those I have the honor to represent.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the very sensible remarks of the honorable gentleman on the other side of the House, may I say that the service there is not yet cut out, and far be it from me to suggest it if I thought it was of any real benefit.

However, I am afraid I am still unconvinced. I contend that this service, put there by the Monroe government, and put there, I believe, in a moment of weakness, was a decided mistake, and I firmly believe that had

they remained in power another year this service would have been cut out.

Regarding the \$14,000.00 the honorable member told us this service had earned, I think there is some mistake. Last year the boat earned \$39,000.00 including her subsidy of \$35,000.00. This means her earning would be \$4,000.00, instead of \$14,000.00; and as expenditure was \$41,500.00, the net loss was over \$2,000.00.

I don't see what real use this boat is to the people and I don't think she serves any practical purpose.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with what the Hon. member for White Bay has said. The District of White Bay has no Highroads, and it should not have its Coastal Service cut down. It is the only way the people have for transportation. It isn't served by any of the branch lines of the Railway, which are costing the country so much. It would be better to cut out the Bay de Verde train or the Trepassey train. What do these people want trains for. They've got their Highroads for transportation purposes. The railway is costing the country too much money. Look at the Railway deficit this year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I've got some information here dealing with the Railway subject. I went around and pieced it together from information I got from different people, some from one man, some from another, and I am going to read it now, and I want the reporter to take it down, and take it down correctly.

Your railway this year shows a deficit of over a half million dollars, and this is on operating account.

Of course, this loss is attributed to general depression that is existing just now. But there are some points that I would like cleared up before

accepting this excuse. Our railway is heavily subsidized. Our steamships get a large subsidy, all capital expenditure is provided for by the Government, and Government patronage is paid for in full by the Government. All charges asked by the Railway of the public are paid, and yet we find a loss of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Surely there must be a cause, that the country and the Government don't know of, especially when we find outside carriers taking trade from our railway and steamers.

Farquahar & Co., of Halifax operates a few steamers along the coast. Their rates are lower and their patronage is greater. They get no subsidy, and their trade has grown to such an extent that they are warranted in getting a new steamer for freight and passengers built at Mahone Bay this season for the West Coast trade of Newfoundland.

The Marine Agencies operate ships and no doubt successfully, they get no subsidy.

The Clark Steamship Co operates large, powerful, well equipped ships into Corner Brook, and have taken our Gulf trade, both in freight and passengers. They are subsidized by the Canadian Government, but they are expanding their business so much so that this year they plan to add the Labrador ports of call to their service, which will no doubt cut further into our Straits service. In view of the above I have yet to be convinced that our railway and subsidiary services are properly and economically managed when it shows tremendous losses on operation.

As I see it the Railway operations are a loose disjointed system. You have the best and most willing men as employees engaged in the service, but they are discouraged by the re-

sults, their pay is lower than any railway employees in Canada or the United States, their hours are longer, and their encouragement is less. I have been speaking to a great many of our railway men about the railway, they claim they simply do as told, which in itself is very commendable. They cannot make a suggestion for the benefit of the service, fearing they may get fired, in other words, "you do as you are told, I am running the job." They conclude they have no one to give their confidence or suggestions to, the heads of Departments are in the same position as themselves and are afraid to make suggestions for the well-being of the outfit, they claim they are only laughed at.

I have heard of a case where a man fully qualified by years of service, experience and training, a practical man in every respect, offered his services to the Commission, but what was the result. This man was given a large increase in salary and stowed away with practically nothing to do. His livelihood for himself and family was to be considered. He could, therefore, do nothing but take his money and stay quiet and suffer the agonies of seeing the railway Sink, Sink, Sink, as is plainly shown even in the last Railway Bulletin issued, where freight and passengers have decreased every year, 1929 to 1931.

There are a number of men connected with the Railway who are willing to stake their reputation that they could assist it to do better if given a chance, but their services will not be availed of, I ask why? Take your railway rates and freight, also your passenger rates, they are pre-war and post-war, and the majority of them were in force when the railway was first established, and in the days of the late E. W. Taylor. Go to any station and see the tariffs

with their circulars and supplements by the dozen. It needs an expert to understand them. If no other expense, the time lost in compiling and copying and correcting, and other losses is sufficient to cause a big deficit as time counts.

What the Railway employees are clamouring for is a man of practical knowledge, one who can understand their grievances and suggestions, and would talk to them on the Railway's good. The management has all its time taken up with Executive work, and the actual railway work receives but scant attention. Ask the people around Conception Bay about their trade, Wm. Dawe & Sons about their drums and their propositions re same, see why we lose thousands of dollars by not handling same. Ask the people of Carbonear how they are shipping their salmon boxes this year. Ask the people of Curling about the fresh salmon shipments from the Straits Points and coming summer, via Sagona. Ask the trade of St. John's about the rates and their reasons for not routing their goods via the Railway, also what was the amount lost last year on pulpwood owing to the A. N. D. Company shutting down on the hauling of their wood on account of the railway adjusting their rates in the midst of their operations. Your Railway is losing eight to ten thousand dollars a week this year as compared with last year.

My suggestion is try it out by making an appointment of a general superintendent, as well as a competent freight man in the General Freight Agents Department. There are men in the service in other Departments that could be transferred to the Departments referred to without much extra cost, if any, at all for the present, but if any improvements shown within a year then pay them accord-

ingly. You, therefore, stand no chance of a loss on this account. I therefore, make this a proposition, that a General Superintendent and an Assistant General Freight Agent be appointed to the Newfoundland Railway, with no increase of pay until such a time as the roads show a decrease in the present yearly deficit.

I have taken this matter up during the last three weeks and have received my information from various people who were in a position to know what they were talking about, and I certainly think it is time that this House went into the matter and took a serious view of what is going on. We are faced with a large deficit from the railway every year and the Government asks no questions but simply pays out the money that is demanded of them. Last year, owing to the additional amount charged the A.N.D. Co. for cars, considerable work was lost and many of the men in the lumber woods lost their jobs. Another result of this extra charge was that the men only received 90 cents a cord for the wood, instead of \$1.00; and it is our job as their representatives in this House to see that mistakes are not caused by incompetent Government officials that will lose money for the ordinary working man.

Then we are told about the losses on the branch railways, and I am informed that on the Bonavista Branch last year the Government had to pay a loss of \$70,000; but I want to inform this House that if a chartered accountant was to swear on oath that that branch lost \$70,000 last year, I would not believe him. I know that road and I know that there are always great numbers of passengers on the trains and a great deal of freight passes over the road. The same thing applies to the Bay de Verde branch.

Another thing I would like to point

out is that the Coastal boats are not making nearly as much money as they should be making, and the reason for this is because they are being run under the same management as the railway and they should not be. I say that if the coastal boats were placed in charge of Mr. Foley and Capt. Dalton they would make from 40 to 50 thousand dollars a year more.

My proposition is that Capt. Dalton should have charge and have all to do with the repairs and sailings of the ships. But under the present conditions that is not so. The boats go on dock for repairs, and what is the result: As soon as they go there Mr. Harvey fills the boats with men, which costs the Government a lot of unnecessary money.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, don't you think it is very unfair for us to be criticising and discussing the characters and reputations of men who are not here to defend themselves.

MR. BROWN.—I am not discussing or criticising their characters.

MR. EMERSON.—I suggest that we should not get into debate on this subject.

MR. BROWN.—Are you afraid that I might make a true statement that would effect some friend of yours.

MR. EMERSON.—Frankly I don't think it is fair for us to discuss them.

MR. BROWN.—I was not discussing their character, but their ability, and when we were elected to this Chamber there were certain responsibilities placed in our care. We pay these officials with money belonging to the people of the country, and I say that we have the right to discuss them.

Capt. Dalton is undoubtedly a good man. When he was first appointed (I

believe that Sir John Crosbie was responsible for the appointment) I sat in opposition and thought that the appointment should not have been made, but since then I have changed my opinion, and today I don't think we have in this country a more efficient man than the same Capt. Dalton.

MR. PUDDESTER.—If Capt. Dalton is the ships' husband, don't you think that it is his job to see that Mr. Harvey does not fill the ships with men when they go on dock.

MR. BROWN.—Perhaps I was wrong in saying that Mr. Harvey fills the ships with men, but if he does not do it, then there are others who do.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in my opinion the handling of these boats should be taken from the control of Mr. Russell and left in the hands of men who are familiar with the handling of them and who would give better service. Let Mr. Russell stick to the Railway.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words with reference to the remarks that have already been made. I am glad to see that at least one member of the Government has the courage of his convictions and is prepared to stand up in the House and defend his district service. Reference has been made to the eliminating of the branch railways, and I want to say that unless things change a lot for the better I am prepared to go as far towards reduction as any man in this House. The whole fact of the matter is that we are living under post-war conditions. Those who read history will know that during the past century and a half similar conditions have followed upon wars in the past, and it is doing no good for us to expect now to get back to the same prosperity and easy living conditions as in

1914. We have got to face the music now. The affairs of the country are in a most critical condition, and reductions have to be made wherever possible. The Government has made some effort during this session towards reduction, but I say, Sir, they have not gone far enough. It is said that the Bay de Verde branch railway has lost \$29,000 during the past year, and of that, Sir, I am not altogether convinced. For instance, a man has to pay 45c freight for a barrel of flour from St. John's to Old Perlican. Of this, 30c is charged from St. John's to Carbonear, and the remaining 15c from Carbonear on. That is to say two-thirds of the freight is charged as far as Carbonear and the remaining one-third is charged for freight on the Bay de Verde branch. From that it must be evident that Carbonear gets credit for a lot that would never come its way but for the Bay de Verde branch. However, if this branch is going to be done away with, I want to say, here and now, that I am prepared to take what is coming. If we are to survive at all, in my opinion, drastic reductions will have to be made.

The Government itself must realise how critical things are at present, and the reason why, Sir, they do nothing towards bettering conditions is because the rank and file of the party are not prepared to make sacrifices and get down to brass tacks. And the sooner it is realised that this is absolutely necessary, the better for all concerned. We have here now three services that can be eliminated at a total saving of over \$98,000, to the country, and this elimination is not favored by the Government. It is only natural for every member to try to defend the votes for his own district, but unless we begin somewhere we will be bankrupt in five years, and placed in the hands of re-

celvers. To hear some of the honorable members talk one would think we were a country of two hundred and fifty millions instead of two hundred and fifty thousand. We can't compare at all with these great countries, and the sooner we realise that we have got to make sacrifices, the better. In 1928 the steamship subsidies amounted to \$423,299, and in 1930-31 they have increased to \$600,000, and if that carries on, in a couple of years they will amount to \$800,000. Steamer running on the side has always been a fertile field for politicians to drag money out of the government. Here we are, throwing out money right and left, getting everything in the world, and bankruptcy staring us in the face. Is this going to be our legacy to posterity? I agree with the honorable member for Green Bay when he says, "let St. John's pay for its own lights." It is no more for St. John's to pay for its own lights than for Carbonear or Bay Roberts.

Let us then try to get together and cut out everything we can do without. Let Mr. Strong try to get along with one boat in his district, and for me to try to do with busses and trucks in mine. If we don't cut our service we are bound to have trouble very shortly. Let us be sincere and try to cut everything we can. The situation is so serious now that politics ought not be considered at all. We are now facing one of the hardest years that Newfoundland ever had to face.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this very interesting discussion by the members on both sides of the House, on our railway and our ships, and to Mr. Puddester I have been paying particular attention.

Whatever the Government does is wrong. If we make a cut, we find the Opposition—and, of course, the Even-

ing Telegram—abusing the Government because we're cutting someone's salaries; making politics of it. Whatever the Government does, the paper will be full of it next week, and they are all the same. All you got to do is give them a printing order. Yes, no matter who they are you can buy them all for a nickel.

Now, gentlemen, our bonds are selling at 102, and I think it ill behoves any member of this House to criticise the Government to such an extent as to prejudice us in the raising of our loan. There's nothing crooked about it. I have just brought in the Budget and it's correct and perfectly straight. There's not a bit of cookery in it; it shows the actual position as it exists.

Speaking of our railway, well, it's too expensive altogether. Every year it costs the country a very large sum. Well, we can't help that; we were saddled with the railway and we've had to keep it going; and in this respect I quite agree with what has been said by the various gentlemen who spoke on the subject.

But we've got to cut it out. The railway must be run more cheaply. The officials of the railway seem to have no idea that they belong to the country as well as the railway. They seem to think that all they have to do is to ask for the money and it will be given to them. They seem to have no responsibility; all they seem to think is that everything they ask for will be given to them. That's got to stop.

Now, we were talking about the 25% reduction. Well, we intend to effect this cut without the Government ships suffering; and I don't want the Opposition to try and play politics with this matter. Every politician isn't a robber. Politics are a pleasure

and I say that I like being a politician. But I'm not a robber, and not every politician is a robber, and I object to the remarks of some of the members implying that this is so, and referring to me in this connection.

As I said before, the Railway officials must be made to realise that economy must be practised. The railway costs over \$250,000.00 a year. I imagine they must think the money comes from the Man in the Moon. Anyway, something has to be done; if necessary, the branch lines must be closed down. Last year the Trepassey branch road cost over \$46,000, and the Bay de Verde line cost \$29,000, and I don't know how much the Heart's Content line cost. Now we've got to quit playing politics. However, no matter what I say there'll be editorials in the papers tomorrow abusing me, stating, "Cashin is closing down the railway; what about the railway employees, and what about Ferryland?" so as to hurt me in my constituency. Yes; I'll bet that within a week there'll be something to that effect in the papers. I'll bet \$5 to 5 cents.

Well I don't care what they say. They're not worth worrying about. You can buy any of them, I don't care who they are or what side they are on.

Regarding this reduction; someone probably thinks we are trying to take it from the Railway and give it to some members of our party. We're not going to reduce the Prospero's subsidy to \$30,000 from \$40,000; neither are we going to reduce the Sagona's subsidy from \$40,000 to \$30,000. We're going to manage without th's; now you can take the vote if you like.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the discussion about

this vote for the "Basque" proves conclusively how perfectly indefensible is the position of the Government. We have heard the Finance Minister flamboyantly charging the members of the Opposition with playing politics, and that we wanted certain votes cut out for political purposes. You have not yet defended that service. It is not a matter of politics with the Opposition, and we have not a district interested in that service. If it is cut out it will not affect the Opposition one way or the other. Still we are told here that the Government has come in with cuts and we will not agree with them, and when we suggest a cut they will not agree to it; but you do propose to cut the salaries of a large number of people in the country who can ill afford to have their pay reduced. You say that is politics, and I will tell you why you say it. You know in your heart of hearts that a statement like that is popular, and the fact that it is popular does not affect you. You know, and every member of your party knows, that it is as absurd as it is unjust to cut the salaries of already small-salaried civil servants, and you will not cut the subsidies for the "Earl of Devon" and the "Basque," and the reason for it is that you are pushed from behind and you cannot help yourself. The Finance Minister also spoke about closing the branch lines of railway. To that proposition I say "quite right." And in order to make sure that we will not lose the money like we are losing at the present time, he ought to have the rails taken up so that these branches will be closed when we get in office. We are loosing too much money on branch railways, and the more curtailing of them the better, as everybody knows that motor cars and trucks are taking trade from the branch lines of railway.

I entirely disagree with the method employed by the Finance Member and the member for Twillingate in dealing with individuals in the civil service. When speaking of reducing salaries, I do not think it is fair to bring up names in the House. As far as I know Mr. Russell is an excellent railway man. Capt. Dalton claims to be one also, and as far as this country knows they are both good officials. The Finance Minister claims to be also a railroad man as well as a shipping man. Now, I would like to know who would be the choice of the Finance Minister and Mr. Brown to put in the place of Mr. Russell and Capt. Dalton, and then let us see what would happen. I think, however, that such stringent criticism of these two gentlemen is unwarranted and unfair, particularly when they cannot defend themselves.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No one attacked them

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, the Minister and the member for Twillingate said that one or the other, or both, were incompetent, and I think statements like that should be deprecated by the House. So far as the two steamships services are concerned, I think the best thing to do is to abolish them. I do not agree with the comments of the member for White Bay on this subject. It is very excellent to have a boat calling every day near our homes, but he has to bear in mind that it is a question of paying the price.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the honorable member for Placentia East so far as using the names of civil servants is concerned. I think we should refrain as much as possible from using their names here in discussion. If I had any complaint to make I would go to the head of a de-

partment and ask for a remedy. Government members think we are defending the railway. Personally I have not enough knowledge of railroad matters to talk on it. All I know is we are spending a considerable amount of money on it, and if we can save it I think it would be a splendid thing to do. I think it is time to have an investigation of our railway affairs unless you want things go on indefinitely and keep on multiplying our indebtedness on railway account until it reaches a fabulous sum. I have some little experience in managing a business and I know what it means to get down to business-like methods, and it is astounding how much money can be saved if business-like methods are employed in connection with the running of our railway and costal steamers.

The other evening when we were discussing the votes of the Controller's Department, the Finance Minister was very touchy over the criticism made from this side of the House. Now, it's an evil mind that prompts a man to unfairly criticise another man. A Government paper stated publicly a few days ago that I objected to the reduction of the salary of the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control. I did nothing of the kind. I simply disapproved of the light-hearted, jocose way in which the reduction was made, as I think it is an unfair way to deliberate when cutting any man's salary. I think it is bad enough for a man to get a salary cut, without sneering at the victim of the cut. I think we should do it in the way that we feel a sense of responsibility for our actions.

When we recall the good old days of the last Squires regime and the scandals that occurred at the Liquor Department, we can appreciate what

a good man Mr. Mifflin is. When you remember that \$200,000 in connection with the sales of liquor disappeared in one year in that Department. I think we can bless our stars that we have such a reliable and competent man as Mr. Mifflin at the head of the Department now. He has cleaned up the mess that was there, and whilst I hold no brief for Mr. Mifflin, I do say that he has done his duty fearlessly and honestly. I repeat, Sir, that if we are going to cut the salaries of any civil servants here, let us do it in a decent manner.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Why didn't the Government pay the Railway the amounts outstanding during the last three or four years?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—The amounts were disputed.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, these were legitimate claims for subsidies and could not be called deficits of the railway, but should be shown as a deficit of the Government.

While I am on my feet, there is just one thing further I would like to say in justice to myself, and that is in connection with the reduction of salaries. Whenever I move that a salary should be reduced I do so because I think that too much is being paid. I now move that the \$35,000 subsidy for the "Earl of Devon" should be deleted from the estimates.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, can that motion be withdrawn. As the Minister of Finance pointed out to you, the Government is trying to curtail the services and to reduce expenditures, and up to the present time it has not made any definite decision as to whether this boat will be running this year. There has been no contract signed, but if the honorable member for Bay de Verde puts that motion it will be de-

feated and will put the Government in the position that they will have to operate this service.

MR. EMERSON.—You mean to say that you are going to defeat this motion even though you know it is being made in the interests of the country.

MR. PUDDESTER.—If the Hon Minister will guarantee me or give me a promise that he will do his best to have the Government to cut out this service, then I will withdraw my motion.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—I will promise.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman I have spent this whole afternoon pointing this out to the members of the Opposition and apparently they have not believed me, but I want to state right here and now that I have yet to make a false statement in this House. I have spent the last hour bellowing my head and lungs off trying to convince the members opposite about these reductions, but they ignored me and have taken the word of another member of the Government when they refused to take my word.

MR. PUDDESTER.—That is not correct. We did not disbelieve you, but now that we find that you have the backing of another Minister we are prepared to accept the statements.

MR. EMERSON.—The Minister of Finance made certain statements, but did not give any assurances.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

the Committee have leave to sit again.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman it gives me great pleasure to be given the privilege of introducing this Municipal Bill into Committee. I have not had sufficient time to prepare any set remarks in connection with the Bill. The Bill before the Committee at the present time introduces several amendments to the existing Municipal Act which was passed in 1921. The original Bill presented to the Select Committee of which I was chairman, had incorporated in it sections asking for power to borrow money on the credit of the city. These powers we could not see fit—could not see our way clear, at the moment, at any rate—to extend to the Municipal Council, but the other amendments to the Act, which are incorporated in this Bill now before us, give the City Council considerably more latitude with regard to assessing proper taxes on properties throughout the City. It is a well-known fact to all—and particularly those of us who live in St. John's—that at the present time appraisement values on properties are anything but equitable. I know personally of properties that are valued for rental at 50% below their actual rental value. We know of houses that are rented to tenants in St. John's for which the owners are drawing down large rents and are paying taxes on quarter the rents they are drawing down. We do know of

houses owned by certain individuals in the city which are valued at a much lower rental than they would receive, provided these houses were put on the market for rents. I think I make my point quite clear in that respect.

Certain sections of this Municipal Bill give the Council certain powers whereby they can overcome the situation I have just outlined. In addition to that, the Loan Bill, which has already been introduced, provides for a loan of \$1,000,000 to be given or to be loaned by the Government, so to speak, to the Municipal Council, on which million the Municipal Council is to pay the Government 5% annually which the Government has to pay the bond owners; and furthermore that the Council will pay its proportion of the cost of raising that loan.

When the Council is handed over this money, it has a considerable program under way, such as the extension of water and sewerage, for which they propose to spend \$250,000; town planning and housing \$150,000; replacing Water Street pavement and extending, \$150,000; paving Duckworth and New Gower Streets, \$150,000; paving Long Bridge approaches, \$25,000; markets, parks and playgrounds, \$25,000; other capital expenditures, plant equipment, replacements, expenses, raising loan, contingencies, etc., \$100,000; that covers the full million dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not the intention of the Municipal Council when we hand over this money to them, to go right in and spend the whole million at once. My information, I can assure the Committee, is this, that the Council proposes to spend this money very economically. They are going to spend a quarter of a million or a little more, a year, while that million dollars lasts.

We are all well aware today that the water and sewerage service of this city is not what it might be, that it has not been extended to various places to which it should be, that the paving of Duckworth Street and New Gower Street is absolutely essential; the further paving of Water Street, which is in a disgraceful condition at the present time, is absolutely necessary; furthermore, that the paving of Military and LeMarchant Roads is a necessity in order that we may be able to present a city worth living in.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, apart from all this and apart from the absolute necessity of having to do this, of having to make these improvements, we must look at present day conditions. It is not the intention of the Government, in passing over this money, this million dollars, to the Council, to just do it for political purposes, because the Government is not going to have any say in the expenditure of the money. But this much we do say, that at the present time we have in the city considerable unemployment. This money, in addition to beautifying, if I might put it that way, our city, and improving civic conditions, will give employment to a considerable number of citizens. Tax-payers of the city, who are paying taxes to the city directly or indirectly, will have an opportunity of getting constant employment during the coming season. We realise, Mr. Chairman, that living conditions in the country at the present time are not so optimistic as they might be; that numbers of our people are out of work, and that no productive work is in sight at the present time; consequently, I feel, Mr. Chairman, in bringing this Bill before the Committee, that in addition to my privilege of being somewhat instrumental, and speaking on behalf of the Government, of being able to do something towards improving the

city, which is one of the main assets of the country no matter what people may say about it, in addition to that, this money will give considerable employment and no doubt will relieve a lot of future destitution as well as that which may exist in the city at the present time. As we go through this Act tomorrow, Mr. Chairman, section by section, the various amendments which have been ratified in the Bill will be explained. True there is another amendment which has been presented to us, with reference to property owners. This amendment has not been absolutely decided upon; it is an amendment for legal minds to decide upon. We, as laymen, are not in a position to say whether or not this amendment is desirable, but tomorrow we will have a definite opinion as to whether this amendment should be inserted in the Bill.

The other sections of the Bill speak for themselves. I do not propose at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, to explain in detail every amendment to the 1921 Act, because it would take considerable time, but as we proceed in Committee and as we discuss this Bill I feel sure we will, on both sides of the House, do so from an absolutely unbiased point of view, particularly those members for St. John's East and West who are possibly more interested than myself, representing as they do the citizens of St. John's. I feel that not alone will every member of the House, on both sides, because, as I cannot help repeating, whilst St. John's is our chief city and whilst it has been subject to criticism from both sides of the House, whereas it has productive powers and has to bear its share in the upkeep of the country, I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the principal town or city of any country speaks volumes for the whole of the country, and in that way, I have great pleasure in

being given an opportunity of fostering or trying to foster this Bill through the Committee stage. I don't propose to have any further remarks on the Bill at the present time. It is sufficient to say that when we go into Committee tomorrow and discuss the various sections, if there is any explanation I can give which is in my possession in regard to the Bill, I shall be only too delighted to give it for the information of the Committee. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we can rise the Committee until tomorrow.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, as members for St. John's East, my colleague and myself were on the Select Committee on the Bill, and it met with our hearty approval. As the Hon. Minister of Finance has just stated, the city is to visitors an indication of what the rest of the country is like. I am afraid that at the present time visitors to the city must often be very far from being prepossessed.

This Bill gives the Council what I might term 'straw' to enable them to make their bricks. Only a few years ago half the children who were born in St. John's were born in houses where there was no water or sewerage. If this Bill is passed it will enable the Municipal Council to a large extent to overcome that condition. It will also enable them to give employment, and if we can give our people employment and at the same time beautify the city, I think we have done something that is going to be very advantageous to us. As the honorable introducer has stated, this is the Capital city of the Island and it is not only the duty of the citizens of the city to do all they can to beautify it, but it seems to me that it is the duty of all of us—of the entire Island—to see that the seat of our parliament, the seat of our university and our principal

schools, is such that we can be proud of it, and help to beautify it. There is only one thing that we, the members for the district of St. John's East, would have been steadfast in setting our faces against, and that was an increased rate of taxation. However, it is not the intention to increase the rate of taxation, as the introducer of the Bill states. It is true, as he also states, that many of us, and all of us so far as I know, are not paying the taxation we should. The rental valuation of most properties is much below what it should be. I know that I am paying about half what I should pay, and I know of other houses in the city the owners of which are paying on a rental valuation 25% of what they should be, so that without increasing the taxation the city is going to get much larger revenue than it has been getting, and that revenue will be paid by people who are, I consider, well able to pay the tax.

There is another matter which I don't think can be avoided. The Minister's explanation to us was very clear; that is, that the city is not able to borrow money on its own credit. It is regrettable, but in view of the very good explanation given by the Hon. the Minister of Finance I think it cannot be avoided. So far as the present is concerned it is considered the city cannot do better than accept the \$1,000,000 loan raised by the Government, paying their proportion of the expense of raising that loan. There is nothing more to say, only that as members of the Select Committee my colleague and myself are in hearty support of the Bill. I trust that it will meet with the approval of the members of this House and that it may be put through and come into effect as speedily as possible.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish" 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. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 21, George V. Chapter 15 (Crown Lands Act, 1930)" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922," without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 7th, 1931.

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 had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's," without amendment.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by the Captain of the S. S. Malakoff and the First Mate and 72 male electors of Bonavista South. The petitioners ask that a lighthouse be erected at Haricut Point as they have large fleets of fishing schooners. This would give a light and thus help to navigate the port of St. Brendan's, where this point is situate. I would like to give this petition my heartiest support. I refer the petition to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to which it belongs and I might add that I will personally take the matter up with the Department later.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, we stopped yesterday at the Lewisporte-Cook's Harbor vote. All sections, with the exception of these, have been fully discussed, and I can assure the gentlemen opposite that the whole matter of subsidies has been under the consideration of the Government. We realise as well as the members of the Opposition, that the time is come when these reductions will have to be made and as I already stated we have given the matter a great deal of consideration.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if it is the intention this year to run the two extra trains across the country the same as they did last year?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS.—No.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Government will take this matter up with the Railway Commission, as I think it absolutely unnecessary to run these trains, certainly to run two of them. As a rule, there is hardly any passengers travelling by them and I think it is a great waste of money. There is just one more question before the vote is passed. In the Speech from the Throne there was a section dealing with the taking of the census, but I do not see any vote in the Estimates for this purpose.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, when the Speech from the Throne was printed it was the intention of the Government to have the census taken, but at a subsequent Executive meeting it was decided that it would not be essential to have it done this year and in view of the fact that we decided

not to take it, it has not been included in the Estimates.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances that is all right, but I do not think it fair that it should be left out of the Estimates and after the House closes to have a Minute of Council passed and have it included.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I think that all the members of the House have been supplied with copies of the Resolutions, so I will just read them through.

(Reads sections)

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Chairman of the Committee will leave the Chair so that we can attend at Government House to present the Address in Reply.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, and asked leave to sit again.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that in accordance with the intimation received, His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address in Reply presently.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House, and being returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency had received the Address of Thanks and has been pleased to reply thereto as follows:

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

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present session was opened.

(Sgd.) J. MIDDLETON,
Governor.

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 in relation to the raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for certain Public Purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, the only change made in these Resolutions is that the amount of the loan has been raised from seven to eight millions.

(Reads)

Now "G" represents the loan to the Municipal Council for the purposes of carrying out the proposed amendments to the 1921 Act. They have arranged with the Government that they will pay the expenses and interest on the loan of one million dollars solicited by them. It may be remarked that the Estimates are by reason of this incorrect by the amount paid out for expenses and the interest so due on this amount will be paid by the Council. It will be seen that the amounts balance. If there's any further information I can give on this subject I shall be only too pleased.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, I must say that it very bad to have to borrow money for non-constructive purposes. I understand one and a quarter million of what we borrow is necessary to pay

the interest on what we owe. However, we must have the money. The Government is not a business, if they were I think the Finance Minister would experience great difficulty in obtaining the loan from the bank. However, a government can usually borrow money where there are resources which are undeveloped owing to lack of capital and when they can pay the interest. Then the people lending the money are prepared to let the principal take care of itself. I hope that by the time another twelve months has passed some improvement will be noticed.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, what is the amount of the public debt now, counting this intended loan?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That brings it up to \$93,000,000.00.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, That's quite an amount. We have had to borrow a considerable sum to pay back the interest on what we owe. Of this, \$250,000.00 is to go into general account. I suggest that a certain sum be paid to the credit of the districts. Two years ago the loan was paid out on a per capita basis to certain districts, but of this the Opposition knew nothing. Now if there's going to be per capita distribution, then the Opposition are going to have their share.

I suggest that part of this loan be paid to the districts on a per capita basis, where the money is greatly needed to help the people. The fishing season is starting and every assistance that can be given should be given. What is the use of spending huge sums on the Highroads and getting no value for it. The apportioning of \$10,000.00 to each district will not go very far and some special

assistance should be given to the districts for fishing purposes.

I think it is only fair to the members of the various districts that if the money is going to be allocated it should not be spent on highroads, but given to the districts to spend on local roads in order that the people of the districts might earn sufficient to supply themselves for the fishery. The ten thousand dollars allocated year after year for the districts will not be nearly sufficient for their need, but if \$150,000 plus \$370,000 were allocated for this purpose it would facilitate matters a great deal, and I would like very much if the Minister would give an understanding to the members of the House that additional money would be granted for this purpose.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member for Bay de Verde, I can assure him that I appreciate the vital necessity of this and will take the matter up with the Government and I think that the chances are that the Government will approve.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the idea is to appropriate \$500,000, none of which will be spent on highroads, but all on local roads in the various districts. At the present time the highroads in most places are like billiard tables, but the local roads are in a frightful condition and residents find it almost impossible to get their produce and fishery supplies over the roads, and I may say I think that this is an excellent idea and I hope the Minister arranges it.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that anything could be wiser than what has been suggested by the two previous speakers, and I can assure the Chairman that what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said re-

garding the state of the roads in some of the districts is perfectly true. Whereas most of the highroads lead to nowhere, the local roads are of vital importance. In my district some of the roads are in a frightful state and unless they are attended to immediately the people living there will have to travel over them in danger of losing their lives. Another aspect of it is that it will give the men money to fit themselves out for the fishery.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, before dealing with the Resolutions, I would like to draw the Colonial Secretary's attention to my question No. 64, which remains unanswered. I asked for it on March 25th, and have been continually requesting a reply to it ever since. The answer to this question will have a great deal of influence and may be very material to the financial position of this country. It has to do with the disposal of the B. Debenutres of the International Power and Paper Co. As there are two members of the Government on the Board of Directors of the International Power and Paper Co., I cannot see why this information should be so long being prepared.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY
—MR. Chairman, the answer to this question will be tabled within a day or two.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, in considering the question of the loan I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if it is his intention to look for tenders for the loan on the alternative basis of being either tax free or not tax free.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No, that is not our intention.

MR. EMERSON.—We seem to be the only country who are not doing it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—When raising the loan in Canada last year they did not do it.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I believe that the latter way is the best even though we lose a couple of points in raising the loan because the Colony will benefit to a much greater extent in the end and the revenues will be more enhanced in a few years by the taxes collected if the loan is offered on the basis that they have to pay taxes.

I agree entirely with the idea of allocating the amounts to the various districts and while we may have to be thankful for mercies received, the present amount allocated will not be nearly adequate to meet the needs of the districts. I hope, however, that the departments will receive their instructions in this connection within a day or two, otherwise it will be too late for the purpose for which the money is needed and that is to allow the fishermen get their necessary supplies to prosecute the fishery this season.

As I have already pointed out in this House, I think it is only right and just that the Minister of Public Works should lay on the table of this House a programme for the Highroads. Millions of dollars have already been spent and more and more is being spent all the time. The situation at present is extremely grave and I think that this House should know how much money the Government contemplates spending on the Highroads and what Highroads they intend to spend it on. I agree that the Highroads officials have done excellent work in many respects, but we must remember that this country is still dependent on the fishery, and if we take a man away from the fishery to work on the highroads for two years then he ceases to be a fisherman.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I know a little about insurance on the Railway and my experience was that it would pay the Reids to lose a ship a year and not insure them against total loss, and if the ships were insured against everything such as dockage, wharfage, delays, etc., there would be a much greater deficit on the Railway. My experience is that we saved enough on insurance on the "Caribou" and other ships to cover the cost of repairs to the "Caribou."

That \$1,000,000.00 repayment loan, is that all spent?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—There is about \$80,000.00 or \$90,000.00 left.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, up to the time that the Colonial Secretary answered my question, out of that loan raised from the Bank of Montreal, \$830,000.00 was spent. I would ask the Colonial Secretary if he would give me a statement showing what has been spent since that and where have the appropriations gone. As I said, the Government pays \$250,000.00 for improvements to the fisheries and a lot of this is appropriated to a few districts. I would ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if there is anything left out of this \$250,000.00 would you be kind enough to divide this among the various districts on a per capita basis, the same as the others.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I would be only too delighted.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman I represent a fishing district and I want to get all the money I can possibly get so that my people can go on fishing and if the Government places this money in the Marine and Fisheries Department, I hope that every district gets a fair show.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable gentleman, I would say that if any amount is left over, the whole country will have the same privileges.

I can appreciate the statement of Mr. Emerson regarding the Highroads programme, but we don't need it. If we announce it, we will have to do every year, and we don't want to have this because we hope that in the course of a few years we will be able to discontinue this policy.

MR. PUDDESTER.—If you give this \$520,000 over to the Highroads Commission you will have the same thing all over again.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the previous speakers, especially with regard as to Commissioners. As Mr. Puddester said, he represents a fishing district. I have the same kind of a district. On last Saturday it looked like that the amount of marine work that would have to be done this year would not be very heavy, but today it is a different story. This morning I took an official of the Marine and Fisheries Department to my district and showed him the trouble the men had gone to to launch their dories for the salmon fishery—all the launchways had been swept away. The seas are very heavy today and when it calms down I am afraid that it will be found that there will be nothing left. There is one place, Logy Bay, where the entire launchway is swept away and I suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this be repaired. There is \$20,000.00 allocated for Marine Works in each district and as the preceding speakers said, it is our business to get the men to the fisheries. There is a frightful amount of money spent on Highroads and I think that a lot of this money should be spent on the fisheries.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, in making reference to this matter, I would like to draw the attention of the House to Section (a), (Reads.)

This was raised during the crisis of the World War and I feel that if the British Government had been properly approached and it had been explained to them that we had got so little out of the war that they might have cancelled this loan or at least given up the interest until we had at least got on our feet again. I feel that if it had been pointed out that we had got so little from the war that this burden would have been taken away and I am sure that they are in no hurry for the repayment.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member, I would say that the British Government intimated that we should create a sinking fund to take care of war reparations. I quite realize what the Hon. Member says with regard to getting so little out of the war but they have been pressing us for money, they suggested that we create a sinking fund from the German reparations fund for this loan.

MR. QUINTON—Is there further payments due us on account of reparations?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yet, quite a lot.

MR. QUINTON—I don't agree with the Hon. Member for St. John's West Extern, all parts of the Empire made a sacrifice; after all the flag stands for something; I don't see why the taxpayers in the Old Country should be asked to pay our bills.

MR. BENNETT—If we did not want to keep our identity in the days of the war the British taxpayers would have to pay our bills amounting to \$33,000,000.00 which the war cost us.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act for the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Dominion 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 with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Dominion 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 with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Dominion 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 with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Dominion 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. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister is he aware that the rules have been suspended in the Legislative Council? This has evidently been done at the instigation of the Government. I would like to know if the Government proposes suspending the rules of this House also, with all this important legislation before us. Has the Hon. gentleman any intention of doing this?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, there is no immediate intention. The Hon. gentlemen opposite have facilitated the business of the House so much during this session that there is no necessity for such a course.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to give effect to a Protocol on Arbitration Clauses signed on behalf of His Majesty at a meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations held on the twenty-fourth day of September, 1923, and to a Convention on the Execution of Arbitral Awards signed on behalf of His Majesty at Geneva on the twenty-sixth day of September, 1927."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in 1923 at the Council of the League of Nations certain clauses with reference to arbitrations were adopted. These clauses are set forth in schedule "A" of this Bill, and the object of this Bill is to put them into effect in Newfoundland. At present they are in force all over the British Empire or at least in all the self-governing Dominions. It was meant

to introduce them in 1928 and 1929, but they were passed over, as also in 1930. It was thought they should not be passed over again this year, and so, when I was in London I conferred with certain eminent Law Officers of the Crown, and I think it quite safe to pass the Bill without amendment as it is drafted by them.

MR. WINTER—I would ask the Prime Minister if this was considered at the Conference in 1929 with regards to Dominion legislation?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No, this was sponsored in 1923 at the League of Nations held on the 24th of September, 1923, and signed in September, 1927, I think it was.

MR. WINTER—Why is it only coming to us now?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Because it was lying at the Department of Justice and every Department of Justice did not know enough about it to bring it up, I frankly admit that I did not know sufficient about it to bring it up, I had to call in some outside assistance.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I glanced through this Bill and we do not take any responsibility for the verbage, that is a matter for the Department of Justice and it is their responsibility. I think that it is unobjectionable to bring us into line with the other parts of the Empire. There is one point I would like to make and that is in the case of arbitration between a Frenchman and a Newfoundland in France, it would be necessary for him if he was successful to come to this country and sue again and so all the value would be lost. There is a little hardship of Members of this House in having Bills of a highly technical character coming before the House so late in

a busy session and consequently it is impossible to see whether this exact legislation meets with the entire approval of the House. As regards the principle of the Bill, the only question in my mind is that if there is an arbitration in Newfoundland between a Newfoundland and a Frenchman, and the Newfoundland was successful and he went to France, would he be accorded the same treatment that we would give a Frenchman if he were to come here. The reference in the schedule to the convention at Geneva does not set forth the countries who are signatories, but I suppose that can be ascertained. There is another question, does this affect relations between ourselves and the countries of the Dominion? How does this apply as between Canada and ourselves and Canada and France for instance?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, this is international as distinctive from inter-Imperial. This was done by the League of Nations of 1927 and it was left to Great Britain to work out her own programme as regards the Empire. This is of an international character as between a Newfoundland and a Frenchman or a Newfoundland and a German.

The 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to

give effect to a Protocol on Arbitration Clauses signed on behalf of His Majesty at a meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations held on the twenty-fourth day of September, 1923, and to a Convention on the Execution of Arbitral Awards signed on behalf of His Majesty at Geneva on the twenty-sixth day of September, 1927" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, yesterday, in my brief summary of this Bill, I pointed out that it was quite possible that some amendments might be inserted. I have here an amendment drafted by the Solicitor for the City Council and it is suggested that this amendment be called Section 26. (Reads).

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, I think that the phrase "Building Lease" ought to be cut out.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this section deals with an area that extends for one mile outside the City limits. This area will be under the control of the Town Planning Commission. Personally I do not think it fair that the tax in these parts should be the same as the tax paid in the City limits.

When you consider that the people living in this area are living on High-roads the upkeep of which is paid for by the Government I do not think it is fair that the Municipal Council should collect a tax.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the House to Section 23 (reads section 23.) I understand that meters have been installed in city water premises and I suppose have been checked over from time to time, but up to the present we have received no reports as to the water used. According to this the Act relegates meters to water premises only. Do I understand that these are the only premises on which the meters are going to be installed?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, we will add Section 23 to the other sections which will be dealt with to-morrow so that we now have Sections 6, 20, 21 and 23 to deal with.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce

a Bill "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, 1931, and the 30th day of June, 1932, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 8th, 1931.

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 had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Cap. 22, entitled 'An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter 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 had passed the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to a Contract for Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay" without amendment.

MR. STRONG—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions from people of my District both of which are in connection with the Department of Posts and Telegraphs. The first is from a place called Wild Cove praying that they might get Telephone

Communication installed there, this is a distance of about five miles from Seal Cove and there are about fifty fishermen and there families residing there. In the fall of the year they find it very difficult to make connection with the Coastal Boats and have to go the distance of five miles in an open motor boat to find out the movements of the Coastal Boat.

MR. STRONG—Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from the people of S. W. Arm of Harbour Deep requesting that a new Postal Telegraph Office be erected there to take the place of the building which is now being rented and used for the purpose of a Postal Telegraph Office. I beg to have both petitions referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Lance Cove Road asking that the sum of \$1,000.00 be allocated for the purpose of completing a Road from Whalen's Hill to a pole just West of the Pier. If the Department of Public Works can arrange to have this road built it will be a great convenience to not only the people who reside in that District but to all those who are travelling back and forth. This particular road runs through the Agricultural and Farming Districts and would help the people in the spring of the year to start their farming and in the fall to truck away their produce. I suggest that the work might be done this summer when the mines are only working at half time when it will be a great source of relief.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Rt. 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 with respect to the Export from Labrador and adjacent Islands of Marine Shells.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows.

Supplementary Supply.....\$ 554,424.93

Department of Posts and

Telegraphs 1,447,089.90

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, 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. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, a question was raised yesterday by Mr. Greene as to whether or not the purpose of the Section was to take over this area one mile outside the City and include it in the City area, thereby making it subject to City Municipal taxation. There was some doubt as to the wording of the Section, and I think it is overcome by the Section, or addition, read just now. The purpose of this amendment is to make it absolutely clear that whilst they do operate one mile outside for town planning, they do not operate outside the city area for the purpose of collecting taxes.

The amendment, however, does not apply to the point raised by Mr. Downey, who refers to agricultural activities carried on by farmers living in that area in the conduct of their business. On many of these farms, residences of a substantial character have been and are being built. His fear is that activities of the Council, or the Town Planning Commission, would be to put a restriction on the nature, class or type of building to be constructed within that one mile area, and thereby put the farmers out of business, as they are not in a position to comply with such Municipal regulations. The amendment just read is the result of a question raised yesterday by Mr. Greene, that the power to extend one mile outside does not include the power to collect taxes one mile outside.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think that is cared for by having this additional amendment added to the section, sub-section (c),
 (Reads)

That means that the extension of the area for town planning purposes does not extend the taxing powers of the City to that area one mile outside the present limits.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman in the area passed over to the Council's jurisdiction by this Section 6, there are a large number of farmers, living between the present City boundaries and a mile therefrom. If you give this area over to the Council, and give the Council authority to control the class or character of buildings to be erected therein, they might make it impossible for those farmers to keep their industries, the very source of their livelihood. The Council are very strict within the City Limits in demanding that houses of a certain

type shall be built in certain Sections. If they were to put similar restrictions on these farmers as to the class or type of buildings they erect, they might make their business absolutely impossible. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be reassured on that point.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, when we read Section 6 yesterday, I think the Hon. Member for Bell Island brought up something in connection with the Section, which gives the Council power to extend one mile outside the present City limits. It gives the Council power to extend itself in the future one mile outside the present limits. That doesn't mean, if this Bill is passed, that they will go out to-morrow and indiscriminately move out; they have their hands full now with the City as it is at the present time, they don't want to take in any additional territory at the present time, they will not take any immediate action in this connection.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister explaining my few remarks yesterday is quite right. I pointed out, I think and I believe the Committee will agree with me, that it looked from the wording of this Section 6, sub-section (c), that upon the report of the Town Planning Commission, or part of their report, the Council could certify the area which is pointed out here as one mile outside as being within the scope and powers of the Act. There might, in that event, be a doubt that taxation could be assessed, and it struck me as rather unfair, Sir, that taxation should be assessed without and adequate returns being given by the City. Take the area outside the City, immediately outside the City; Waterford Bridge Road, Topsail Road, on the one end; Portugal Cove Road, Quidi Vidi Road and Torbay Road on

the other. You will find that in most of the houses on these roads, they have their own septic tanks, sewerage system, their own water supply; and the roads passing their residences are highroads.

I don't see why they should be taxed by the City when they can get no adequate returns. That is the reason why I suggested the amendment which the Hon. Minister of Finance has read for me. I think the residents of this area should be safe-guarded until such time they should not be taxed. As any of the gentlemen of the House might see, in sub-section (c) as printed there is a possibility that upon the area being certified by the Municipal Council as within the City, the area might be taxed. And I think it grossly unfair to tax them, when they have their own water and sewerage system and their own highroads.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I don't for myself see that there is very much in the argument of the Hon. Member for Bell Island. I was not in the House when he spoke yesterday on the matter. Right in the heart of the town, for many years, the same complaint exists that he is now making in connection with those who are in the area.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, It must be recognized that the Council has to get money somewhere to improve the city. They said they were not going to increase taxation. Of course, it must be admitted that their rates are very low and I do not see how they can get along on the revenue they are getting up to now. The effect of this section of the Bill is that my Company say have to pay taxes on the offices occupied by certain professional gentlemen who also got to pay taxes on them, so that the property is taxed twice. Whilst I sympathize with the Council in their

efforts to try and increase their revenue, I think it is a hardship on a man who occupies a residence in another part of the city and pays a tax there and then has to pay an additional tax for occupying his office. On the other hand it must be apparent that the people of St. John's are not paying taxes at all commensurate with what the people in other cities are paying. Therefore, we cannot expect to get city improvements if the City Council have not the wherewithal to make them and I, for one, am prepared to give them the straw with which to make the bricks.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, I wish to register my disapproval of the Motion put by the Hon. Member for Trinity South for the deletion of Section (9) from this Bill. Anybody who was interested with the deliberations of the Select Committee and anybody who is familiar with Municipal affairs must certainly know that the City Council have not collected anything like what they should have collected in the past under this Section.

I think it would be advisable if the Hon. Member for Trinity South reconsidered his Motion and let this matter stand over for further consideration so that the section can be so worded whereby the Council can collect in the future what they should have collected in the past. It is not the intention of the Council to increase the taxes on the poor man; but, on the contrary, they are desirous of putting the burden of taxation on the big stock holder.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks made by my colleagues, the Hon. Members for Bay de Verde and St. John's East, and I have considerable sympathy with what has been said by the Hon. Member for Trinity South. There can be no question but that the City Council has not

for a number of years obtained the revenue it should have obtained. That, unfortunately, has been the experience of the Government as well as the Council.

The trouble is that the manner in which revenue is got is attacked from the wrong angle and that is the basis upon which taxation is based. Why the appraisement of property in St. John's has been a joke for half a century and no property has been appraised at its proper value, with the result that the revenue based upon the rental value is ridiculously low. Offices that if the owners were going to rent them at \$500 or \$600 a year, are appraised at \$200 or \$300 a year and the tax is fixed upon what the appraisement Court has fixed.

The rate of taxation is high enough; but the rate of appraisement is far too low. That is why the Council is struggling as it is to-day and bringing in machinery to try and get a couple of thousand dollars additional by way of taxation, whereas if the appraisement of property had been carried out upon proper basis there would be no necessity for coming in here with some other method of getting revenue because of an obvious error on the part of their appointees in connection with appraisements.

Another reason is because in the past we have provided an escape for the inefficiency and laxity of Council officials and City Councillors, and that too has been responsible for loss of revenue. It has happened in the past that men have been sued by the Council for debt. Friends of theirs went to Councillors and interceded for them to have the enforcement of the collections held over for a few months.

The Councillors acceded to the requests and made the necessary ar-

rangements with the Council officials. And so cases like that went on, the taxes were never collected, even when overdue, and thousands of dollars were owed the Council. If we knew similar circumstances comparatively applied to the Finance Minister today when dealing with an expenditure of eleven millions of dollars, we would not get out of this House for a month; but apparently, the Council can have it and nobody says a word. The fact of the matter is that past Councils have not done their duty and have allowed their officials and nominees to be equally lax, and there would be no need for considering this section of the Bill to day if property was appraised on a reasonable basis. There would, in consequence, be ample income for the city and no debt. I understand there is no statute of limitations in regard to Council debts and I think it is time there should be.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think this section was put in to enable the Council to wipe off old accounts on its books. By sections 21 every Commercial Traveller is taxed at \$25.00.

MR. GODDEN—Will any traveller whose firm is represented in this country be so taxed?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No, this only applies to travellers representing firms not having an agency in this country. I think the next section is No. 23, I believe Mr. Bennett has some objection to raise:

MR. BENNETT—No, that has been satisfactorily explained.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman,
(Reads.)

This means that if my taxes are not paid and I sell or mortgage my house the debt I owe the Council is a first

charge on the property, however, a certificate may be obtained from the City Clerk releasing the purchaser but then I am still liable.

Now I agree with this, we have no Statute of Limitations for Municipal debts and I think this is the reason why there are such a large number of debts owed the Council for this state of affairs tends to a laxity in the collecting of debts. I move that the third line of 265 (a) be changed so as to read "not exceeding 6 years due."

I don't see why the law relating to the Council debts should be any different from the law in this respect as it exists between individuals. Why if the debts are allowed to continue so long trouble is bound to result. Look at the scandal about the Government Customs bonds.

I think this amendment I suggested should prove beneficial; if the debts on property are allowed to run there's going to be a lot of trouble.

(Reads.)

The solicitor for the City Council has just brought my attention to the matter of assessments. These it appears are often paid by installments. I think the fairest way these might be handled would be to make the six years limitation run only after the payment of the last installment due on the assessment.

There are members of the profession who are experts and who should have been consulted. I understand this does not come from the Council. I neither agree or disagree with it and I think that the Hon. Minister is quite right in suggesting that it be withdrawn.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, there is an additional section which will now be section 31, section 9 has been wiped

out and consequently all the sections will have to be renumbered and this section will be 31. No. 9 is gone and 10 becomes 11 and 11 becomes 12 and so on;

(Reads section 31.)

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I think that very few of us will consent to this section. It seems to me, to say the least, unfair. That section did not come before the Select Committee, was not considered by the Select Committee. Why should the Municipal Council, any more than any other ordinary individual or corporation, be deprived of the right to avail of the Courts to sustain or justify a claim. I am opposed to the amendment and I think that every member of the House should be against it.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, I desire to go on record as being strongly opposed to this amendment, as a citizen of St. John's, I am inclined to use a little stronger language than our Leader has just used. He thinks it is unjust; I think that it is absolutely un-British. I think the right word to use is unprecedented; and say that we, as Britishers who are living under the British flag, should not be debarred from taking an action or bringing a claim before the Court by the action of the Legislature. I think the position is an outrageous one, Sir, and one that no man who wishes to see fair play will give his vote for.

It must be admitted, Sir, after all, that the City in forcing this claim had good reason to believe that money due them for a number of years, covering a long period of years, had never been received by them. The citizens of St. John's East and West and the Council, to my mind, have been fair. They have reached a stage when they need money to carry out a definite program of improvements for the City of St.

John's. They approached the Government and asked for what was only their right, they asked for the right to run their own affairs; asked for the same privilege that any town in Nova Scotia, the smallest municipality in Canada, enjoys to-day, but they could not get it.

They asked the Government to give them permission to raise some three millions of dollars, that could not be granted; they owe a certain sum of money. Their debt to the Government is, I think somewhere about one and three quarter millions. Altogether, their debt, including the \$450,000.00 due the Bank, is a little over \$2,000,000.00. They say, we can't raise this money, but give us permission to raise one and a quarter million dollars and we will drop our claim. The Government says "no." The Government says no, we will give you a million dollars and we will not allow you to have a claim and we are to be put in a position to-day Mr. Chairman, that we are not allowed to go in and ask the Court to decide whether or not we are entitled to it. Surely, we are living under the British Flag, and surely we have ordinary citizen's rights. You might just as well say that I was voted a salary here last year for some particular position, and for some reason or another, the money voted for me did not come to me, and the year afterwards I go to law for it and you come here and pass some measure of legislation that deprive me of my rights—deprives me of looking for my rights.

I am not a lawyer, but this to my mind is what it amounts to, I can't see any difference in the position. I think, Sir, that we citizens of St. John's have been harshly dealt with and I would be falling far short of my duty if I did not strongly protest, as one of the citizens representatives

against any such action by this Government.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, the position is this, some minutes ago, whilst in my place here, I was informed that Mr. Conroy wanted to see me. That message was brought to me here. Going out I asked Mr. Conroy to come out with me. When I got to the Speaker's room, he took advantage of the fact that I was out of the House to serve upon me, as Minister of Justice, the following papers, acting as Solicitor for the St. John's Municipal Council.

(Reads Notice served by Mr. Conroy.)

This is addressed to me as Minister of Justice and as Prime Minister. As Minister of Justice, I wish to take this opportunity to say that the Government does not admit any liability to the Council, has not entered into negotiations with the Council for obtaining settlement, and has no intention whatever to do so, as far as the Department of Justice is concerned. The Department of Justice takes the position that the Government owes not one cent to the Municipality, and does not propose to compromise its claim, or make any suggestion of compromise or modification, but is prepared to fight the Municipality in any proceedings they choose to take against it.

MR. BYRNE—May I interrupt you for a moment, Sir?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Just a minute. I may point out to this House that this is done to-day after we have sent up to the Legislative Council the Loan Bill of yesterday, in which we undertook in the terms of the Bill itself to raise a loan of one million dollars for the Council, under certain conditions. This is a trick, and I speak on behalf of thirty members of the House who are not

prepared to take nonsense from the City of St. John's. I look upon it as a trick, to be served with these documents during my absence from the House.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—How does that effect the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—I have not had time to consider it. I telephoned for the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice. I now move that this Committee rise and report progress and beg leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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 a reduction in the Public Expenditure for the fiscal year 1931-32.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that at the time I introduced the Estimates I also introduced certain resolutions dealing with a 10% cut in these Estimates, together with a 25% cut on Steamship Subsidies. These reductions are intended to secure \$400,000 saving in the expenditure. Out of the total revenue

of the Colony, there is a permanent charge of about \$7,000,000 per annum which the country is committed to pay before anything else can be paid, and in my opinion these reductions are absolutely necessary. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen opposite say how it would be possible to bring about these reductions in any other way than by cutting the civil servants salaries I would be glad to hear it.

The opposition have proposed certain reductions but they have been almost too trivial to be considered. They have proposed a reduction in the sessional pay and in the salary of the Solicitor General. In all these reductions as proposed by them have not amounted to \$20,000. They have also proposed a sliding scale, but in my opinion the cut should be a general one, and all should be prepared to bear an equal burden.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I agree that we have to face the inevitable. A cut to come sooner or later, but we ought cut our coat according to our cloth. It is unfortunately true that a great deal of expenditure is irreducible, we can't fall down on the interest to our bond holders. But, I think, Sir, the cut has not gone deep enough.

If we wanted to show our sincerity we should have begun with ourselves. There is nothing greater than the force of example, and I believe that the members of this House could stand a cut a great deal better than many of the civil servants.

I say the reductions should be on the basis of a sliding scale. A civil servant living on \$600 or \$700 a year is already hardly beyond the starvation line, but when we get to the \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year class, we find that they can provide themselves with a great deal of the luxuries of life.

We have given the matter considerable thought and I have here a proposed scale which I shall read for the benefit of the Minister.

(Reads.)

I do not think that teachers salaries ought to be reduced at all. We hear more about teachers than we do about any other branch of the public service, and I am sure there is wide felt sympathy for them. They have a position to keep in the community as they are usually the leaders of thought in the places where they live. In view of the miserable salaries they are already receiving I certainly think they ought not to be penalised.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I take it that ability to perform ones duty is not taken into consideration according to the amendment proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I do not think it is fair to penalize long service men who should be paid in accordance with their ability and experience. There is only one fair method and that is a general cut of ten per cent. To-day you can cut fifty per cent. off the \$600 a year man and even then you can't keep people out from looking for their jobs. People who were getting \$1,000 last year should be able to live on ten per cent. less this year as the cost of living is lower.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, would the Hon. Minister tell me how a man living in a rented house in St. John's with a family can pay an exorbitant price for coal, educate his children, pay for the common necessities of life and generally support his family on \$50 per month.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I claim that if a man could live on \$500 last year he can live on \$450 this year because the

cost of living has gone down ten per cent. I do not know whether your grocery stores in St. John's are robbing the people or not; but it is said that wholesalers have cut their prices but retailers have not.

MR. BYRNE—But groceries are only part of the story. What about clothing, increased rates of rents and other things?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I agree that it is difficult for a family man living in St. John's to-day to get along on \$50 a month; but you must remember that the price of fish has declined from \$9 to \$4.50 and would you kindly tell me how the fisherman is bringing up his family on an average yearly earning of \$350? It is through the avenue of the fisheries that the bulk of the revenue is collected. We talk here about other industries. They do not produce large revenues for this country because the major portion of their earning is sent out of the country, and one million quintals of codfish is worth more to this country than ten Ganders. The only time you can make an industry like the Gander go well is when it is under construction. After that you merely get the labour on it. The same conditions apply to Bell Island.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, I maintain that that argument does not hold water because there is a marked difference between the man living in an outport on \$50 a month and a man residing in the city at \$50 a month. A man can live in an outport in comparative luxury on \$50 a month because he has no taxes, no rent, no vegetables and other household necessities to pay for that the city man is called upon to pay.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, we

are not legislating for St. John's, but for the country as a whole you must remember, and I am still of the opinion that a family man in St. John's can live on \$600 or \$500 a year just as well as the outport man can live on \$350 a year.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would like to see politics left out of this question. I think it is only fair to put a heavier burden on the men who can best afford to stand against this reduction in salaries. Whenever a wage cut happens in any industry a sliding scale is invariably used, and if you are going to collect \$150,000 from civil servants take it from the higher paid ones and let the low paid man free. There is no use in the Minister losing his temper over this thing and indulging in heated tirades of irrelevant matter; but rather to accept the amendment in the spirit in which it is made. I think that a little more might fairly be taken off the salary of the better placed man.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the proposal of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, may I say that it seems to me rather unfair. You take nothing off the salary of the \$600.00 man yet from the man getting \$625.00 you take a ten per cent. cut.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—No that is no so; it is not intended to take a 10% cut from the \$600.00 man.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in connection with this matter, there is no one more concerned about this than myself or the members of the Opposition.

Where the trouble exists in my opinion is in the extravagance of past Governments, take the civil service as an example. This institution is over staffed, men are paid for services

they are not doing year after year, Government after Government add to their numbers. The practice itself is the cause of the trouble but what I want to get at is whether the amendment of a sliding scale as suggested by Mr. Alderdice wouldn't be fairer. For example you cannot compare the outport civil servant or the city servant and in this respect a 10% cut of their salaries providing they have the same salary would not be fair. I have here some figures on the civil servant getting a salary of \$70.35 and I want to assure the Finance Minister that I am not trying to stage a politic show.

(Reads.)

Now this leaves him only \$12.00 left for clothes for himself and his three children and for amusements and other necessaries. I frankly do not see that this reduction all round of 10% is not as good as the sliding scale suggested by the Opposition.

I know that every mail brings applications from the outports for jobs in the civil service and of course I realize how difficult it is for any member of the Government to keep a stiff upper lip when the Treasury is concerned. I have hear a report from the Department of Education which I would like to read for the House.

(Reads.)

This I would beg to remind the House is not the smallest salary received by the teachers, it is the average salary. I for one am very much against cutting the teachers salaries and I am not playing party politics when I say this, I know that education is passing through hard times. I believe that there are no less than nine members of the House who were once teachers. I am sure they will endorse this. Education has steadily grown and improved in standard since the Government has been able to help

it with a grant, and I am pleased to note this Government has made special grants this year for educational purposes.

I trust the Government will consider this phase of the situation when considering the sliding scale as suggested by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I think that some acrimony has crept into this discussion. I may say that it is not our intention to critize the proposed reduction of the civil servants salaries by the Government. We realize that this course is a necessary one. We are simply trying to do our duty and see the best way in which this reduction can be most equitably effected. It has become necessary for the Government to bring in these measures for the reduction of the civil servants wages and I only hope that the Minister of Finance budget next year will show the benefit of this saving.

The question is what way is the most equitable for basing this reduction on. The trouble is that it's impossible to make this reduction fair in all respects owing to circumstances over which we have no control. Now the Leader of the Opposition has suggested a method of reduction, of course it isn't a matter of voting because owing to circumstances over which we have no control you can always outvote us. It is the method of imposition of this reduction that we are talking about, of course it's really impossible to effect a reduction which will be absolutely equitable, because some of the people are living in different circumstances, for example some men have larger families and some living in the outports have less expenses than those residing in the city.

I really must object to the noise going on in the House, often we have requested the presence of certain Ministers and when they are present they make so much noise we can't hear ourselves speak.

Regarding this reduction I think the sliding scale advocated by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is the fairest. I feel that the whole House will agree with me when I say that the man with a salary of \$3000.00 will not feel his cut of \$300.00 to the same extent as the man earning only a thousand dollars a year or for that matter the fifteen hundred dollar man who loses \$150.00. Salaries lower than \$1000.00 or \$1500.00 should not be affected. The loss of fifty, one hundred or one hundred and fifty dollars on salaries up to say \$1500.00 a year is much more serious and means much greater hardship to those affected than the 10% reduction on people whose salaries range between \$3000.00 and \$5000.00 per year. This in my opinion is where the Government scheme fails. I am not saying this for political purposes but trying to give the most workable scheme for a suffering people.

We are not trying to find fault with the Government for trying to economize as we realize just as well as they do that conditions are serious. If conditions were not so bad there would be no reduction in the civil servants salaries, but what we do find fault with is that there has been no reduction in other branches of the Government. We feel that the Government is deserving of all the criticism they are getting. The reduction was done in a most lax manner. In fact by a sweep of the bayonet, the salaries of the civil servants were reduced by 10% instead of being reduced on a sliding scale that would have been fairer to everybody and have

reduced the expenditure of the Government even more so than the present scheme will reduce it.

We are not going to deal with the causes that made this reduction necessary our only question is the best scale in which it can be done so as to inflict the least hardship on the people.

The introduction of the sliding scale by the Leader of the Opposition as I said before is not done for political purposes. If the scale proposed by him is wrong it can be examined by the Minister of Finance who can show where it is wrong and in what way it can be improved upon.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I have very few words to add to those already expressed by my colleagues. Most of my comments that I have to make on this subject I made on April 24th when the Resolutions were introduced.

I realize that the Government is in a very hard position financially and something must be done to offset this position. I myself am in favour of the sliding scale introduced by the Leader of the Opposition for one thing only and that is that I think the Minister of Finance will be able to cut more from his Estimates by the sliding scale than he will on the straight cut of 10%.

The two thousand dollar a year man and up will bear a greater burden under the sliding scheme than at present under the 10% reduction and vice versa so far as the man who is only getting a salary of \$1000.00 or \$1500.00 a year and the Minister will have reduced his Estimates to an even greater extent than at present.

I quite agree that something must be done, as for the last twenty years Governments have been living at the

rate that has brought us to the disastrous position we are in to-day, and it is high time that the pruning knife has been put into the civil service and everybody must be willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the country. I agree with the Minister in what he says regarding the fishermen who have to live on \$250.00 a year and I know lots of these men who ship in the spring of the year for \$180.00 or \$200.00 which is a very small amount on which to keep a family of 10 or 12. The civil servants in St. John's who live on a \$1000.00 a year and down find it very difficult. As we well know living expenses in St. John's are extremely high and a man on this salary in St. John's might be able to get along as well as a man in an outport who receives \$200.00 a year. Cost of Governments has gone up considerably since the war and it is impossible to get anybody to go on a commission for less than \$1000.00. This will have to cease. Then there are the tremendous salaries that have been paid to certain members of the Government. The Solicitor General received during the past 18 months the sum of \$15,000, and that with the huge sum that was paid to Dr. Campbell and other members of the Government would feed hundreds of fishermen for a year. If these and other fees which had been paid lawyers and others in connection with the Labrador boundary some ten years ago had been cut out the country would not be in the position that it is to-day. Now the Government is in the position that though they know that they should cut these salaries they cannot do so.

I agree that the Estimates must be cut down, but I believe the sliding scale would be by far the better measures. Teachers salaries which under the present 10% reduction will be reduced will not be affected by that scale. The teachers cannot afford

to have their salaries cut. There are in this House at present nine members who at one time were teachers and they know that after paying board the teachers have nothing left from their miserable pittance when their year is finished. They go home in summer with nothing for their parents and believe me it is a very heavy sacrifice for these parents to have to send their children to Normal School in order that they might equip themselves as school teachers.

The average amount paid a teacher is \$640.00 and I think that to reduce this would be a crime. During the last few days we have been discussing the subsidies regarding the steamers and my opinion is that if the three steamers were cut out as suggested and as we believe you will cut them out you could take that amount and not cut the teachers salaries at all. When we get to that vote I am going to move that they be eliminated and I think that the sliding scale will place you in the position that this can be done and show the world and Newfoundland that we do not intend to cut the teachers salaries.

Nine-tenths of the amount allocated to the Board is paid to the teachers in salaries with the result that they have practically nothing to pay for incidentals.

Let us go half way, leave the Boards alone and cut the augmentation. The augmentation goes direct to the teachers, the grants go to the Boards. These Boards find it very difficult to get along but they will do their best, they will try to pay the teachers the same salary as they have been getting before but it is putting them in a very hard position. If the Government is going to be courageous and cut down and not have any frills, let them do so but not have the Governor in Council put it back next year, I do not

think that we should relegate our powers to the Governor in Council. I am strongly against delegating our powers to the Governor in Council because I think that this House should have the last word as far as spending public monies is concerned.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the House on this matter, I do not intend to deal with the resolution, the only thing I have to say is that the cut is necessary and the Government has seen fit to bring it in. There is only one issue as I see it with regard to this matter, and that is whether this should be on a general or sliding scale. Now, the scale as suggested by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is imminently fair. The lower the salary, the lower the cut, that applies in other systems of taxation, as death duties, etc., and if it is fair there it is fair when you cut salaries of the Civil Servants. It is unfortunate that the Civil Servants should be the victims, but we cannot help that, it is the only way that we can reduce the cost of running the country. The Finance Minister said that he would be glad to have and suggestions for economizing, we made suggestions in regard to certain votes and we were turned down and now the question is what should the scale be for the proposed cut to the Civil Servants?

I think that the Government should consider the suggestion coming from this side of the House, they may not have considered it, but it is a fair system and certainly a great deal fairer than a general cut of 10%. A man getting \$5,000.00 a year can better afford a \$500.00 cut than a man earning \$500.00 can afford a \$50.00 cut. I think that is obvious to every member of this House and I hope that the Government will accept this suggestion in the spirit in which it is offered as being the only fair way and

it is along the lines adopted in systems of taxation, not a general cut but a cut on a sliding scale.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, there is only one conclusion I come to about these resolutions and that is, that the cut is due and there is only one thing I would like to shadow forth and that is that this cut would be received by the Civil Servants with more resignation if the members of the Government showed the same desire to economize themselves. During this session there came from this side of the House various suggestions for the reduction of expenditure and even the House divided on several occasions. It was said that we were insincere in our criticisms. We advocated the abolition of boards and the reduction of members salaries and even asked where these Boards and Commissions were necessary without receiving any satisfactory reply.

That is the only comment that I have to make—that this cut would be received with more resignation by the Civil Servants if the members of the Government had taken a cut themselves and led the way.

MR. TOBIN—Mr. Chairman, in regard to these resolutions, I realize that times are bad and that the cut has to take place but we should see that those who can afford it take the greater part of the burden. As the Finance Minister said lots of the fishermen in the country earn only \$300.00 a year and it is very difficult for them to make both ends meet, but they have not the same taxes to pay as the people here in St. John's but they have other things to meet and \$300.00 is very little to support a family of eight or nine. There are cases where men in some Departments of the Government are receiving less than \$50.00 a month, I know of one case in particular and men like this will feel this

proposed 10% cut—a great deal more than the man who is receiving \$3,000.00 a year. I am very much in sympathy with the amendment moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this suggested amendment, I would like to point out that if we care to be consistent in one way we must be consistent in another. We were told the other day that we should run the country along the lines of Ottawa, I would like to read an item here about a cut in Ottawa:

(Reads.)

I would like to point out that under your amendment anybody getting under \$600.00 is exempt, there are very few Civil Servants getting less than \$600.00 a year, I can't see very many.

With regard to Mr. Puddester's point about education, I like education, enough to get along on, but twenty years we balanced our budget and we spent \$250,000.00 on education and to-day we are spending over a million dollars on education and if you ask me the people are over educated.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—In the wrong direction.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes, I believe you are right. In 1914, we spent \$250,000.00 a year on education and to-day we are spending over a million dollars and I might say that we have received more applications for free entries from educationalists than from anybody else, they are trying to defraud the country more than anybody else.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has any answer to my question, it was a verbal one, with regard to the teachers at the Memorial College. It is a curious fact that Professor Hogg

accepted a position in the United States. I would like to point out that these gentlemen are not on the pensions fund. I don't think that it is fair that they should have their salaries cut, I would like to assure the Prime Minister that I have no personal interest in the matter.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen are under contract and I do not think that their salaries can be cut. As regards the matter of Mr. Hogg leaving the country I have had no knowledge. It is a matter of anxiety to the Board of Education that we cannot get men of Mr. Hogg's class in Newfoundland because of the shorter hours and better pay that they can get from wealthy schools in the United States and other countries. We had a young man who gave promise of becoming an outstanding educationalist but he gave up his position on account of the shorter hours and smaller classes offered him in the U.S.A. These gentlemen come here and soon go to the U.S.A. where they have abundant opportunities for personal culture and bigger salaries. They are in the same position as a barrister, say, in London, receives a much bigger fee than a barrister in a small town would receive for a similar matter.

MR. PUDDESTER—How many classes of the railway employees are exempt from this, I know the locomotive engineers and dock workers are and also other workers by the day or hour. But how do you propose to deal with the conductor and brakemen.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—These latter men are strongly organized under what is known as the Brotherhood of Railway men and they are under what might be termed a contract with the Railway, that is they have an under-

standing as to what rates they shall receive.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, as I understand it the only people excluded from the ten per cent. reduction outside the dock hands who are paid by the hour or the day are the locomotive engineers and firemen, and they, I understand, are paid by the mile. For example, if they run a hundred miles a day they are paid so much per mile. The conductors and brakemen are paid by the month. Are they going to receive the ten per cent. reduction, or are they excluded?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, they are excluded. They have an agreement with an organization somewhat similar to the Brotherhood of Railwaymen, and for that reason we do not intend to cut either the conductors or the brakemen. I would like to say here that the engineers and firemen who are paid by the mile have very hard jobs, and owing to the limited amount of freight being offered they get very few runs and in consequence earn very little money.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I was always under the impression that conductors and engineers earn very large money, but I have recently learned that it was only a false impression, and I have heard from firemen on the trains that during this winter they at times only earned from five to thirteen dollars per month and things were looking so bad for them that they almost had to look for dole.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, according to what the Minister of Finance and Customs said this afternoon the lower the wage a man was getting the better he would be off under the ten per cent. reduction, as he would receive a smaller cut.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, who was responsible for the firemen and engineers earning so little? Was it on account of weather conditions or because there were less trains run.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, the Railway Commission had to cut the number of runs, particularly with regard to freight trains owing to the lack of business offering, and as everybody is aware the earning power of those who are paid by the mile depends almost entirely upon the number of freight trains run.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to place myself on record in connection with the rate of pay for work done on the Highroads, and I trust that those who have charge of the work this year will see to it that there is not as much difference between the wages paid the ordinary pick and shovel men and those paid Pit-bosses, Foremen, Superintendents, and I feel sure that all the Members on this side of the House and those on the other side of the House as well who have anything to do with the expenditure of money belonging to the Highroads and allocated to their districts will bear out what I said. I see no reason why the pick and shovel man who has borne the heat and burden of the day should get so little wages as compared with a Pit-boss who stands in the pit and watches the other man do the work. Why is there such a difference in their scale of wages.

This in my opinion is the reason why all Members of this House are continually badgered by people sending them telegrams and asking them to try and get them jobs as Pit-bosses, Foremen or Superintendents.

I think that I have made myself clear regarding this position, and it

is unnecessary for me to elaborate any further in this connection, but trust that the Minister of Public Works will see his way clear to have this difference of wages rectified.

MR. PUDDESTER—What is your opinion of patrol men.

MR. SCAMMELL—I think that their's is a fair wage.

MR. PUDDESTER—Is their wage subject to the ten per cent. reduction?

MR. SCAMMELL—May be the Minister of Public Works who is more familiar with this Department than I am would be able to explain it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Chairman, the patrol men are not subject to the ten per cent. reduction. They receive \$90.00 per month and for this they have to supply a horse and equipment, and have to feed their horse during the winter. Some of them have no need for horses, but have got them since being appointed patrol men. And surely no person can think that \$90.00 a month is too much to pay any man who has to supply a horse and feed it all the winter. It must further be remembered that after bad and rainy weather when the roads are heavy these horses are used to pull drags along the soft roads and to haul carloads of material with which to repair the roads.

I agree in part with what the Member for Bonavista Centre has said regarding the difference in wages between the ordinary laborer who now receives only twenty-five cents an hour. It is not our intention to reduce this, but we do intend to lower the difference between the wage received by foremen which is now \$4.00 per day as compared with that of the laborer which is \$2.50 per day, or a

difference of \$1.50 per day between the two. This, we think, should be cut down to a difference of \$1.00 per day.

A Superintendent receives \$5.00 per day, but it must be taken into consideration that to be appointed to this position he must be a good outstanding man, and he is picked for the particular position to which he is appointed.

Pit-bosses receive fifty cents a day more than the ordinary laborer, and that is only a difference of five cents per hour, and in order to have any control over their men they must at least be paid this extra five cents per hour.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that we are unable to accept that resolution, the words especially abnoxious are:

(Reads)

That seems to me to open the doors of favouritism and the whole intention of the resolution is destroyed and the legislation may be nullified by this section.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, and if that is so I maintain that members of this House should have some knowledge of the fisheries. We brought in Estimates the other day reducing expenditure by \$700,000. The Opposition brought in amendment for a reduction of expenditure to the extent of \$27,000 and when they made that amendment they were praying to God we would not accept it. You moved a reduction on the vote for Agriculture.

MR. EMERSON—And what have you done about it?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Nothing.

MR. EMERSON—Are'nt you ashamed of yourself.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No.

MR. EMERSON—You ought to be.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member for Placentia East seems to be getting too cocky. This is a family complaint and handed down. You are very anxious to have reductions now. Why didn't your Government do it in 1928 when you put five dollar bills under water-horses and everywhere else and the ten of you bought your way into this House out of a slush fund. Now if the member who just sat down is looking for trouble I'm the gink who is going to give him all he wants of it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I resent the accusations made by certain members of the Opposition and these sections are going through just as they are in the Resolutions. The Opposition set up the position that we can go down and change the whole business over night. I hope that conditions will change to such an extent that we will be able to make drastic reductions in the public expenditure. Nothing would please me better than to be able to make them. But if the same people who are crying out for reductions to night were in power they would not alone not make reductions but would be increasing expenditure, because that is all the Monroe Government did when they were in power.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Member for Twillingate is rather inclined once in a while to get angry. He thought we were looking for trouble. Certainly not from a man of his size. But the point I wish to again emphasize is that no Executive Council of any Government should have power to amend the Supply Bill. You might just as well have power to reduce salaries whereby a civil ser-

vant can get his salary cut because he aroused the ire of some member who might recommend the reduction to some member of the Executive Council. I wonder would the Minister agree to that procedure? I agree with the Minister in the hope that conditions will be changed so that civil servants can have their salaries increased next year. The proper thing to do then is to issue a proclamation informing civil servants that their salaries will be put back to a point where we found them; but for the Executive Government to change the Supply Bill is I think outrageous. Now I would like to know what is the meaning of the words in the Section—"which by reason of contract or moral obligation"?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—There are thousands of things in my opinion in this country that are legally right and morally rotten. You can put a fellow in gaol, but morally he should not be there.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, and there are other cases where they ought to be morally in gaol but are legally out of it, and there are other people employing lawyers keeping them out of gaol on account of their moral obligations, and some of the things that keep lawyers awake over night is how we are keeping some clients out of gaol so long. I submit, Sir, that the word "moral" ought to be stricken out of this section of the Bill because the legal obligation can be enforced; but the moral obligation cannot and that is why my friend the Hon. Finance Minister has "drawn a red herring across the arail," and that is why the Executive Government should not have power to alter salaries which are fixed by Statute.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words before the passing of the Resolutions. I trust

that when the present Government goes to the country next year that they will go without any slush fund behind them and I trust that we will do likewise. The Government of 1928 probably spent a slush fund of three or four hundred thousand dollars; but not half as much as the gentlemen on the Government side said was spent. Now the Squires Government went to the country in the Spring of 1923 and spent six million dollars of a slush fund. The Government of 1924 went to the country with not a cent of a slush fund and that was the Government, the cleanest Government, since the Bond administration of 1904.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, following upon the remarks of the Hon. Member for Bay de Verde, I would like to point out to the House that neither in the three elections of 1923, 1924, or 1928 did I ever spend a dollar, directly or indirectly, from any slush fund or any other fund throughout the whole period of the three campaigns. Whoever spent dollars on either side, I spent none to secure my three elections, and, Sir, I am quite prepared to prove that assertion at any time.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received.

On the motion for the adoption of the report, Mr. Alderdice moved and Mr. Puddester seconded the following amendments:

Cross out the words "ten percentum" in Resolution No. 1.

Add after the end of Resolution No. 1 the following words:

Any salary of \$600 or less, no reduction.

Any salary of \$600 to \$1000, 10% upon all salary over \$600.

Any salary of \$1000 to \$1500, \$40 on first \$1000, plus 15% on all salary over \$1000.

Any salary of \$1500 to \$2000, \$115 on first \$1500, plus 20% on all salary over \$1500.

Any salary of \$2000 to \$3000, \$215 on first \$2000, plus 25% on all salary over \$2000.

Any salary of \$3000 to \$4000, \$465 on first \$3000, plus 30% on all salary over \$3000.

Any salary of \$4000 and over, \$765 on first \$4000, plus 35% on all salary over \$4000.

That the said Resolutions should be otherwise amended to give effect to the above amendment.

Moved by Mr. Alderdice, seconded by Mr. Puddester, that in Section 2 under the heading Department of Education, the Grants to Boards and also the Augmentation Grant be exempted from the ten per cent. reduction. That Sections 10 and 11 be eliminated from the Resolutions.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendments: Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Byrne, and against it Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. the Minister of Posts, Hon. Sir W. F. Coaker, Hon. Dr. Mosdell, Hon. Mr. Lewis, The Minister of Agriculture, The Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Brown, Mr. Earle, Mr. Fitzgibbon, Mr. Skeans, Lady Squires, Mr. Scam-

mell, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Godden, Mr. Greene, Mr. Smith, Mr. Murphy, so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for adoption of the report was put when there appeared in its favor: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. the Minister of Posts, Hon. Sir W. F. Coaker, Hon. Dr. Mosdell, Hon. Mr. Lewis, The Minister of Agriculture, The Minister of Public Works, The Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Brown, Mr. Earle, Mr. Fitzgibbon, Mr. Skeans, Lady Squires, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Greene, Mr. Smith, Mr. Murphy, and against it—Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Winter, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Byrne, so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act respecting a Reduction in the Public Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 1931-32" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of 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.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, this Bill which is now before the House is one which in my humble opinion has become necessary. It is not a party measure, it is merely for the country's benefit and meets a state of affairs which had to be faced by the Government sooner or later and I am glad to see the Government facing it so courageously as they are. I only hope it will not meet the criticism which every Bill we bring in meets at the hands of the Opposition.

This Bill has its financial aspect like everything else and of course it's financial troubles, for I am afraid it means taxation. Now I've gone through this Bill from beginning to end thoroughly and I scarcely know how to express myself. This Bill is one which came before the Salt Cod-fish Board last year, the Board of which I am a member. We had some difficulty until we found out who was the nigger in the woodpile. Now I'm noted for expressing myself frankly, I'm never afraid to do so. This Bill was originated by the Board of Trade and speaking frankly I may say that I think it's going to drive the smaller man out of the business.

On the first of April the firm in which I am vitally interested, of which I am senior partner, Lake & Lake of Fortune, sold a cargo of fish through Holmes, a Newfoundland, resident in Oporto. The sale was put through successfully and shipment was to be made by the steamer "Frank". Someone discovered we had made this sale. It was reported to the people to whom we had sold the fish that the fish in question was of very poor quality and badly cured. On this information the buyers refused to do business without a banker's guarantee.

It has taken me since the 10th of April to finalize that sale and it is

only today that I received confirmation of the last credit been paid. This was resold by Holmes. There is something going on behind which are Hawes & Company and my contention is that what is going on is not beneficial to the Newfoundland fish business in Oporto, without which market doom and nothing else is left for Newfoundland.

The conditions through which thousands of fishermen went through last year have caused me many heartaches. I am continually receiving telegrams from my District regarding the destitution of the fishermen there. My District in which I take great pride in is one of the greatest fish-producing districts in Newfoundland, but unfortunately last year the fishery there proved almost a blank and practically fifty per cent. of the fishermen are now existing on dole. But for God's sake above everything else I don't want the men of my district to have to work on the Highroads, because in my opinion the Highroads have been the curse of the fishermen of this country. Nothing is too bad for me to say about fishermen working on the Highroads, which I think is the most damnable thing that has happened to this country, and I say this with all respect to the ladies who are present in this House.

Now to get back to the Bill which was drafted and sent to this House by the Board of Trade and which is under discussion at present, I would like to read an extract from the copy of a telegram sent to the Board of Trade at St. John's by two importers of codfish in Oporto.

(Reads.)

Just listen to this, and I want the whole country to get this, and will give the Press a copy of this message if they will publish it. I know one of the people who sent this message, and

I would not like to give my opinion of him in this House. A copy of this message was sent to Holmes in Oporto and he sent a message in reply.

(Reads Message.)

In reply to this telegram they refused to ship fish by the same boat (which was the S. S. "Frank" that I previously referred to) as shipped by Lake & Lake of Burin. I am glad to say in this House to-night that there is one Newfoundland still alive who is prepared to take up the cudgels and look after the interests of the Newfoundland fishermen.I am not going to mince my words when I speak in this connection. I don't have to. I say that the Board of Trade and its associates in bringing in this Bill are trying to kill the small fish-merchant in Newfoundland, and I further say that the last thing they think of is the welfare of the fishermen or the country in general, and I will continue to say so while I have breath left in my body. The S. S. "Frank" is now in Fortune and she has on board 47,000 quintals of fish loaded by Lake & Lake which fish I was unable to sell in the foreign markets. But today I received a wire saying that cash for this cargo had been put up by Holmes from Oporto in the Bank of Nova Scotia, and I want to let this House know that I have gone through hell during the past few weeks, and I will stand behind Holmes through thick and thin.

It is my opinion, and I feel sure that the public opinion will damn this Bill which will do nothing else but kill the fishermen in this country. I regret deeply to have to speak like this in the House, but I was a fisherman in my day and I have passed through the mill, and I know that it is only by hard work, hardships and suffering

that a fisherman is able to make both ends meet.

This Bill which is brought in by the Board of Trade and was fostered by the merchants in St. John's needs to be watched.

The Prime Minister is anxious to bring in standardization, and I am in sympathy with him in that regard, and think that standardization of fish will be a great benefit to the fishermen of this country but not in the form that this Bill embodies.

Many of the people whose names appear in this Bill have been in touch with me by telephone during the past few days. Unfortunately, I have not had the time to interview them personally, but they all state they were opposed to this Bill.

MR. EMERSON—If their names appear as sponsors of this Bill don't you think that they should let this House know that they are opposed to it.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I shall find out and if I have their liberty will give their names to this House in a day or two.

This body which is composed of the Board of Trade are employing three men on highly paid salaries, and they have the power to find and appoint the salaries of the Board of Directors. They further have the power of appointing those who will have charge of the inspecting and grading of all codfish, a power which in my opinion should rest with the Government, but judging from this Bill the only authority that the Government will have will be sit by and look on. I contend that this power should be under the Department of the Marine and Fisheries, I don't say this because I myself happen to be the Minister in charge of that Department

at present, and will still continue to be until 1932 unless some extraordinarily thing happens.

Included in this Bill is an inspection fee on fish, and this will naturally come back to the fishermen who in my opinion cannot afford under the present conditions pay this extra tax. If this Bill goes through conditions will exist exactly as those existing at present in connection with the S. S. "Frank" which is now loading. The merchants practically refused to put their fish on this boat, but I am pretty well sure that the boat is now about loaded. If this House passes this Bill I think it will be the damndest crime this country has ever known.

I could continue talking for hours but don't want to delay the House when the time is nearly at hand for the House to be closed and the Members should be attending to their District troubles. I know that in my own district I have a great many matters that need my personal attention in order that I may do something to put the men of my district back to the fishery.

I feel that every Member both Opposition and Government will back up what I say, and I firmly believe that this Bill should go before the Fishery Research Commission.

I received no pay for any Commission that I have been on. I was on the Fishery Research Commission which took up the matter of standardization of exports in which the Prime Minister is so vitally and honestly interested. The Prime Minister is filled up with the idea of standardization and I agree with him. It should have been done before but I do not agree with giving power to three individuals selected by the Water Street Merchants and that is as frank as I know how to put it, and should this

Bill happen to pass I am going to move an amendment and while I am on my feet, I might as well give this House the benefit of that amendment:

(Reads Amendment.)

MR. PUDDESTER—Would you mind reading the first part of that again?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—(Reads.)

That means that the district of Burin West, for instance, can be absolved from the rulings of this Act by a majority vote of the exporters in that district with the permission of the Governor in Council and can have an Act of their own. The fish business in this country is a very ticklish one but it is on own mainstay and as I said before if we had not sold that cargo to Oporto it means that maybe I would not be a member here because one insolvent cannot hold a seat here; \$30,000.00 is quite a lot of money to some of us.

MR. EMERSON—Not all of us.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—No, maybe lawyers wouldn't think so.

MR. EMERSON—You must mean Government lawyers.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—This is a serious matter.

MR. EMERSON—Pardon me, I shouldn't have interrupted.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, this matter makes me weep, this matter is too serious even to smile at because it is vital to the business of the country. If we had not sold that fish to Oporto, I don't know where we would have sold it. A board of the association composed of Water Street business men will be very little use for the small outport man. I hope that those

interested are within hearing of my voice, I have no fear of them or anybody else. I am ready to sacrifice myself on the altar for the best interests of Newfoundland whatever the outcome. I am not living for Clyde Lake in the present, I have a family to bring up and I don't want my children to rise up and curse me as we cursed those who lived before us and did not bring in legislation to dam the tide of ruin that is sweeping in on us. That is why I am going to say on the 10% cut that every man, woman and child in Newfoundland, whether they are school teachers, civil servants or anything else, they are not true Newfoundlanders if they are not prepared to accept this 10% cut. We must accept it because the cut is just, and it will have to go deeper before Newfoundland is pulled through.

We must retrench and be careful with our legislation and this applies to the main industry of the country, so we must be very careful before we pass this Bill. It is of such vital importance that my mind is worried day and night for the future of Newfoundland. We were sent here by the electors of the country to do what is right and if we do not do so we are not fit to be here as the representatives of the people. If I cannot do a job as I like to do I will get out but before I do I will do all that is humanly possible. I give of my best in the interest of the country, as I said before I have a family and I do not want to be cursed by future generations and I say now again that we must be very careful in passing this Act.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—

Mr. Chairman, for many years I have believed that the system of carrying on the fish business in Newfoundland is the most risky and un-

certain of any business conducted in the world.

If we go back, we find in the days before I was born that we had some very large firms conducting the exporting of fish in Newfoundland, and if we go back further we find the old firms of Waterman & Company, and Cox & Slade, in the North, and the old Jersey firm which conducted half the business of the South West Coast, operated large extensive businesses, but where are these firms today?

In the old days of James Murray in Hoylestown, of James Fox who did business adjoining Harvey's premises, Thorburn & Tessier, Thomas, LeMesurier (the latter two carried on business where Lazo & Company are today), Baine Johnston, W. B. Grieve, Goodfellow & Co., O'Dwyer, Goodridge, Stab, Row & Holmwood, Bishop, Stewart, Duder & Tessier, of St. John's, and Munn and Ridley of Hr. Grace, Bremner of Trinity, each conducted a large supplying and fish exporting business; but where are they all today?

They were conducted by great men experienced men. They did not fail because they were fools or indolent. They attended to their business; they were great workers they started work at 6 a.m. and were in their offices until 11 p.m.

Why did they fail? They failed because of the miserable, risky, uncertain, unbusinesslike system they had of exporting fish; and all the trouble encountered was trouble which arose after the fish left our shores. They did the best they could, although they had a better system of grading than we have today. It is only during the last twenty-five years that the "tal qual" system has come into being. They had a first-class cull, and they sent shipments across the sea

graded. But the trouble arose on the other side of the water, and they became the victims of the foreign middleman.

The exporting of fish today is not conducted on a sound business basis and cannot be, as long as the present system remains.

I have been in all the markets of the world. I met the men who handle the fish exported from this country. I have followed the fish as far as the consumer.

I have been exporting fish for sixteen years. During these years the Trading Co. lost \$400,000 on claims made by middlemen. Twenty other firms have no doubt met similar losses, which means \$8,000,000 taken from the trade in sixteen years—the most of which would have been saved had a Bill like the one proposed been in operation. My experience has taught me that the exporters will have to wake up, or the whole industry will be faced with disaster. **UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS WE CANNOT GO ON ANOTHER FIVE YEARS.** The system cannot continue. It must be placed on a businesslike basis. Not a single firm has made money out of the fishery since 1919, except during 1928.

The firms giving out the supplies are keeping the fishery going. Firms like Strong, Ashbourne, Long, Earle, Swyers, Templeman, The Trading Co., Moore, Job's, Bowring's, Murray's Monroe's and other large firms on the West Coast are keeping the fishery going. These men ought to be considered and saved if at all possible.

What I am saying I believe, and I do say that something must be done to make exporting fish safer, or these firms will have to go out of business. Disaster is staring them in the face.

Are we going to allow this to happen? I feel sure most of the supplying firms would sell out today at fifty cents to the dollar, if they could find buyers.

Last year the Fishery Commission recommended two Bills to the Government. They were not introduced in the House, because the Government Party was not unanimous on the matter, and it was thought that under these conditions it would be better to let it stand over for another session.

During the past winter the Board of Trade got together and formulated the present Bill, which contains almost word for word the Bill recommended last year. The House can do as it likes, but I say unless it passes this Bill, it is going to be a sorry day for Newfoundland.

Iceland and Norway have **STANDARDIZATION** of their fish exports. That happened about ten years ago, and they have been gaining ground in the markets steadily ever since. We are losing the markets to our competitors, because they grade or standardize their fish.

Who will buy our ungraded fish when the **STANDARDIZED** article is obtainable?

What do we find in Italy? We are fast losing the market there. We cannot supply enough No. 1 fish for that country. In Spain and Greece it's the same; and yet these countries are eating more fish. But it not from Newfoundland the increased consumption is taken, but from Iceland and Norway. Italy would take twice as much fish from us as she does, if we could supply a suitable article, both shore and Labrador cure. Newfoundland is exporting less and less to these markets every year.

Iceland is going ahead by leaps and bounds, and is selling to markets we

sold to in former years. Brazil is getting fish from Norway because of a bungle that was made here in 1929-30 respecting prices. On that occasion we demanded a price of sixty-two shillings per drum. They were not prepared to pay that price, and sent to Norway for a supply. They bought at eight to ten shillings less per drum. The result was that the fish dropped to forty-five shillings, and a half a million dollars was lost to the trade in the twinkling of an eye. This need never have happened. Fifty-five shillings could have been obtained had the exporters been properly informed of conditions in Brazil; but they had no one to give them the information necessary; we have had another bad experience the year past which would have been avoided by this Bill, and they were caught napping and lost.

There is a great danger of this country losing the Greek market for the sale of Labrador fish. We can sell as much or more fish in Greece than was ever sold, if we can supply that country with a grade of fish that it requires. The Greek market is a very particular one, and while there is sale for some No. 2 Labrador fish in certain parts of Greece, the demand is for No. 1, and they want a very prime article. Iceland has already secured a footing in that market, and the fish from Iceland has turned out fairly well, but the Greek fish dealers tell us that if Newfoundland is cured properly it will always be welcomed with open arms by the fish consumers of Greece.

Another menace has arisen in connection with the disposal of Labrador fish in Europe, which shows how necessary it is for Newfoundland to take more care in curing Labrador fish, and to do something in the future that has not been done for many years.

In order to prove my assertion, I wish to quote from a letter received the past winter from the Trading Company's permanent Agent for Italy and Greece, Mr. Saccarelli. The following is what he writes :

The Soviet last week started to introduce the soft cured fish of the Labrador style in Piraeus, and that market has taken all discharged there, viz., 147 tons. I had the opportunity to see this fish at Patras. It was packed in big cases of 100 kilos, say 205 lbs., and salted like the Iceland wet salted, and the buyer washes the salt out. When the fish is washed it looks beautifully white, thick and good-sized, weighing 2½ to 3 pounds each. In any case I can say that this Russian fish, that nobody knew about before is splendid fish and superior to any other kind of soft cured fish, and consumers look very favorably upon it. I have eaten it and found it very tasteful. This fish has been sold at about 16 shillings per 100 kilos, but when washed the shrinkage increased the cost to 21-23. (The last Labrador fish from here fetched 17 shillings per qt. in that market). According to information received this fish is caught at Archangel and shipped from Odessa. I have forwarded you per parcel post 4 of these fish, and even if it won't reach you in good condition you will at any rate have some idea of what it is like.

"I have heard lots of comments regarding this fish, and have been informed that the Soviet Commercial Agents in Piraeus are trying to make contracts with the importers there for three thousand tons, 60,000 qtls, to be imported during the season starting in August. Of course I cannot say yet if this information is correct, but I would not be surprised if the Soviet do make things bad for Newfoundland trade. Italy has not

taken any yet, but I have been informed that Soviets are going there too, and will send some trial shipments. As soon as I get more detailed information regarding this business I will report to you fully. In my opinion, the Nfld. Labrador is to meet another danger, from competition in future from this Russian fish, unless an improvement is being made in the quality of genuine Labrador.

"A new sound business system and serious attention given to improvement of the quality are required to make the fish business profitable for all parties concerned in Greece and Newfoundland. The idea of having an exporters' association controlling the whole business and have all the fish sold in the various markets through one agency, is the only thing that can be done to save the situation and from wasting thousands of pounds each year. The buyers also would be very pleased, there would then be in the market some kind of control. Under the present system, very often competitors sometimes cannot help making trouble in order to save themselves from losses caused by the selling competition. Therefore, you will no doubt agree with me, that the system must be changed. If this will not be possible, I would suggest you to come to some understanding with Hawes for your interests in the Greek market, because if business remains the same you will not blame me if it turns out to be unprofitable. I understand that the Patras buyers are going to make you a report wherein they will point out how for them the present system of business is not good.

"I tell you with all sincerity, that if you find no remedy for the improvement in the dealing of fish business with Greece, it would be better for

you to finish with Greece instead of showing losses year after year."

A great deal has been said in this House and elsewhere about the Fish Regulations. Had they been amended as experience would have dictated from year to year, we would today possess a system of standardization for exporting codfish that would prove of immense benefit to the country. The Bill before the House not only deals with standardization, but gives an association of exporters powers under the act to establish a system that will protect the interests of exporters with regard to settling claims on fish, and the regulating of supplies to the various markets. The bill empowers the association to appoint trade agents. These agents will be directly responsible to the association, and have no political connection of any description.

It has been the aim of the promoters of the Bill to exclude anything of a political nature in connection with the operation of this Act. It has been considered essential to place the powers within the association itself, and to exclude even the Fishery Department from any connection with the operations.

From my experience of 1920 operating the fish regulations I am confident that the safer course has been followed by this Bill in excluding all political interferences. The Bill provides that every exporter of fish must become a member of the association. This compels every exporter to co-operate, and gives him the right of association with his fellow exporters, which will prove of immense value to the young exporter as the years pass. They would learn more in one meeting in discussing matters pertaining to the operation of this Bill, than they could learn in years by trying to paddle their own canoe, as the expert ad-

vice of a Board of many years experience will be open to them, as well as advice of the experienced members of the association, and will help them to escape many of the pitfalls which formerly tripped up most of the exporters in dealing with foreign markets.

The bigger exporters can do more to help the smaller exporters than most of the smaller exporters imagine, as it takes a man, many years to learn the business.

I considered ten or twelve years ago that I knew all that was necessary to know to export codfish to foreign markets; but as the years pass, I realize that there is always something more to learn.

This Bill has no connection whatever with the establishment of a local cull. What I mean by a local cull is the culling of fish coming from the fishermen; the Bill only deals with fish after it has been lodged in a merchant's store, it then being the property of the merchant himself. He has to pack and grade that fish according to the rules of the association. It will be necessary another time to introduce standardization for local cull but the enforcement and operation of that cull cannot be left in the hands of the exporters association, but should be placed in the hands of a body upon which the fishermen have some representation, a body in which the fishermen will have full confidence.

Anybody interested in this industry knows that for years there has not been any system or co-operation amongst the merchants in Newfoundland in regard to the exporting of salt codfish. We had experience of that particularly in the years 1920 and 1921 when the fish regulations were imposed. All the blame at that time was put on me. I admit that the regulations were not all that one would wish

them to be. No system is going to be perfect in one or two years; but, after mature consideration I am convinced that if we had not repealed the regulations and had kept on making amendments to that Act, and correcting our errors for the benefit and improvement of the regulations, we would now have a splendid system which would have been the means of saving millions of dollars for this country through the protection afforded to the markets.

There is no doubt but that an immense amount of good would have come out of these regulations by cutting out the bad points and holding on to the good.

For many years I have been considering the question of how the exporters could help each other. Suggestions of a practical nature have been made, and some firms were in favor of them; whilst half a dozen others were very emphatically opposed to them, and no harmonious relations resulted.

We then came to the conclusion that it was no use trying to do anything in an honorable way; that is, in making a gentleman's bargain. A hard and fast rule must be made, enforced by penalties; and this Bill before us now provides that every exporter in Newfoundland who sends fish to foreign markets must be a member of an association of exporters. In that way it gives the smaller men an opportunity to get in contact with the bigger exporter, who can do more good in helping the smaller man than the smaller man is likely to admit. For instance, the knowledge that I have gained in my long experience in the fish business will be available to the smaller shipper, who can gather more knowledge by listening to the experiences of senior men than he

would gather otherwise in many years.

In my opinion there is no way any harm may come to any exporter of fish through this Bill. What object would I personally have in doing anybody financial injury? And if I approve of this Bill, it is because I am convinced of the actual necessity of such a measure in order to establish the business on a basis that experience has dictated.

Arising out of the deliberations of the Salt Codfish Commission last year two bills emanated. The two Bills of last year were put into one Bill by the Board of Trade Committee. Of the two Bills mentioned one was in relation to the taking of fish by the merchant; or in other words, the local cull. The other concerned the export of fish. The Bill now before us does not contain any power to establish a local cull. It does not affect the fish until it is the property of the merchant and in his store. The merchant then has to have it inspected graded and packed according to the rules and regulations that this Bill empowers the association to establish. The Bill further provides that there shall be a meeting of the exporters one month after the passing of this Act, and at that meeting an association must be established. Three men shall eventually be appointed by the association as a Board of Executive. The Board shall consist of not more than three and not less than one. One person must be appointed within three months and the second person within six months after the first general meeting.

The Bill does not contain one rule or regulation. It provides the machinery, and gives the association power to establish rules and regulations; but it does not contain, as it is, one obligation that is compulsory, other than that of compelling every exporter to join an association.

Every established firm exporting fish can join the association, if it possesses a suitable store and wharf. In future anyone wishing to engage in the exporting of fish can do so by possessing or having a suitable store for the handling of fish, and the Bill even permits anyone to export fish who does not possess a store or wharf, providing he is willing to do it seriously, and not play with it, the only stipulation being that he will give assurance that he intends to handle five thousand quintals during the year.

One of the greatest curses of the present system is the so called exporter who has his office in his hat. I venture to assert tonight that this class of exporter has, during the last ten years, caused the Trading Company \$100,000 loss. He is the cause of immense losses to the regular exporter; because he having no overhead expense, no office staff, no store or premises to keep up, no risk of loss caused by supplying, no property to provide for the catching of fish,—can undersell every established supplier, and sell at a small profit, while the same price would mean a considerable loss per quintal to the firm which has to carry the burden of supplying to catch the fish and maintain offices, stores and premises with the usual staff.

A fish peddler of this sort can sell a quintal of fish in Italy for six dollars per quintal, and make 20 cents profit; while the firm that carries the heavy burden of supplying and maintaining a staff and outfit would lose 20 cents per quintal.

These peddlers make offers to all the dealers in the market, and as a result the large exporters are told by foreign buyers that so and so has offered at a price twenty to forty cents below, and the larger exporter has to

come down in his prices to meet that competition, and often has to sell at a loss when a price which included a fair profit could have been readily obtained, had the peddler not interfered. Besides these small men often cause friction and annoyance amongst foreign buyers who often put up cash to purchase his fish owing to the lower price offered, but who sometimes finds the fish inferior and has no one to collect claims from and therefore brings the whole trade into disrepute because the buyer cannot often distinguish the peddler from the larger established exporters and all are bracketed together as Newfoundland fish exporters and the brush is applied to all in general.

This sometimes happens. — am prepared to see that any bona fide applicant for a license to export fish is treated right and given a chance; but it is not a very hard condition to insist that he shall have a premises to handle and grade such fish. No legitimate applicant is debarred from exporting by this Bill. The conditions attached are only effective against anyone who is a menace to the legitimate exporters, and it is the duty of the country to protect the legitimate exporter against those who care little how much harm they do the country or trade generally, so long as they can make an easy dollar. Let this man with his office in his hat do something to gather the harvest from the seas, fit out and find schooners and supply them and engage in the business in a regular way, and the trade will welcome him with open arms.

We must not have our feelings imposed upon by the appeals of such men, for we know that they are a great menace to the fish business as it exists today. The door is open and open wide, but they must be admitted as co-

operators in business, and not as destroyers.

We have to establish an association to bring exporters together to make their own rules and regulations. They have failed to get together themselves. They tried to do so and failed. But if they were given the powers to make their rules and regulations and control their own affairs, and failed to use them, then this Assembly would not be blamed for inactivity.

There is also provision for a board of experts. There are only eight or ten men in the country today who could fill this position which I term "expert" exporters. A member of this board would have to abandon his position as a member of a firm, and devote his whole time to the work pertaining to the markets and in time would be of immense benefit to the trade. They must be able to advise the association on all matters. These experts would be in the same position as for example a bank manager. The Board would in time be to the trade what a bank manager is to a bank. As I said before there are only a few men in the country qualified to be members of such a board of experts. Mr. Brookes at Jobs, or Mr. Walter Monroe would, in my opinion, be suitable for such a board, but these men have special arrangements with their firms, unlikely to be in a position to accept appointment on the board. I believe a couple of men could be secured that would suit.

If something isn't done we might as well hand our business over to the Icelanders or the Norwegians, for they will oust us from the markets we now sell to, unless something material is done without delay. The benefit of an expert board under this Bill would, in my opinion, be noticeable immediately. I have no doubt about recovering lost

grounds in all markets if we supplied the proper article. The most important and pressing duty this year is to grade the Labrador fish and get back the Italian market and keep the Greek market for our produce.

If the West Coast don't wish to join the association then give them the right to remain out. But I can tell them that they'll soon be begging to come in: for as soon as this country begins to export inspected and guaranteed grades of fish, it will be impossible to sell any ungraded fish. Every buyer abroad will demand the guaranteed brands of the association. Nearly all our fish is forwarded on consignment of 60 to 90 per cent advance. Very little is sold outright.

This Bill will not only ensure an inspected grade, and protect foreign buyers, but will protect us in the event of claims, because this Board will have its own agents on the spot to settle and adjust all claims. If any exporters remain out they are going to have some trouble selling their fish if it isn't inspected and graded, for no one is going to buy uninspected fish, when they can get inspected fish for the same price. The West Coast exporters deal largely in fish for the Oporto market, not much of it goes to Spain or Italy, but if the North and St. John's ship inspected fish, which will give satisfaction, won't it be difficult to dispense of fish not so inspected and guaranteed.

I cannot review the sections of the Bill tonight, but as we consider the Bill in Committee I will be glad to explain the meaning and give the reasons for each section and generally to supply what information I can to enable the House to understand the Bill, and obtain a grip of the whole position, and therefore move that the

Committee rise, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House at this late hour to present a petition received by the Legislative Council regarding the Hr. Grace Water Co. The Petition has been signed by their solicitor, Mr. Ray Gushue.

Mr. Moore, the member for Carbonear, was asked to introduce this petition but he was opposed to it and I, myself, as responsible leader of the House, have to take over the burden of introducing it. I will invite this House to receive the Bill and move that it be referred to the Rules Committee of the House.

On motion this petition was received and it was ordered that the said petition be referred to a Select Committee to report as to whether the Rules of the House have been complied with.

The Committee to consist of: Mr. Speaker, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Winter.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 11th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 11, 1931.

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

Hon. Mr. Lewis presented the Report of the Select Committee on Carbonear Water Company's application, as follows:

To The Honorable House of Assembly:

Your Select Committee appointed to ascertain whether the Rules of this House have been complied with in respect of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act to Incorporate the Carbonear Water Company 47 Vic. Cap. 6" beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred and find that the Rules of this House regarding publication of Notice have not been complied with but they, nevertheless, recommend that leave be given to introduce the Bill.

Dated the 11th day of May, 1931.

(Sgd.) P. J. LEWIS,
A. J. WALSH,
J. A. WINTER.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said report be referred to a Select Committee.

A petition from the Labrador Marine Shell Company, Limited, protesting against the passing of Resolutions submitted by the Northern Products Company, Limited, was read by the Clerk.

On motion this petition was received and it was ordered that the said petition be tabled for future possible consideration.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of Question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of Question.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled copy of the Regulations issued under the Radiotelegraph Act.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions with respect to the Export from Labrador and adjacent islands of Marine Shells.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, before formally moving the House into Committee on these Resolutions, I suggest that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again on tomorrow, so that the Hon. members may have a chance to consider the Resolutions. This is not a party measure and I might say that I am one of the few members of this House that is not financially interested in this matter. Two years ago this matter was the subject of controversy in this House, it went to the Legislative Council and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Government, Sir Tasker Cook refrained from voting because they were personally interested. Consequently I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on these Resolutions, the Bills will be distributed and we will raise the Committee so that these Resolutions can be given further consideration.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, 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 the 30th day of June, 1931, and the 30th day of June, 1932, and 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 with unanimous consent 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 the 30th day of June, 1931, and the 30th day of June, 1932 and for other Purposes Relating to the Public Service," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a

Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a few remarks in connection with the Budget, and I shall be concise, fair and constructive in my criticism. As the Hon. Minister of Finance stated the other day when delivering his Budget Speech, we have three Budgets under consideration, namely, the immediate past, the present and the immediate future. There is one other Budget and that is the one for 1929. That unfortunate Budget seems to be nobody's child. Apparently, it has a very cold hard-hearted stepfather in the form of the present Minister of Finance and Customs and I am very much afraid that that year's Budget paid for the sins of the succeeding Budget, as I feel that things that should have been charged into that Budget was held back for the next Budget. In the 1930 Budget the Hon. Minister of Finance forecasted a surplus of \$8,000. It caused me to smile at the time he made that statement, and a few days later the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs cut a sorry figure in the House when he got up in his place and reminded the Hon. Finance Minister that the Department of Posts and Telegraphs was out \$76,000 which he forgot to get from the Finance Minister in Supplemental Supply and which would have left a deficit of \$68,000 instead of a surplus of \$8,000, as forecasted by the Hon. Finance Minister. This incident, it will be recalled, left the Hon. Finance Minister in a very unhappy plight in the House. Now one of the reasons why that Budget showed a surplus was the misleading practise of charg-

ing up to capital expenditure and then getting the benefit of that expenditure in the way of giving the people increased purchasing power.

The Customs Department derives considerable benefit from that source. Suppose a million dollars are spent on capital account and the whole of that is spent on labor; I am taking the average returns as I figure them on wages paid which amounts on the average to 20 per cent. The Customs Department is benefitted to the extent of two hundred thousand dollars, but then we have to remember that from that time ever on until we are able to liquidate that million dollars, we have to pay 5 per cent on the original capitalization of a million dollars; in other words perhaps the next 50 years, we have to pay \$50,000 a year for the questionable benefit of getting a return of \$200,000 for the Customs Department.

Mr. Chairman, I am comin to the current year, the Hon. gentleman, I am afraid, was duly optimistic, I told him so last year. His estimated revenue was \$11,380,500; the actual revenue was \$9,925,000, leaving a deficit of \$1,460,000. There were a great many reasons why we should have that deficit. I know we can't compel people to import goods, we can't compel people to pay duty. Where we can blame him is, that his forecast was so far out. I would just like to quote my remarks on that forecast. "Now I should like to be as optimistic as the Hon. gentleman himself, but I am afraid that he is going to be out in his calculation when he states that the estimated revenue for 1930-31 will meet expectations."

Now I think the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs should have been able to see as far as I could see in so far as that is concerned. In fact

he has more reliable information at his disposal. I am afraid we must censor him there for being so very optimistic in so far as Customs receipts are concerned.

Coming to estimated expenditure, his estimate was \$11,363,139 against \$11,920,500, and actual deficit there of \$557,000 making practically altogether \$2,000,000; in addition to that, he had to find another million dollars from the Bank of Montreal. I now remember when the Hon. gentleman was telling us about the wonderful things he was doing with his Department, and he looked at us in such an almost patronising way, when he told us about the sins of the 1924-28 Government, where in four years they had a deficit that amounted to \$4,000,000—an average of a million dollars a year—and now, the Hon. gentleman comes into the House and he is able to do in a year what it took the previous administration three years to do; they took 4 years to have a deficit of \$4,000,000 and he took one year to have a deficit of \$3,000,000. For the year ending 1930 he took all the credit to himself of the increased Customs revenue; it was not because he had better times, higher prices for fish, people had splendid earning powers; he did not say a word about this; he seemed to take all the credit to himself; his brilliant financing was the cause of that balanced Budget; surely he must now take the blame where blame is to be laid.

I am coming now to the spending of money, Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of an old saying about painting the cart and letting the horse go hungry. Honestly, I am afraid we have far too many painted carts in this country; too many of them in this House; letting the unfortunate horse go hungry; spending money where it is not required and depriving the country in

many ways of the money that it should be getting.

I am coming now to the immediate future, and that is the Budget for 1932. We have an estimated expenditure of \$11,500,000; the cut in salaries in the Service amounts to about \$550,000, leaving a net expenditure of \$10,950,000, excepting Supplementary Supply, and I think that is one of the things that should be cut out of this financial reckoning; I don't mean to say that we have not to make provision, but the estimates should come in such form that it should not be necessary to call for Supplemental Supply. The total requirement for the service of the country is \$11,450,000, and the estimated revenue is a little over \$10,000,000, leaving a deficit of \$1,440,000.

I am afraid the Hon. Gentleman, just as he was in the last year, is over optimistic, insofar as Customs receipts are concerned. My estimate is, that he is \$500,000 short. On Income Tax he expects to collect as much during the coming year as in the present; I believe he will be \$150,000 short there; on miscellaneous revenue I don't believe he would get any large amount; in other words to his admitted deficit I would add another three quarters of a million. I am afraid our deficit is going to amount to two and a half millions. I sympathise with the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs in having to come into this House and lay the Budget on the table and tell us we are going to have a larger deficit on the 30th of June next. He is to be sympathized with and I would much prefer that he was able to come into the House and show a surplus of three millions rather than a deficit.

Reading his speech, there is one paragraph that rather took my attention. The Hon. gentleman states "You are aware that when the present ad-

ministration came into office, etc."

For obvious reasons I am not going to discuss lines and twines, nor am I going to discuss tobacco; I know nothing about butterine. Let me get to the principle of this paragraph. The Hon. gentleman stated if he reduced the duties on any article more of those goods would be imported, and in spite of the reduced duty the Department more than recouped itself because of the increased importations. Let us take one case in point; remember we have very few men in this country who are not spending their salaries as received; spending every dollar they get on wearing apparel, on food and on rent and on taxes and amusements. Suppose a man has \$200 to spent on certain commodities and the present using is 25 per cent.; we will ignore profits in shops but will say the price of that commodity, cost, insurance and freight is \$160 on the wharf and he gets it at that price. Before he gets delivery of it he has to pay 25 per cent; he pays 25 per cent, that is \$40 and his whole \$200 is absorbed. The Hon. gentleman says that the best way is to cut the duty, and the people will import goods. "Despite the lower rate of duty, I will get greater revenue." He cuts it down to 20 per cent and the goods come. There are so much goods there to be taken away; the person who has got \$200 to spend figures how much duty there would be; how much goods he can afford to ask for delivery; he finds that on a 20 per cent basis he can get \$166.66 worth. He goes up to the Customs Department to get delivery and pays 20 per cent on that order which amounts to \$33.34. When \$166.00 is added to \$33.34 we have \$200. The only difference is that the man gets \$6.66 more worth of goods but the Customs Department loses \$6.66 duty. That would happen on an ordinary commodity. There is only one exception and that

is in the case of luxury. If 80 per cent is put on a certain luxury—and the wealthy class is no more desirous of being victimised than any other class—they say that 80 per cent is too much; they will not buy the goods; the Minister of Finance says "I will cut that down to 50 per cent." these people will buy; they would not buy at 80 per cent but they will buy at 50 per cent. That is the only case I know where with reduced duty you will get an increased revenue.

In the 1929 Blue Book I find that our importations of readymades were \$585,144, and the duty that was paid on that was \$312,702. For the succeeding year, that was 1930, the last year we have any Customs Returns published, the importations were \$687,373, almost \$100,000 more, but the duties collected were \$309,317. In spite of the fact that \$100,000 more readymade clothing was imported, the Customs Department received a little over \$3,000 less. Now, that may look very nice on paper, but the people of this country were able to get \$100,000 more clothing and the Customs suffered only to the extent of a little over \$3,000.

I think if the Minister of Finance and Customs would have been wise when he reduced the duty on cloth to 45 per cent. if he had reduced the duty on cloth to 30 per cent. and the manufacturers would have had the chance to fight against the mass production, but in his wisdom he did not do so, and what is the result? Some people got \$100,000 worth more clothing by reason of reduced duties and the Customs Department suffered a loss of \$3,000, but there is another side.

There are 400 employees of the tailoring industry doing nothing, there is no work for them. The average weekly wage for these people is \$4,400.00 per week. In the course of a

year these people would have earned over \$200,000 and as their earning power was reduced so was their ability to spend, or as I have called it their purchasing power and as the average rate of duty on this amount is about 20 per cent. then you have taken this sum of \$200,000 from these people, and in doing so have lost on Customs duty about \$40,000.

After all, I really must say the real reason for these cuts made in November, 1928 were rather to spite political opponents rather than to effect any benefit to Newfoundland. Might I also draw attention to the protection promised Mr. Collishaw when he was intending to erect a woolen mill in the West end. He was promised a protection of 60 per cent. Now, that is really unfair, for if you place a protection of 60 per cent on a product then you cut out the foreign competition and if you do then the local manufacturer is going to fix his prices so that they will be very little different from the imported product, that is only human but it isn't fair even though Mr. Collishaw was a friend of the present Government.

The fact that I want to impress on the Government is that capital and labor are every day coming together and when times are bad they are very close to each other. Thus the only people hurt are the 400 employees thrown out of employment—a hundred of whom are earning \$20.00 per week and now every day they have to go home to their wives and children and say that there is no work in St. John's and if to do this causes gratification then I think that shows a very poor spirit.

In one respect I do blame the Finance Minister and that is that he being in the position he is and having his finger on the commercial pulse of

the country did not see this coming depression. Every merchant on Water Street saw it, and what did they do, they battened down their financial hatches; the manufacturers saw it and they shortened sail. The merchants bought less stock and took other precautions according to their particular business, the manufacturers by reducing working hours as low as they could and still pay a living wage. But the Minister of Finance and Customs sailed right into this squall as business men thought it was but what really turned out to be a storm, he sailed into this storm with every stitch of canvas spread and as a result we are faced with a loss of \$3,000,000 and I'm afraid that if something isn't done the next time, we will find the spars wiped out the good ship Newfoundland and we will find her a derelict, lumbering about waiting for someone to pick her up and tow her into port.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking as a patriotic Newfoundlander, not as a politician, and what I think we need is a thorough overhauling in all our departments. There's only one way to do this and that's to get some outside experts to come in and point out our mistakes to us.

I know of a large manufacturing concern in the United States, and the Government is really a business, that had a yearly turnover of \$20,000,000, they had efficiency, they made good products, they had intelligent loyal men in their employ yet they couldn't make it pay, the shareholders never got a dividend, and the directors held a meeting and decided to call in experts on the same line of business. These experts showed them their mistakes, showed them waste, and the other factors responsible for their loss of profits. It's like the old idea of be-

ing able to see the trees but not the forest, you haven't the right prospective, your too near the thing, what you need is the long view and this is what the experts had; they were not, in any way, blindfolded or prejudiced.

A doctor can diagnose any case but he doesn't diagnose his own.

Some time ago I was entertaining a great Canadian financier in my house, he said to me "this is a terrible tale of woe I hear from all the business men of your city, each one tells me the same story, yet neither can tell me the cause of it." Now, he said, if Sir Richard Squires hadn't been elected last election, you would be in his position now, and what would you do?

I said "Well, I would thoroughly overhaul the administration end of the Government; I would obtain some expert advice on the matters I require it on; I would go to London and I would take Mr. Keating with me and I would ask the British Treasury Board to lend me two good men to go into our financial difficulties thoroughly.

I would institute a thorough reorganization of the Civil Service. I would make some educational tests for young men desirous of obtaining inside jobs. If it is necessary to preserve our denominational balance this can still be arranged. One dislikes mentioning matters of this nature in the House. It is terrible to think that before we can give a man a job we must ask him what church he goes to.

I want to assure every member of the Civil Service, regardless of what may be his political record, that he will get a square deal from our party. I want every boy and man in the service to understand that if he shows efficiency, ability and industry that he

may rise to Deputy Minister of the Department.

The boy should go in from the beginning and work his way up and then we will have a good capable civil service. At present we have none of this, there is no interest shown in the work nor is there any esprit-de-corps. It is not good to hear that when a member of a Department is on holidays the other clerks apply for overtime for doing his work. Mr. Chairman, I've never heard of such a thing before in any business, and until there is a general reform of the whole Civil Service there will be no improvement and as I said before no esprit-de-corps. If I was in charge of the Government I would give the Minister of Finance and Customs far more power than he has at present, and when I am in charge I will see that he gets that power.

It is true that he has charge of the votes for the different departments but he has no direct control over the spending of these amounts. The Minister should have charge of all the accounts and then he would be in the position that he would know exactly what had been spent, what it was spent on and how much was left.

Last fall he was going about the streets wringing his hands in despair and wondering what he was going to do. The expenditure was going up on all sides, the Revenue was down, and I say that if he had then had the power, the straight-mindedness and the courage he would have informed the different departments of the conditions existing and refused to grant the departmental heads the amounts they were looking for for unnecessary and wasteful expenditure, and I say again that there is a great deal that a Minister of Finance can do if he would make up his mind to do it, but in order to make a success of it he must

hold the purse strings and keep them tightly tied.

I think that the amount spent by the Department of Posts and Telegraphs over which our friend in the corner, with the Sphinx like countenance, has control is \$1,400,000 and I think that that is all together too much money for any departmental Minister to have control of and too much responsibility to place on his shoulders.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—In my department we have financial controllers.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Well, Mr. Speaker, there is not much more that I have to say but there is one more thing and that is that because a country borrows it is not necessarily a mistake. For example if a Company is capitalized at five millions of dollars and finds that it cannot supply all its orders owing to its limited capacity of machinery it would be sound business to issue an extra \$2,000,000 worth of bonds if by doing so they could increase their orders and pay extra dividends to the share holders. As I said there is nothing wrong in borrowing if it is contemplated that they are going to increase their business by doing so, but if the money is borrowed to expend recklessly and extravagantly then I say it is wrong. When we borrow money we should have the earning power to pay the dividends on it but where a mischief comes in is that we are borrowing money, not to earn more money with but to pay the interest on money previously borrowed and to pay off past debts, this is very unsatisfactory. If we were only in the position of production and earning power then increased borrowing would mean increased earning power which is what this country needs today.

I have been looking through some of the records of past Governments and came across some which to my mind were very encouraging.

In 1910 the estimated expenditure was \$2,940,750 or \$12.00 per capita.

In 1930 the estimated expenditure was \$11,343,315 or \$42.00 per capita.

In 1910 our debt was \$22,270,000 or \$95.00 per capita.

In 1930 our debt was \$79,000,000 or \$315.00 per capita.

Figuring this out on a percentage basis we find that our expenditure has increased 250 per cent while our debt has increased 232 per cent. Our population has increased about 12½ per cent.

When with an increase in our population of 12½ per cent. our debt does not increase as fast as our expenditure then I say the figures are encouraging, and I say that if our industries are watched and kept apart from politics our future is not as black as it is painted.

Last week two men, both of them financial men, with good reputations called on me and one of them had a scheme which had an earning power of \$100,000. I told him that the people for him to see were the Government and was informed by him that the Government of Newfoundland was not interested in any plans of this sort. If the Minister wishes I would only be too glad to give him the names of the men.

Mr. Chairman, unless we are going to put the old ship on the rocks or turn her into a derelict hulk then we must do more to economise than we are doing at present. We must work harder and cut deeper, and I feel sure

that if the people of the country felt that a square deal was being done throughout then the Minister would not find nearly as much dissatisfaction as there is at present.

MR. TOBIN—Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to delay the House much in my remarks as most of the discussion has already been covered by the Opposition. Members of this House are no doubt aware that last year's Budget stated that there would be a small surplus, but the books do not show it.

We thought that judging from what was contained in the Budget it would place Newfoundland in a better position financially, but as events afterwards proved, things were not as they were promised.

In the Minister's Speech of a few days ago he told us that the revenue had fallen to nine millions of dollars, and the expenditure had increased to eleven millions, or in other words that the 30th of June, 1930 there would be a deficit of \$2,000,000.

The Minister further stated that the deficit on the Railway was \$750,000.00, \$140,000.00 of which was on account of fishery supplies and fishermen taken to the Labrador on steamers controlled by the Newfoundland Government Railway. I agree with the Minister when he stated that the running expenses of the Railway should be paid out of Current Account and not out of Loans. In the first year of this Government the Minister said that he thought that the Railway should be put under a Ministerial head. I did not agree with him, but I have since been converted to that idea. The reason for my conversion is that by doing this the accounts of the Railway will be laid on the table of the House the same as they are done in other departments of the Government. I very much regret to say that in a

department such as the Railway where huge amounts of money have been spent, that it has been practically impossible for any member on this side of the House to get any satisfactory answers to questions asked in connection with that service.

I certainly think that the running of the Railway and the running of the steamers should be placed in different hands. I think that Mr. Russell is a good railway man, but I don't think the same can be said of him with regard to the running of steamers.

As representative of a fishing district I want to see the fisheries expand. It struck me on listening to Sir. William Coaker's speech what a change had come about in his mind. There was a time a few years ago when nothing was too strong for him to say against the merchants. And the other night he said were it not for firms like Monroe & Co. and others that it would be impossible for the business of this country to be carried on. I am in accord with him in what he said there, and I congratulate him on the intimate knowledge he shows of the fish shipping business. I think, Sir, that no stone should be left unturned by this House in order to induce fishermen by every means in their power to go to the fishery.

There is a lot of talk in this House already about Highroads. I say candidly that too much money has already been expended on Highroads. There is no definite programme for the coming year, and as soon as the House closes we will see scores of machines again plying to and fro on the Roads.

In view, Sir, of our present critical condition. I say we have got to shorten sail. I say that this year only the necessary repairs on the roads should be made, and that roads leading from

nowhere to nowhere should be dropped completely. It's keeping the men away from the fishery for a year and next year if they want to go back, they will not be able to do so, for their gear will have been destroyed. So I say again it is time that we start in to curtail the Highroads policy. It should be the business of every man in this House to get every possible man back to the fishery, for on the fishery we must stand or fall. We have heard a lot in the House this session too on standardization. I am now going to read an extract from a speech of the leader of the Opposition last year on that subject.

(Reads)

Now, gentlemen, that speech contains a whole lot and as I have said before I think it is our duty to see that these men can get a chance to go back to the fishery.

On opening day a speech was delivered in the Legislative Council on the subject of smuggling. I don't know if there is much of this going on or not, but I do know that not very long ago I was talking to a man who had been in the United States during January and February. He went into one of the firms there and asked how it was Mr. So and So could sell such an article at such a price. The head of that firm said: "That's easy," and putting his hand into his desk he showed him a bundle of invoices which could be filled out at his own prices. Now, if that's the case it should be stopped. I have no fault to find with the men in the examining store, but oftentimes one must ask himself "are these men capable of valuing all the articles which come into the country?" At any rate I think the Finance Minister is bound to give the matter his closest attention. It is not my intention to delay the House, and I sincerely hope

that the deficit of \$1,400,000 anticipated will only be that, and that it will not touch the \$2,000,000 mark.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Chairman, as has been said by previous speakers, it is not my intention of delaying the House. Personally, I think that most members of this House are anxious now to finish up with their parliamentary duties and get away to their regular jobs. It seems to me that ever since Responsible Government there has been endless discussion on the business of the country, and it has all ended in discussion. I hope, as a beginner, I will be pardoned for saying so, but for the life of me I can't see why this country has been so retarded and dwarfed all these years. There were people coming here in the time of the Fishing Admirals, and we have had Responsible Government for a good many years now, and still we seem to be no further ahead. But in my opinion the discussion on Ways and Means is one of the major duties of the members of this House.

The Budget Speech says that seven million dollars is our irreducible expenditure, and in spite of our rising expenditure things are getting steadily worse. My view of this Chamber is, that we are concerned to much with trivial matters rather than with major policies. There is scarcely a single letter written to a member of this House but it contains a request for something for nothing; and I say, Sir, that that frame of mind has largely been brought about by the manipulations of politicians.

The Finance Minister has said that Railway investments have cost the country over 45 million dollars. A couple of days ago, speaking here in this House, he didn't seem particularly keen on branch railways, and in that position I agree with him. In

a time of crisis like this any portion of the railway that is not paying its own way should be discarded. I don't see why thousands and thousands of dollars should be expended annually on carrying along a white elephant. It has been said that branch railways have been built entirely through the manipulation of the wiley politician. We are spending too much money altogether on capital account, and with the high-roads it is the same thing.

The figures from 1921 to 1930 show that exports have increased from 25 millions to 40 millions, and this despite the fact that year after year our fisheries have been perishing. I believe, Sir, that if our fisheries had been seriously considered during the past nine or ten years we would be better off now, and the Finance Minister would not have to pucker up his forehead. The Gander would be a very welcome thing. No one appreciates better than I how much such an industry would mean to the N. E. Coast; yet the Gander with its thousand-ton a day mill would do very little towards taking the place of the fishery. A great many people think the government is responsible today for the non-existence of this industry, and, personally, I am convinced that they are to blame. But if they will not carry out their election pledges about the creation of new industries, at least they might do something towards the resuscitation of the fisheries. I know there is a leaning towards a Russian policy in what I am going to say, but I am fully convinced that the Government should seriously consider guaranteeing the price of fish this year. The Government, year after year, spend large sums of money in order to provide employment. It seems to be universally agreed that money spent on non-productive in-

dustries is false economy. But if the Labrador fish were guaranteed \$4 or \$4.50, new life would be infused in that branch of the industry, and if a guarantee of \$5 or \$5.50 a quintal could be given for shore fish, new heart would be put in the fisherman.

But the government does the exact opposite. It takes the fishermen from his boat and puts him on the road with his pick and shovel, and it is putting both the fishermen and the country in a false light. It is only natural that the worldwide depression should strike here, and it is the bounden duty of the government to do everything it can to try to resuscitate and rehabilitate the fisheries. Other countries—Canada, and even outlaw Russia—are doing everything in their power, and borrowing money to get their products in a market where people can afford to pay for them. It is evident that the member for Bonavista East has not lost sight of the necessity of legislation in this direction, and while there are many things in that Bill which everybody won't agree to, still I do think the appeal was made sincerely and deserves support and consideration.

I don't intend to delay the House, but before I sit down there are a few remarks I want to make with regard to the Reparations Fund. I am sorry that the Hon. the Prime Minister is not here to hear what I have to say. I am sorry that the manner in which these payments were made were not according to the traditions of British fair play. Some of us feel considerable diffidence in talking openly about matters which are very close to our hearts, and the members of the House will realise that I mean no mock modesty by that. But the people who have intimate knowledge of the manner in which these payments made have nothing but a feeling

of disgust and intense antagonism, and I use these words advisedly.

Some years ago (I have told this story in the House before) I went to visit a young man from Norris Arm. He had a wife whom he had brought out from the Old Country and whom he had married before he went to France. He was captured at Monchy, and lost his reason through the treatment he received in a hostile country. When that man enlisted, he was passed by seven doctors, he was given every possible test of fitness and passed. When he was discharged he was told by a doctor that he was fine. He was so marked, and discharged. This man was given \$50 or \$100, and I say it is a crime when we see a legal firm get \$500 for the rent of their office, and \$5,000 and \$6,000 in fees for administering the fund. There is also the case of Capt. J. Power, in Harbor Grace, who was blown from the bridge to the deck of the "Eric," and who received \$700. A similar sum was paid a passenger on a liner for the loss of a straw hat. If the Prime Minister is not aware of this, he is not to blame; but if he is aware of it, it reflects no credit on either the Government or the Prime Minister, and I recommend to the Finance Minister that in one or two outstanding cases the awards be reconsidered and justice done.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, in rising to make a few remarks, I want to say that it is not my purpose to delay the business of the House. I don't think anyone could enlarge on the financial statement so ably dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition, but I would like to go back over what my colleague has just said with regard to the Reparation Fund. I would feel I had failed in my duty if I did not take this occasion to register my protest against the manner in

which this fund has been administered. I am not now referring to anyone in particular, but to any civilian who touched that fund. Questions have been asked in this House about the \$12,000 which has been spent in administering this fund, and I am very sorry that the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Squires, Knight Commander of St. Michael and St. George, is not here to listen to what I have to say. I say that this Reparation Fund is a scandal, and a first-class one at that. If he was here he would probably tell us about the Versailles Treaty. I know that it was decided there that combatants who were prisoners of war are not entitled to any compensation.

Let us bring our minds back to when this money was received after the Versailles Treaty. This money was to be divided up. Britain received her share out of it, and Britain said to the Dominions, "Here's your share." To us came our share, and it was locked up, but the men who were in charge of that here wrote themselves cheques and paid themselves as Trustees. Then it came to the point when the present Prime Minister stood up in this House and stated that the prisoners of war were being paid. Yes; they were paid all-right, as low as \$50 and no higher than \$250, for the brutal atrocities and barbaric treatment perpetrated upon them by a ruthless enemy.

Next we find that he had a Commission of three men to advise him as to the disposition of this reparation money, and he was very careful to pick out two majors who had served in the army and one who had served in the navy, to advise him. Advise him about what? However, he did not even take any advice from them and they did not even get a chance to advise him, but he paid

them \$1800 each. Now if the Prime Minister was sincere he would have handed over \$100,000 to these three Commissioners authorizing them to distribute this money to the men who had suffered so frightfully through the war. But, no; just as Sir Richard Squires bluffed the people of Newfoundland before, he bluffs the returned soldiers and prisoners of war now. He told that Commission to go down and examine cases and take evidence. Surely any man who has served overseas did not have to do that, because he already knew all about these cases, but the Prime Minister who knew nothing about them, took it upon himself to pay \$50 to a man who had spent two years and three months in a German prison camp; but the Prime Minister took mighty good care to look after Sir Richard and paid himself the munificent figure of \$5,600 as Chief Commissioner of the Reparation Fund, and \$500 for office rent. The answer to all that is that the Prime Minister was not sincere, never was sincere, and could not be if he tried. This is the same Hon. Sir Richard Squires who is carrying an honor from His Majesty the King, and this is the same Sir Richard Squires who swanks around this country and elsewhere and tries to look dignified in his title of Knight Commander of St. Michael and St. George. As he struts around he is bearing this insignia on his forehead, yet he has not played a man's game with the men who put him and kept him where he is.

Regarding the Versailles Treaty and the competent prisoners of war, already referred to, I may say that there were only 140 claims altogether and the Prime Minister has not even dealt with them. There were only 72 prisoners captured at Monchy, and, as a representative of Newfoundland, you ought to be proud

that only that number was taken and who would not have been taken that memorable morning but that they were surrounded and enveloped by the enemy. These men of Ours were spat upon, kicked, whipped and subjected to all sorts of brutal treatment and hauled along worse than if they were cattle. The German women came up with their cans of water, and when a poor fellow wanted to get a drink, the women would spill the water on the street. I would like honorable members of this House to consider then the treatment meted out to these prisoners of war as compared with what happened when the S.S. "Stephano" was torpedoed—and, by the way, this was the biggest joke ever known, as the "Stephano" was accompanied by two destroyers at the time. However, there were passengers on that ship who were travelling at this country's expense, and who were paid out of this Reparation Fund \$600 each for the loss of their hats.

Now, Mr. Prime Minister, there were only five men in Newfoundland who were prisoners of war, and for whom you were asked to give the major portion of this fund, and you gave them \$250. You, Sir, as Chief Commissioner of that fund, must have known this evidence, and, if you did not, you left it to your advisers whose advice you did not take, and, therefore, you are still more to blame. You gave \$250 to a man who, after being captured by the enemy was posted here as missing. His people went in mourning for him and 18 months afterwards, through the Red Cross in London, they found out he was alive. That man belongs to Catalina and is feeling fairly well today. He was brought to Germany as a prisoner of war and he was the only Newfoundlander there amongst Germans and Frenchmen. There was

a German soldier on the same ward with him who had lost his left jaw. The surgeon there decided to build him a new jaw. It was next decided that our man was the right man to take the rib from to make a new jaw. So they set to work and sawed a rib out of him without even putting him under chloroform—they merely gave him what is known as a local anaesthetic. However, they cut the rib out of our man; he survived the ordeal, and they built a new jaw for the German soldier. Now, Sir, this is no exaggeration of the evidence that came before the Commission. Yet this poor fellow of 'Ours' received \$250, and a comparatively wealthy passenger on the "Stephano," who was travelling at this country's expense, was paid \$600 for the loss of a hat. I think if the truth was all told, the Prime Minister did not know what he was doing in the administration of this fund.

Take another member of 'Ours' who was deliberately maimed by the enemy in the war. When arrived in Germany he was asked: "What did you come two thousand miles to fight for?" And there and then a German surgeon cut the tendons of the man's hand and this member is incapacitated today. He went before this Commission and he got \$250. Another man lost his leg in a German prison camp through pure neglect, and all he got was \$250. And so the same amount was paid to the five of them. I think I have demonstrated the fact that the treatment these five men was nothing short of outrageous. Why, Sir, to be straight about the whole thing, money could not compensate these men for what they went through physically, and the least you could have given them was \$2,000 each. Now, Sir, you had a chance to be generous and you had a chance to do what the people of Newfoundland wanted you to do, and that was to deal with these men who,

unfortunately, were in the hands of the enemy; and you had a chance to do what every man went "over there" to fight wanted you to do.

Take, again, the 72 prisoners who were taken at Monchy. Five of them received \$250 each and the rest of them \$50 and \$100. I would like to know how the Prime Minister arrived at these figures. He was certainly more generous than that on Christmas Eve last when he had a brain wave and started to pay the men who served in the Mercantile Marine. I wonder where he got his advice from then? However, he suddenly found that his brain wave cost money. As far as the prisoners of war were concerned, they have been dealt with improperly and unjustly and the Prime Minister has used all these payments to bluff the public and bluff the returned men. If he took in his three Commissioners to advise him, why did he not go the whole way and say to his Commissioners. "You know the circumstances, you investigate and you recommend the payments." Otherwise, why did he pay \$1000 to one man and \$800 each to two others. These three Commissioners are good men in their way, but why throw away that amount of money. We are told that they had to take evidence and write out records, that every man who had been overseas knew all about. And now it is said they were entitled to nothing.

Referring again to the Versailles Treaty. I say that when the money came to Newfoundland it was up to Newfoundland to decide how it was to be paid out. With respect to the original cases, compensation did not cover them. Reparations did not cover them. Gratuity is the word, and it was up to the Newfoundland Government through the Prime Minister, to give the returned prisoners of war a

decent gratuity, particularly in view of the small number who would receive it. I consider the amount given them is positively ridiculous. The case is parallel to that of a man walking down the street on a muddy day and who is bespattered and gets his clothes ruined. He takes the motor-can man to court and gets judgment for \$50, the cost of his clothes. The Court does not tell him how that \$50 is to be spent; and this is exactly the same position we were in with regard to the British Government. The British Government said, "Here's your share," and it was left to the Newfoundland Government to use its own discretion and judgment as to the distribution of the money. When the fund was divided, Britain dealt with her Dominions, but she dealt with them on a per capita basis, and here I claim we did not get all we should, but if we had persons in charge of the affairs of this country, persons who are reasonable and responsible, I have no doubt but that we would have fared a great deal better than we did out of this reparation fund on the proportionate amount of fighting forces we put up.

Canada is next door and she is getting her share for her population. I think that this unfair; I think it is only a matter which you, Mr. Prime Minister, when you were over there last year, if it had been missed before, could have it taken up then; you could take it up next year. Britain knows what Newfoundland did; she knows in proportion to our population, what fighting force was put up for the army and navy. I am positive that something better would be done; that makes my argument all the stronger for prisoners of war. The money you have on hand; I charge you, here and now, with not having dealt fairly with prisoners of war; not having dealt fairly with returned

men. While there were only 72 prisoners of war, every returned man feels there has been an unfair deal; every returned man feels it should never have cost anything to administer the fund. Every returned man feels that any civilian that touched a five cent piece of this money ought to be ashamed of himself. We feel that way about it, and every Newfoundlander who did anything feels that way about it.

I am going to tell this House that that fund could have been administered from the start, gratuitously, by any Board of citizens, who would only be too delighted. Where was the Newfoundland Patriotic Association who carried on during the war, and who would be only too delighted to look after prisoners of war and administer this fund? What about the Permanent Marine Disasters Board? There are two who would have been only too glad to administer this fund. But, now that flag-waving is done, it is a chance to take easy money, and it takes the Prime Minister of Newfoundland, this Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, this man who did nothing for the war, to step in and take \$5600, and I am here to protest against it.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I am going to move that the Committee rise, and the reason for that is that just now has been placed in my hands the answer to my question, No. 64, in connection with the International Power & Paper Co., which I find the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs is studying very closely. In making that motion, which I hope will be accepted by the Minister, I wish to state that on tomorrow I would like to hear from the honorable member for Trinity South an explanation of the statements contained in these two papers which have just been tabled

as to why conditions of the International contract with the Government have been so glaringly avoided by the Company.

I look upon it as being extremely serious. If it were not for that I would be quite prepared to go on and deal with the matter of the Budget right now. I hope that tomorrow the Minister of Finance and the honorable member for Trinity South, who is one of the Government Directors, will give us some explanation of the situation which, after six weeks of pressing, has been tabled now for the first time.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Would you mind pointing out what the Company have fallen down on?

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I will give you the Sections of the Act. You will find it in detail. It is on Order Paper of March 25th.

(Reads)

Now, if you will look, you will find that as from July 1st, 1928, they were supposed to provide a fund to purchase the Debentures at the rate of 105 per cent in such amounts as would relieve all Debentures by 1973, and also provide trustees with a fund to cover interest on the Debentures for the same purpose. That would amount—mind you, I'm not an expert on figures; I may be wrong on this—I just worked it out in my own mind. It would provide a position whereby on the first of July this year the Debentures ought to have been redeemed; all the funds ought to be in the hands of the trustees to the tune of \$1,000,000 already. In any event, perhaps the honorable member for Trinity South will explain why it is. I think he will agree that this information ought to be before the House in the early part of the session, because this \$10,000,000 guarantee is a very

important part of our financial liability; and, furthermore, why the trustees of the Debenture holders have not reported to the Government about the default; if the Trustees reported, why, when the question was asked, the information was not tabled? The Colonial Secretary is not here today.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I don't see any reason the Committee should rise at this stage. I have no objection to the honorable member having all the information available, but at this stage of the proceedings I don't see why the Committee should rise.

MR. EMERSON.—Perhaps the Minister of Finance and Customs will do the Committee the honor of explaining the statement that the Prime Minister has just handed me.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, my knowledge of these documents is they have not been in the hands of the Government any more than a week. The Directors had to get in touch with Corner Brook and New York.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I am not blaming the Minister for any delay in tabling the document; I did not know they would be referred to at this stage. They should be tabled tomorrow. The Prime Minister brought them along, handed me a copy and gave one to the Minister of Finance. The position is this: The question of this \$10,000,000 and its true position should appear in the Minister's Budget. I don't know whether he thinks that \$10,000,000 is such a small sum of money that it does not need to be considered in the Budget, but I have been asking for this for six weeks, and now certain papers are put in my hands. I agree with the courtesy of

the Prime Minister, putting them in my hand in Committee, and handed apparently for the first time to the Minister of Finance, and I am asking now for an explanation of what they mean. Can he tell how much has been paid off; how much has been paid off under the contract existing today; how much should have been paid off?

MR. GODDEN.—Mr. Chairman, the honorable member for Placentia East wonders why his question has been so long unanswered. I may say that most of this information has been available with the exception of the Auditor's report, which ends on July 30th, that was not available and won't be for a few days yet. That is the only reason why the question has been held up. The auditor's report for July 30th is not of great importance, considering that you have the Auditor's report as to the 31st December, 1930. As to the question you refer to, particularly the Sinking Fund for the Redemption of Debentures, you will see in the auditor's report that you now have, just what has been done in that matter. The report calls for no alarming comments, rather the contrary. The report, coming as it does from one of the most important auditors in Montreal, is one which I would not care to criticise adversely unless I knew there was something to criticise, but their statements of assets and liabilities and their showing of progress since 1928 is one which gives us all cause in Newfoundland for thankfulness. You will see what their liquid assets are.

In the Act it says that they must have not less than half a million dollars liquid assets, but actually they have over \$3,000,000. You will also notice in the auditor's report the fact that the securities held for the Debenture holders are well protected regarding fire insurance, and also that

some of the B. Debenture Bonds have been redeemed. I don't know that there is very much else that I can say as a layman, but I think if the honorable member will go well into that auditor's report and compare it with the latter statement which you have also of the assets and liabilities, you have no cause for criticism.

MR. EMERSON.—Then if this was available, why was it not tabled in the House in reply to my question of six weeks ago?

MR. GODDEN.—The reason was that it was thought better to wait until the answer to the question might be given in full.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, all except one part might have been tabled. I don't think the honorable member is speaking critically correct, the remainder of the question might have been tabled six weeks ago. Now I get part four and five, and the balance is to be given me just as the House is about to be prorogued, and the reason given is because the answer was not available, while now I get part one which was available six weeks ago. The assets and liabilities should have been tabled in the House at the beginning of the session. I would like to ask how much interest was paid, and what redemption was made on the B Debentures?

MR. GODDEN.—I don't think any interest could be called for until such time as they had two and a half millions of assets.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, might I ask the honorable member if he has obtained any legal advice on the subject or whether this is merely his own opinion. Has he asked the Solicitor General about this question?

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this two and a half millions is in addition to the redemption of the bonds and can be taken up in the purchase of property in Newfoundland. So that as it is only a few thousand pounds has been paid off.

The Chairman of Committee left the Chair until 8 o'clock.

The Chairman of Committee resumed the Chair at 8.15 o'clock.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, when the House gets down to the time when we are discussing Ways and Means, or, in other words, the Budget, the curtain is about ringing down on the session of the House. We are now concluding the financial measures introduced by the Minister of Finance and Customs about three weeks ago, and it doesn't matter much what we say now, we can't do anything more than what we have done. The country has seen and heard the Budget and in due time the country will pronounce upon it, and upon the records of finance and the other records of the Government. They must be prepared to face the electors on these records. We, on this side of the House, have discharged our duty as well as we knew how. When we gave our viewpoint we thought we were right, and the Government thought they were right.

I spoke a few words about a week ago a few words of warning. It was, I admit, pessimism. I like to be optimistic; I do not wish to do my country an injury. The man who can sit in his seat and not issue a word of warning to the gentlemen who compose the Government would be recreant in his duty, especially when we feel that we are come to the time when optimism is a very good trait, but a sincere warning note is a better one. We did our duty in warning the government that we have come to

the time when we must take due notice of the financial affairs of the country. I remember the Finance Minister when he was on this side of the House, making a prediction that when Newfoundland owed one hundred million dollars we would have come to the end our financial tether.

The Finance Minister strikes a pessimistic note himself when he asks—and I think with all due sincerity—bearing, as he does, a weight of responsibility on his shoulders such as few Ministers have had to face since 1895: "Where are we and whither tending?"

We collected a very big revenue in 1930, but our expenditure kept up with it. No matter how much revenue we collect, we always get our expenditure to keep pace with it; so that we are always in the hole. We have seen very few occasions indeed when we have shown a surplus. It's all very well for great countries like Canada and Australia to go on borrowing money, because there are people continually pouring into these countries and they have tremendous resources.

The prairies of Canada are an almost unlimited source of wealth, and if the wheat supply falls off, they can rely on mixed farming. But Newfoundland cannot compare with these great countries. Here we are, a small country, with a practically fixed population, and it should behoove every Finance Minister to keep our expenditure down as low as possible. Two years ago, it will be remembered, I asked the Finance Minister to start a Sinking Fund, as conditions at that time were fairly good. He didn't do it then and he can't do it now. But during past years there were times when a sinking fund could have been started in order to take care of our debts. We have now to keep on borrowing to pay off the interest on our

bonds, and there can be no prosperity in a country where borrowing is kept on, with no provision whatever for the future.

England had a large deficit last year, but more than half its deficit was paid into a sinking fund in order to redeem her bonds when they become due. The same thing is being done in Canada and in several other countries. The country that is making provision for a sinking fund in order to meet its debts is on the right road, and the country that is borrowing to meet its debts is on the wrong road. I also warned the Finance Minister last year in connection with the spending departments of the government..

The permanent heads of the departments ought to keep within their votes, but instead of that they seem to be vying with each other to see who can spend the most. Supplementary Supply has to be brought in again for over \$550,000, and that means that the heads of the departments have overspent their votes by that amount. I have always thought that the less money voted in the Estimates the better for the country. It makes it so much harder for the heads of the departments to get money, and it is so much better for all concerned. The office of the Auditor General doesn't seem to care much. The departments are all overspending and there does not appear to be very much check on them. I agree absolutely with the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition when he says that the public accounts should be checked over every night by the Minister of Finance, so that he could see every possible way how the public moneys could be conserved and not overexpended.

The Finance Minister has given us some interesting comparisons in his Budget. During the past few years

our revenue has increased from eight million dollars to over eleven million dollars, but our expenditure has also kept pace with it, and that's the hard part of it. The more we get the more we spend. Every year we have to borrow three or four million dollars to make up our deficits, forgetting that the interest is piling up to such an extent that it will be an absolute millstone around the necks of those who come after us. The cost of government last year amounted to \$45 a head, and if we add the borrowed money it amounts to \$57.25 for every man, woman and child in the country.

It was agreed here, the other day, by members on both sides of the House, that the average earning power of the fisherman was between \$300 and \$400 a year, and with the cost of government at \$288.75 per family, anybody can see where the burden falls. It is on the middle class man—the man with an income from \$1200 to \$2500 a year. The middle class man has to bear the brunt of the burden of taxation, and this class is finding it increasingly hard to live, especially in St. John's. This year, when we have raised the additional eight million dollar loan, of which one million is to go to the Municipal Council, and two millions to the British Government, our public debt will amount to ninety-three million dollars. That \$355.50 per capita, or \$1,850 per family, and with an earning power like we have in Newfoundland, that is far too heavy.

There are some figures the Finance Minister gave out in connection with the Budget, and in dealing with them, I might say that it is not my intention to belabour the question in discussing them at any length tonight, as we have been talking figures practically since the House opened. The Finance Minister told us that the

Railway cost us \$45,000,000 and the war cost \$36,000,000, but since 1920-21 you have raised by way of loans \$54,564,000, and if you add to that the sum of \$5,000,000 of 1931 you will get in round figures \$60,000,000. That goes to prove that a lot of our railway expenditure and war expenditure were taken care of through current account. Seemingly, the figures cannot agree, and I am not mathematician enough to discover where the discrepancy lies, but this is certain, that we have raised by loans \$60,000,-000 within the past ten years. It is quite true a large amount of that money went to pay back loans which we had before 1920.

Now, I would like to refer to the Finance Minister's forecast for 1931-32, both income and expenditure. His forecast for 1930-31 was a bad estimate and he had a deficit of \$1,974,600, and if you add to it that \$1,000,000 he owed the Bank of Montreal, his deficit would be \$1,000,000 greater, or, approximately, \$3,000,000 in round figures. That \$1,000,000 borrowed from the Bank of Montreal went a very large way to relieve distress in the country last fall. A large amount of it was spent on Highroads to keep people employed and to give them the wherewithal to buy food for the winter. Therefore, you cannot strictly call that capital account, although it has been termed so for the past number of years. However, the fact is that it cost \$3,000,000 more to live than the Government collected* in revenue for the year 1930-31 and everybody knows that condition of affairs cannot continue.

The position is that we got to find wider fields to get revenue from or else expenditure will need to be lopped off very considerably. The Finance Minister told us that he collected by way of Income Tax and other

taxes \$812,000 last year. That might have relieved his Budget somewhat, but it did not do any good so far as a surplus is concerned for 1930-31, because the expenditure went up as the income tax went up. For the year 1931-32 the Finance Minister estimates to get through the Custom House \$7,750,000. Last year he got from that source \$7,650,000, or \$100,000 less. That is, I am sure, a very optimistic outlook. Here is a complete list of the revenue and expenditure for 1930-31, as compared with the Minister's estimated revenue and expenditure for 1931-1932:

	Revenue 1930-31	Revenue 1931-32
Customs	\$7,650,000	\$7,750,000.00
Posts and Tele- graphs	600,000	620,000.00
Crown Lands..	110,000	115,000.00
Fines and For- feitures	5,000	6,000.00
Int. Guaranteed Loan	76,000	76,891.08
Broom Dept.	2,000	2,500.00
Inland Revenue Stamps	72,500	65,000.00
Taxes and As- sessments	65,000	65,000.00
Liquor Sales....	400,000	300,000.00
Fees:— Institutions	65,000	60,000.00
Estate Duties....	30,000	50,000.00
Income & other taxes	650,000	600,000.00
Miscellaneous	300,000	300,000.00
Total	<hr/> \$9,920,500	<hr/> \$11,895,100.08
Deficit	<hr/>	<hr/> \$1,974,600.08

	Expenditure	
	1930-31	1931-32
Finance	\$4,973,300	\$5,202,431.08
Colonial Secy.	234,900	124,412.50
Pub. Charities..	325,900	311,537.05
Public Health..	341,000	325,674.00

Justice	406,000	387,857.75
Education	1,025,500	1,013,065.03
M. & Fisheries	504,100	410,697.09
Agric. & Mines	197,300	152,450.56
Public Works....	1,030,500	943,675.50
Posts & Tel....	1,536,500	1,445,585.00
Customs	664,500	549,869.50
Assessors	15,100	15,840.00
Pensions Com.	640,500	634,050.00
 Total	\$11,895,100	\$11,467,146.00

Now some of these figures are very optimistic and I should not be surprised if the Finance Minister next year will realise his over-optimism of this year. So far as myself and my colleagues are concerned, apart from all partisan feelings, we wish that he will be able to come in next year and be able to balance his Budget, and I would not be a true citizen of Newfoundland if I wished anything different, but I say that his over-optimism and his high hopes are not going to be realised for 1931-32 any more than they were realised for 1930-31. For instance, your estimated expenditure for the Colonial Secretary's office for 1931-32 is \$124,000; well, if I know anything about the public accounts, your general contingency account alone will take care of that amount, because more than \$124,000 was spent on general contingency account by that department last year.

Now the total expenditure for the current year is \$11,895,100 and the expenditure estimated for next year is \$11,467,146, or \$428,000 less than the expenditure for last year. Add to that the amount taken for Supplemental Supply and then account for the cut in the salaries of Civil Servants, and you will find that the estimated expenditure for 1931-32 will reach \$12,000,000 approximately. Now, I cannot see where the Finance Minister is going to get the revenue to meet that

expenditure. Most of the business men of the country know what kind of a year we have facing us, and it will take all the ingenuity and all the ability that the Finance Minister possesses to get down near to balancing a budget next year, even with the deficit that the Finance Minister estimates, namely, \$1,350,000. And then, in addition to that, we have the railway to contend with. A great deal has been said in criticism of the railway, but in my opinion we would not be very much without a railway.

Before the war, from 1890 up to 1914, with the progress the nations and countries of the world were making, I think Newfoundland would have been lagging very far behind if there had been no railway. The branch railways were built in 1909, 1910, 1911 and 1912. I don't think these men who were responsible for this policy were dishonest. I think they were honest. It might have been better for the country if the railways were not built. Nobody could foresee the war, which added \$36,000,000 to Capital and Current expenditures. The men whose policy brought the branch railways into being I think were absolutely honest, and they did it for the sake of trying to put Newfoundland in the forefront, as her situation and her position in the British Empire with Responsible Government for 60 years before that time, entitled her to be in; but anybody can see the mistake after the thing is done. I have no hesitation in saying that if the statesmen of those days could have seen that the Great War was going to come upon us in 1914 there would have been no branch railways built.

We have branch railways today, and probably it would be better for the country if the rails were taken up and other services inaugurated, such as bus services, and these things which could

be run very much more cheaply than locomotive engines and the cars that we run there today. Then, as I said the other day, the time may arrive when we shall be able to close down the branch railways, when we shall have to cut our steamer services to the bone, if prosperity does not dawn on Newfoundland during the next three or four years. Anybody can see that is what will have to come; we cannot go on borrowing millions upon millions.

In five years time our interest will be up to \$6,000,000 a year, instead of \$5,000,000. Where the people of this country are going to get the money to pay that, I don't know. We are selling our products today in markets to people who have not the money to buy and pay a high price for them. It was only Friday night we had a debate on the Fish Bill, and we were told that if we did not do something to hold the markets we would have no markets to sell fish to in five years time. That being so, we all, as the representatives of the people of Newfoundland in the Legislature, should give serious thought to what will happen to us if we carry on in the way we are going. In my opinion, that Bill, even if it does pass this House, even if it does go into effect this year, it will be some time before we get the markets back to where they were years ago. I hesitate after the speech that was made here on Friday night, to give expression to any views that could in any way be construed to put a setback on anything that would be done to affect the market for our produce. I have yet, Sir, to be convinced that, and I say this in all seriousness, that that Bill will raise the price of fish one cent. If we do not raise the price of our products, if that Bill does not raise the price of our products during the next two or three years, you see what a situation we are facing.

We have to increase the earning power of our people if we are to do anything to meet the large deficit and to meet the heavy cost of government in this country.

There is no question but that the railway is a big drawback, a half a million dollar drawback every year to the finances of this country. One asks the question, what are we going to do without the railway? Are we going back to 50 or 60 years ago, to the time when our fathers and grandfathers ploughed along, having to go without a railway or without anything? The modern trend of events simply will not let us return to those days. If we want services, if we say we must have steam services and railway services, then the people of Newfoundland, whose incomes are more than \$1,000 or more than \$1500, these are the people that must pay for them in the future. It cannot be the man who earns \$300 or \$400 a year at the fishery.

I agree with the Finance Minister in some things which he has said in connection with the railway. I believe the railway expenditure can be cut down. I have an answer to a question here tabled a day or two ago which shows that the railway for the last two years paid \$27,000 in doctors' fees. I don't believe for one moment that that amount should be paid. I think the Finance Minister should tell the Railway Commission that they should not only co-operate, but he should order the railway management to keep down expenses. I am well aware that the men themselves paid so much per month to pay those amounts, but not half the amount payable to the doctors was collected from the men. One doctor gets everything that is paid by the men at the railway at the rate of 40c. per month, and that doctor received \$17,000 in two years.

The rest of it was taken from the finances of the railway to pay those doctors' fees. I think that is a little bit high; no wonder the Colonial sent back the answer to get more accurate information. There are lots of other things that can be cut down as far as the railway is concerned. I would advise the Finance Minister if he has to go on paying deficits, to co-operate with the management of the railroad and see what can be cut down. That cannot be done by running trains without passengers, by trips across the Gulf without passengers; running up expenses and increasing deficits. I think these things should be absolutely forbidden.

I would like to ask the Minister in connection with the railway and the subsidies, if he has made any progress in collecting from the Canadian Government the \$235,000 that he claims is owing by that Government to the people of Newfoundland since 1923 up to date?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I have not got anything yet.

MR. PUDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance visited Ottawa in January, 1930, to try and impress upon the Minister of the Crown there our claim against the Canadian Government, and I think he thought he had something when he came back. I visited Ottawa in May last, and I was talking to the Minister of Inland Revenue. I asked him—as I was interested in the question myself, as the Finance Minister had told me how he was received and how he expected to get the money—I asked the Minister of Inland Revenue what they were going to do to pay Newfoundland the money that they owed us for the subsidy. His claim was that the Newfoundland Government had to introduce legislation into the House and

pass that Act of Legislation in connection with certain duties, preference duties, that were given Canada, before he would undertake to pay Newfoundland any subsidy. I don't know if he made any such agreement with the Finance Minister, but he gave me to understand that was the agreement; that it would not be done unless it were done on a revenue resolution after the Budget had been tabled.

I came home a day or two before the Budget went through the House. I saw no such resolution in the Budget as I thought was going to be there to enable the Canadian government to see that Newfoundland was sincere in making the bargain that I understood was made with the Finance Minister. That was the statement to me, that they would not do anything until they had absolute faith from the Government of Newfoundland. My own view is that it is not very much good to give a large concession of \$29,000 to get \$35,000. It is almost better to let it go.

The Canadian Government paid Reids a subsidy of \$35,000 for carrying the mails; since this Government took over the railway they have not paid it; surely they owe it to the Newfoundland Government as much as they owed it to the Reid Company in days gone by. I don't blame the Minister for trying to collect it. It has been suggested that something should be done in connection with the Post Office at Sydney; to remove it to Port aux Basques and show the Canadian Government that we mean business, if they do not pay the subsidy. Then their mails would remain on the wharf. I know there would be some difficulties in the way of doing that; I know that we would have to hold up the steamer for two or three hours. I would suggest exploring that to find

out whether it could not be done. I think the steamer remains at North Sydney now for two or three hours to assort the mail. I think if we could not bring the Canadian Government to terms any other way, it might be done that way, even though there is some difficulty in the way. I think we should explore every avenue to make the Government of Canada, who can now get mails brought into Newfoundland free, pay this subsidy even though we have to encounter difficulty.

I have very little more to say beyond expressing the hope that the Finance Minister during the next year will be well within his estimate, for it will give me great pleasure to see that the country is again coming back to prosperity, that prosperity is again showing her face in Newfoundland, and I think the Finance Minister should institute a stringent rule in his Department. He should say: "These are the Estimates! this is the money that you have been voted; keep within that vote." He should give the Auditor General and his staff, who conduct the audit in these departments, strict orders that nothing is to be paid out beyond what is absolutely necessary for the business of the country. May I read an extract or two from the Finance Minister's Budget so as to give emphasis to the House:

(Reads)

I hope that the Finance Minister will put that into practice; that he will insist that these are his views and they must be carried out. Twice already the Finance Minister has expressed those views in his Budget and twice we have had Supplemental Supply of over half a million dollars. The answer is that his authority is being defied. The Finance Minister is the guardian of the purse strings of this country; the Finance Minister, in the last analysis, must come into this

House, face the members and give an account of his stewardship, for three terms: the past year, the current year and the future year. Far be it from me to suggest that anything will be done to hamper the affairs of the country to keep us in a state of turmoil, as we are going to be, if we cannot get the revenue. I do trust that the Finance Minister will fully realise that we must try to do our best to keep our country in the position and the place that she occupies as a unit of the British Empire.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, the remarks I have to make on the Budget will be very short as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and my friend the Hon. member for Bay de Verde have reviewed the position so exhaustively that there is little left for me to say. I see now that we are, at the end of the session having placed before us many Bills of major importance. Bills which call for much serious consideration that should be dealt with by the whole House and not rushed through, as will of necessity occur, because we haven't sufficient time left to give them full consideration, and these Bills need deep thought, not to be hurried before a Committee or Select Committee as the case may be. Now, just at present we are on Supply and tomorrow we have on the Order Paper the Salt Codfish Bill, the Municipal Bill and so on and these are Bills of major importance.

Now I think this Salt Codfish Bill calls for much earnest discussion; it is very important to the country, and it is not fair for the Government to present this Bill and immediately proceed to put it through when the Opposition have had no opportunity to consider it. It isn't fair to the members of the Government themselves; surely the Government must have these Bills prepared for Legislation.

Another thing I wish to draw the attention of the House to is that the Minister of Finance and Customs should present his Budget before the House about half-way through the session, that is in a session of this duration the Budget should have been presented about a month from the closing of the House. That, I believe is the practice in all Houses of Parliament in leading countries, it might be worth while looking that up. Last year the Budget was brought in even later. I realize that certain circumstances, over which we had no control, as for example, the Viking disaster delayed matters, still I think if the Government wish, as I understand they do, to close the house at the end of the week matters might have been better dealt with than they have. It is not the object of the Opposition to keep the House open—far from it; it is their object to close the House. Still, I do not think it right that legislation should be rushed through as it often is; time and again we have evidence in our courts of the mistakes and harm that is resultant to this hurriedly passing legislation because matters have been brought up so late that there is not proper time to deal with them.

Now, I'm often complained of, as being critical, yet I think I'm one of the least critical of men, yet I can't discuss the Budget of our Finance Minister without being just a little critical. I would say that I think that when the Finance Minister presented his first Budget, he, in his youthful exuberance, I think I might term it, his youthful joy at finding himself in such a position, made certain statements. Now, as I will never be Finance Minister of this country, I will take this opportunity of making a few remarks about his financial knowledge, that, when after the next election, I

am sitting on the other side of the House and he is sitting on this side, as I will only be one of the rank and file on the other side, then he will not be able to criticize my actions, that is, he won't be able to say about me what I'm going to say about him now.

Now the Hon. Minister, when he came into power, spoke rather severely of his predecessor, and he, perhaps, under the impression that the large loan he was going to raise would do so, made very optimistic statements. Though he was the one who told us that this should not be done, that the country should know the worst side of the story, the real truth that we could only get so much and that we must spend at least a certain sum. Yet the year which he said would show a profit of \$17,319.00 turns out to show a deficit of \$2,974,000.00. Now I wouldn't like to say what the past Finance Minister would say about his successor, who, after predicting a surplus of over \$17,000.00 has a deficit of nearly \$3,000,000.00 and this doesn't include the railway.

It seems really unbelievable that such a surplus could be estimated and show the deficit it did. I realize of course, that certain circumstances which could not be helped were largely to blame for this, but I would like to point out to the Finance Minister that he should not be so critical of his predecessor when he has seen what has happened to himself.

I do not criticise the Minister of Finance and Customs for being out in his estimates, but I do criticise him for the way in which he criticised the previous Minister of Finance and Customs.

Last year and the year before I questioned him as to his Budget being complete, and this year or at this session of the House I should say, I

spoke regarding the Highroads Commission where all the money that has been spent has been charged to current account instead of being charged to capital account. The Minister of Finance and Customs, under the present regulations, has no control whatever over the expenditure in this Department. What happens is this, he has no idea whatever of the Highroads program, but work is done under this Department until a tremendous overdraft is the result, and the Highroads Commission applies to the Minister of Finance and Customs to meet his overdraft. I contend he should have complete control over the amounts paid this Department by way of salaries, roads, building of bridges and machinery, but this is all done by the Highroads Commission over which the Finance Minister has no control. In other words the Minister does not or never will know what amount is actually spent this year, nor does he know what they contemplate spending during the forthcoming year.

The Minister said that he was going to be the Master of this House, but how can he be the Master if money is spent about which he gets no account whatever. I regret to say that he can never be the Master of the House of Finance if he has no control of the money spent by the Highroads Commission.

A few days ago when this question was brought up in the House he raised the argument that the Highroads Department was not to be a permanent Department of the Civil Service, and while I admit that the argument was good, it is no reason why the Chairman of the Highroads Commission should be allowed to spend such a tremendous sum without the permission of the Minister of Finance and Customs.

Even though this Department does not come under the Civil Service Act, the Minister should have estimates showing the expenditure of that Department and what he needs to meet the program for last year or the program for the coming year, but today the Minister has not got the foggiest notion of what is required for the forthcoming year.

What will happen is this, that one of those days there will be a demand from the Highroads Commission to the Governor in Council to meet an overdraft of two or three or four thousand dollars at some bank, and it will have to be put up without any questions as to the amount or the justification for the extra expenditure.

For years past I have pointed out to the Minister of Finance and Customs about this condition. Since the present Government has come in, a Treasury Board has never operated, and I think a Board of this nature, if operated properly, would be very advantageous to the Minister of Finance and Customs. In England for many years past and in Canada during later years this Board has been found to be of outstanding importance and benefit, and it is only during the last seven or eight years that it has not operated here. I think it is a great mistake that it is not functioning to its full extent, as I really believe that the Minister would find it of great value.

This year we had from the Minister of Finance and Customs his Estimates and Supplementary Supply, but we did not have from him anything for additional Supply, and I feel sure, though I cannot definitely state, whether or not this has ever happened during previous Governments, whether or not this has ever happened during the past twenty years, and he might be able to point out to me one year in

which additional supply has not been asked for. This makes me feel very dubious regarding his Estimates and Budget, and I feel that next year he will have to ask us for additional Supply, and I know that if he was to take the Departmental figures for the coming year for additional Supply, there would be another twenty, thirty or forty thousand dollars added to his Budget for next year.

I think possibly what the Leader of the Opposition said regarding last year's Budget, and the Minister not facing his present difficulties but putting them off for future troubles is perfectly true.

I do not wish to point a finger of scorn at the Minister, but I must say that he has no thought for the future, and last year's Estimates and Budget proved that.

In the fall of the year conditions became such that the Government could not be in any way blamed, but even then the Government, or maybe I should say the Executive Government did not try to face the difficulties which were before them. I believe that had the Government then and there faced these problems we would not have been placed in the position that we are today.

I can hardly imagine that the Executive Government did not realize the difficulties with which they were placed during the fall and winter of last year, and yet nothing was done of a constructive nature to offset these conditions. The result was that during the winter all they did was to bail out dole on an unprecedented scale. I myself, wrote the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary about constructive work that might be done in my district, and they did not even answer

my letter, tho I must say that in a discussion with the Finance Minister he agreed with me about the terrible conditions and the necessity for doing something, but nothing whatever was done, and the result was that in my district dole was still bailed out to people who did not need it.

A man, and a man whose word I would accept, came to me and asked me if there was no way in which this dole could be stopped, and if there was no practicable way in which money might be spent in the District. But in spite of this the Government did not stop, and I ask the Minister now how he can expect to balance his Budget if that is going on. Not a single cent was spent on work that gave any value last year but all the Government did was bail out the dole and I again ask the Minister now how can he expect to balance his Budget if this is going to continue.

This year the Hon. Minister has informed the House that he expects to have another deficit; I sincerely regret that that is the case. Last year it reached the enormous extent of \$2,000,000 and this year I don't believe it will be less than \$2,500,000. Among the things that have not been allowed for is the amount for the extension of the Memorial College of \$100,000 and the \$375,000 for the Districts to get the fishermen ready for the fishery and the additional \$150,000 which I hope is going to be given to the different districts; added to this there is \$120,000, the cost of raising the new loan; my own opinion is that by June 30th there won't be a cent left in the Treasury. Does the Hon. Minister know what the Audit Act is or what it contains. It states that the Government can not get a temporary loan for six months and they will have a whole year to go and I know the Banks won't give them the credit

they will require. The Hon. Minister must bear in mind that banking conditions are not the same today as they were a few years ago and the banks are getting more and more conservative.

To my mind no past Government has been placed in the position that the present Government is and that is, to have no money to face the expenditures they anticipate making. Memorial College, \$100,000; General Purposes, \$375,000; the \$150,000 which I am hoping for the district, but which we may not get, and the \$120,000 the cost of raising the New Loan, this leaves them with a deficit of \$420,000 after paying off the old loan. I feel like advising the Minister to make the new Loan \$9,000,000. In making this estimate in the Budget he has not taken into consideration the International Power and Paper Co., nor the amount owed the Government by the International Power and Paper Co. on their debentures.

I do not like at this late hour to delay the House regarding this matter but must point out that at the present time in my opinion, the \$10,000,000 guarantee given by the Government should be approximately reduced to \$9,000,000. Bonds should have been retired to the extent of \$800,000 and by the 15th of July should be retired another \$200,000. It is a shocking condition of affairs to think that six weeks ago I asked a question in this House concerning this matter. I think it was on March 25th that I asked this question, and from day to day I have been pestering the Government for an answer to this question and am informed by the Colonial Secretary that a cable has been sent for the information. Even if the Government had not the power of appointing two directors to look after their interests, this condition would be disgraceful,

but when we take into consideration the fact that they have this power and can still give us no information, then I say it is criminal.

These directors receive \$2,500.00 per year and do nothing to earn that money; someone is gravely at fault. That is no excuse for the Auditor General. Why did he not report to the Government? The International Power and Paper Company were obliged to reduce these bonds and provision was not made. We heard nothing from the Auditor General as usual. It is time that that Department was done away with.

Having spoken so calmly and with heat for perhaps five minutes, I draw my remarks to a conclusion. I do so in the hope and in the spirit that the turn of the tide has come. I do not mean that we are through all of it yet but I think that the possibility of a fair fishery this year is good and furthermore I think that the prices will be higher. I think that the markets are better than last year. I do not speak in a spirit of excessive optimism except that I look for a boom, I think that conditions are better than they were. We must bear in mind that the fundamental supplies necessary for the fishermen to get to the fisheries are cheaper, conditions, even in Spain, where they had a revolution only lately, are, I think, better than they were last year. While the merchants lost considerable money last year, their conservatism in supplying the fishermen this year will enable them to pay a higher price this year.

I criticised the Finance Minister for making a prophecy; that is mine; I hope that it will be correct.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I think that it is customary before passing

these Resolutions for the Minister in charge of the Budget to make some short reply to the criticisms of the Opposition and I would say at this juncture that the Opposition have criticized the Budget in a very, very fair manner. There was nothing offensive in what they said, I failed to see in any of their criticisms any touch of political tinge and the only criticism they made was in the nature of looking at the situation as a very critical question. I must thank them for praising me and telling me I am the most wonderful man in the country, everything they said was directed to me, you would imagine that I was the only member of this House. That is the gist of their criticisms.

I would say this much, and I wish that my voice could reach the whole country tonight, that not since the days of Responsible Government, has any other Finance Minister been confronted with the situation that I have been faced with. We have heard discussed in various ways how the Budget should have been balanced. Mr. Alderdice says that I charged 1928-29 business to 1929-30 account to show a surplus. That is not correct. The argument he gave was in reference to the Postal business of \$70,000, that argument has been refuted. That was a subsidy for May and June and in previous administrations it was paid from year to year and the financial year started on May 1st and this year we charged up 14 months and it had nothing to do with the small surplus on Current Account 1929-30.

There were several reasons for the accounts being squared last year. The Government was instrumental in collecting considerable outstanding money and they also entered into an arrangement with the Bell Island people whereby they paid \$150,000 on the royalties they owed the Govern-

ment and the revenues collected from these sources helped in no small measure to balance current account. The argument that the cost of the Highroads Commission was not charged up to Current Account is true, the argument put forward was that if the Highroads had been charged to Current Account there would have been a deficit.

I stated before and I state here again now that in my opinion the Highroads is not a permanent Department of the Government. It was started in 1924 or 1925 and I say that it is the greatest curse that was ever inflicted on the country. In 1924 the fishermen were prepared to go to the fisheries but when the work started on the Highroads, the men, especially around Conception Bay would not go to the fisheries and went to work on the roads. That, in my opinion, was the beginning of the disaster to the fisheries in Newfoundland. Therefore, in my opinion, the Highroads are the greatest curse ever inflicted on the fisheries in Newfoundland.

In criticising the Budget the Opposition members have been quite fair and probably not quite frank. I say to the people of this country and I wish that they could all hear my voice tonight, that they have got to realize that we are up against it just as every other country in the British Empire today is up against it. We have only a population of 250,000 and as suggested by Mr. Puddester, we act like a country with a population of 250 million. I attributed in my Budget Speech the present financial condition to the construction of the railway and the cost of the war. The war cost us \$34,000,000 and this amount was found out of Exchequer Account.

It has been suggested in this House that in order to retain the dignity or

the position of a Dominion, or a Colony, of the British Empire we should have partaken in the War. The War is over and I say that Newfoundland could never afford to pay for her part in the War and the Newfoundland Government of the day, whoever they were should have seen that someone else paid the bills. What would we find today if we were \$34,000,000 less in debt; it would mean that we would have to pay one and three quarter million dollars less in interest charges and we would be in a fairly good financial circumstances. However, it can't be helped and we have got to make the best of it we can. I tell the people of the country tonight as Finance Minister, that we cannot better our financial condition without the co-operation of the people and the Departmental heads and the Opposition. Without that co-operation we cannot hope to better our financial condition.

My position now is almost like the head of a glorified Labor Bureau, with people coming around from morning till night, I don't get time to think about the finances of the country. I've tried to tell the whole story openly, and I want to say now that every one has got to do his share in trying to put the vessel back on an even keel. Mr. Alderdice referred to the position of the country, as like a ship sailing into a storm with all sail spread. I agree with him that the only way for us to get on now is to double reef her. People now seem to have the idea that there are barrels and barrels of money in the Treasury and all we've got to do is to bail it out in bucketfuls. I don't know what makes people think that.

I don't want, Mr. Chairman, to appear unduly pessimistic. If I wanted to be pessimistic, I'm afraid I would have presented a very different Bud-

get. I wanted to be as optimistic as I could for the sake of the country. When I was on the other side of the House and used to criticize the Finance Minister of the time, conditions were very different then. There was more revenue coming in and more avenues were open. The cost of goods was higher and our duties being collected on a ad valorem basis, our revenue was higher. Now goods can be got for little or nothing, certainly at prices greatly below market values of twelve months ago.

Nearly all the textile goods that come into Newfoundland today are practically given away in the United States and the position we take in the Customs Department is that we try to do the best we can to value these goods and to carry out the law. As a matter of fact I have held up a lot of goods both in St. John's and outside of it in order to have them properly assessed.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
You have drifted away from the point. I want to see Newfoundlanders kept at work.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Do you mean that I want to see a crowd of men out of work? That is the impression you are trying to create. The Hon. member made mistakes as well as I have.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
I have admitted them.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I have not heard you. I said here the other day that the man who does not make a mistake is no good, and I repeat that assertion now. There is very little more I can say on the Budget because when one talks on local industries it touches the heart of the Leader of the Opposition, but if I were interested in local in-

dustries I could tell some interesting things.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
You were interested in a certain local industry one time and you were very glad to get out.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Sure we were forced out because of a similar industry right here in the city today which is making handsome profits had got such a large protection, and more than they should have, that we were unable to compete with them. Now I think I made a mistake in these Resolutions, as I should have incorporated in them a further reduction on imported tobaccos. This industry is controlled largely by a big corporation in the United States and they concentrated down here and put the industry I was interested in out of business.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Their prices were so low that your firm could not meet them and that is why you closed down.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—This local industry business started here before I was born.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
And yet you think they should be burnt down.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The statement I made in that particular case was misconstrued just as another article which appeared in "The Watchman" was misconstrued and I am now going to refer to it.

(Reads Article in "Watchman")

I said that through an error on the part of the Accountant at the Post Office \$76,000 did not appear in the Estimates for Supplementary Supply, and I said if that were so the surplus

showed would not be so large but for the mistake that was made.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
I said if that was correct your surplus would be cut in two.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—You ought to bring your man of the "Watchman" to task. I have been accused of saying last year that our local industries should be burnt down. This paper does not matter much to me. I know that it is only published for the purpose of publishing the guff that the "Telegram" and "Daily News" refuse to publish. Any how I am glad I am not interested in that paper and do not want to be. However, Mr. Chairman, the criticism of the Budget by the Opposition has been fair, but principally for the reason that they could not offer the House any constructive criticism.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS—Mr. Chairman, I would crave your indulgence to refer to a report that appeared in the newspaper "Watchman" relative to an incident that occurred when the Estimates for Steam Subsidies were up for debate. It might be considered alright for some members of this House to make a joke out of misrepresentation but I dont. If the paper referred to members of the House only I would not rise in my seat to reply to it; but a statement has been made in the "Watchman" which reflects upon the efficiency of an official of the Government who happens to work in the Post Office, and I would not be performing my duty as head of that department if I would not draw the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the article, as I notice that his picture embellishes the pages of every issue of this paper. We presume, therefore, that the statements contained in this paper from week to

week are known to the Leader of the Opposition.

Now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in this House appears to me a man of honest intentions, as he is fair in debate and he deprecated the practice of making statements in this House in reference to men who are outside of this House and unable to defend themselves. I admire him for taking that stand as I do not think he would knowingly be a party to circulating throughout the country anything that would defame the ability of a reliable and decent official of the Government.

And now I feel that all I have to do is to draw this article to the attention of that gentleman and he will cause a correction to be made in the columns of that paper. So far as I am personally concerned, I never got a fair report from an Opposition newspaper at any time during the seventeen consecutive years that I have occupied a seat in this House. When in Opposition I admit I talked a lot but I was never fairly represented; but I will not stand for anyone in my department to be treated indecently and to be held up to ridicule by a venal press run by pure hirelings who will print anything you want if you pay for it. We have read in Sacred history of the thirty pieces of silver given to betray his Master and I have no more respect for certain people who write to the local press and for the one who wrote in the "Watchman" than for the individual referred to in Sacred history. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition persists in making a joke out of this, my respect for him will be lowered 100 per cent. I look upon him as an honourable man, one who would not do anything to injure another, and all I ask now is for a retraction to be made.

In the first place I am represented as making a false statement, but worse than that it says here:

(Reads.)

There was no mistake made by the Accountant at the Post Office. We all know that with regard to Steam Subsidies, they should not be paid from the Post Office; in the matter of accounting, it has gone on from year to year; if the Government employs a steamer to bring fishermen from Labrador it is charged up to the Post Office.

Now I will give an explanation as clearly as I can about that \$70,000. The Accountant at the Post Office will only do what he is authorized to do by the Executive Government. We have two men there from the Auditor General's Department; we have Mr. Howley and Mr. Ivany, who pre audit; every bill is pre-audited; every bill is scrutinized by these men before a cheque is drawn or signed for payment, and one thing leads me on to another. I may refer to a remark made by the Hon. Member for Bay de Verde. He said that the departmental heads vie with each other to see who can spend the most money. It is unworthy of the Hon. gentleman to make such a statement. I am supposed to be the head of the Postal Telegraph Department. What have I to do with the finances of that Department?

MR. PUDDESTER—What did I say?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS—That the departmental heads vie with each other to see who can spend the most money.

MR. PUDDESTER—I said permanent heads.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHHS—It is unfair, you don't know what you are talking about.

MR. PUDDESTER—If they did not spend it you would not have half a million dollars Supplemental Supply over the expended vote.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—They did what they were authorized to do. Blame your auditing department if you are going to blame anyone for over expenditure. Get back to the Executive Government and blame the Government for it and not the departmental heads.

Now about the \$70,000. This year we are paying for 14 months subsidy, and the Finance Minister is honest enough to try to arrange payment of subsidies so that we will pay for the 12 months beginning the fiscal year July 1st. The Finance Minister of 1924 did not pay for the months of May and June; he only paid for 10 months of that year; ever since then the railway has to wait for the month of July to get payment for the months of May and June. Last year a Minute was made by the Executive Government:

(Reads.)

That was made after the House closed last year, and a copy of the Minute was sent the Accountant to govern himself accordingly.

Now if there was a mistake; if at any time the amount in the Budget for steam subsidies showed less than it really was, it happened four or five years ago, and now we are rectifying it. When we try to rectify and do what you are asking us to do, to try to put all our expenses before the Legislature here, it is misrepresented. I admit it may not be misrepresented intentionally but through ignorance just because you thought you had something against the present Finance Minister. That should have shown Minister. That amount of \$76,000.00 should have shown four or five years

ago. He should have shown that the first year we came in and showed that the deficit of the last year of the preceding Finance Minister was \$70,000 greater than it showed.

MR. PUDDESTER—Just recall what happened before you explain.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—We find the Supplemental Supply as far as the Post Office is concerned: (Reads.) That was paid for May and June; every steamer was not paid the previous year. If you subtract \$76,000 from \$94,000 you will find that our Supplemental Supply for the Post Office was not very great; we kept fairly well within our votes. I think, Mr. Chairman, I have made sufficient explanation so that I hope the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will draw the attention of the reporter of the "Watchman" to the statement I have made, as in all fairness to the Accountant of the Post Office a correction should be made.

Allow me to give the Hon. Leader of the Opposition a bit of advice. Evidently his ambition is to become Premier of this country; "Newfoundland's next Prime Minister." If you think Mr. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Coming Prime Minister, that you will help yourself to attain that worthy position by allowing these things to be printed in this paper, so objectionably and so plainly wrong that anybody knows the statements are wrong, you are defeating your own purpose.

There are certain papers printed that are subsidized by the Opposition and perhaps subsidized by certain members of that party—a thousand times better they were never printed. People have said to me "I don't know what to believe; I have read certain things; I know they are wrong; other things I don't know whether they are right or wrong; I have come to the

conclusion therefore to believe nothing that is printed." Every Government has sins of omission and of commission; stick to those and you will attain your object much quicker than you will by allowing wrong statements to be published and broadcast throughout the country. Now, that is a bit of honest advice.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, thank you. I must congratulate the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs on his loyalty to his supporters. I think when he is loyal to his supporters they will in turn be loyal to him. What influence I have is very little. I will try to induce the Editor of the "Watchman" to make that needed correction so far as the Accountant at the Post Office is concerned. When we saw that \$70,000 odd dollars specified in Supplemental Supply, and I think we asked the Minister of Finance and Customs about it, and he said it had to do with a sum after last year, we took it that it was something left behind by the Accountant of the Department. Now that it is explained it is very simple and intelligible. It will be a pleasure for me to make things right for the Accountant.

As for this abuse in the paper; I don't see why one should mind it. I get lots of it. I get called all sorts of things; in fact the other day I was told I was a louse; I was told I was making use of my position in the House to benefit my own private ends. It does not alter the even tenor of my way in the least degree. They can abuse me if they will. I will tell the honourable gentleman to take it in the same way. It is like throwing mud; it does no harm only to the person who throws it.

Now as to how it happened; at the time I had no explanation; I could only take the explanation that was

offered by the Minister of Finance and Customs.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, When it was introduced I asked you about the \$94,000 and you reminded me of what I said last year; there might be certain votes outstanding that if included in your Budget you would not balance it at all. The explanation to me as far as the Post Office was concerned was that you had discovered that \$70,000 after the House was closed and it was transferred from one year to another.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, in connection with an article in which I am referred to I wish to more or less agree with the position taken by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; we were not fully informed; whose fault it is I don't know. You have to bear in mind that newspapers do not know, they go by the information given them. It is not the intention to misrepresent the Honourable Minister.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—They did not go by the information.

MR. EMERSON—I will read the whole thing if you like.

(Reads.)

The point I want to make is this, as my name is mentioned, it says the Honourable Minister and I had what we may call a passage of arms. I don't think we ever had a passage of arms of any importance. The Minister knows perfectly well that I never have a passage of arms if I can avoid it, it is only when it is forced upon me.

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 introduce a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act., 1925" 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 Further 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 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 Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Further 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.

requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order 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 for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending the 30th day of June, 1931, and the 30th day of June, 1932, and for other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 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 the 30th day of June, 1931, and the 30th day of June, 1932, and for other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Reduction in the Public Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 1931-32" 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 Respecting a Reduction in the Public Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 1931-32."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 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 Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Reduction in the Public Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 1931-32" 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 it had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively, "An Act to Amend the Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Company,'", "An Act to Facilitate the Operation of the Newfoundland Hotel," "An Act to Amend Chapter 76 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund,'" and "An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An

Act to Amend the Criminal Law." without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, Limited," with an amendment in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendment was read a first and 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 passed without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 21 George V., Chapter 14 (Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930") with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendment was read a first and 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 passed without amendment.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Law relating to the Employment of men engaged in Logging Operations.

Mr. Downey, on behalf of the Select Committee presented the following report:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill respecting the Grant of Land on Labrador to the International Grenfell Association beg to report that they have considered the said Bill and recommend its adoption.

(Sgd.) J. F. DOWNEY,
E. J. GODDEN,
WM. EARLE,
J. A. WINTER,
H. W. QUINTON.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister what the programme will be for to-morrow, will we have the Municipal Bill or the Salt Codfish Bill first? I want to say a few words on the Municipal Bill.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If you like we will go on with the Municipal Bill first.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, In the English House of Commons it is customary to ask the Prime Minister towards the close of each session what the programme will be for the next session and he states in a general way in what order the business will proceed, it helps a great deal in facilitating the business of the House.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, yes, it is very helpful and I would go further and say they arrange certain limits for debate so that at a certain time the House can take a vote on a matter so that members can be present at that time. If it meets with the pleasure of the House we will start tomorrow with the Municipal Act and follow that up with the Salt Codfish Bill.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions on the Order Paper which remain unanswered, the time is drawing short and we would like to have all these answered in the next couple of days.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 12th, 1931.

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

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Hearts Content on the subject of a road. The petition is signed on behalf of the members and people of the United Church of Hearts Content. They ask for an allocation of \$300 to repair the public road which badly needs attention and which leads to the place which has been recently acquired to be Consecrated as a new Cemetery. I give the petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the district of Bell Island on the matter of re-building the public wharf at the beach there, and I crave your permission, Sir, to read it to the House.

(Reads Petition)

This petition is very largely signed by the residents of all sections of the Island. The petitioners point out that

at the present time there is only a small Government wharf there and it is totally inadequate for the people who this year have the spare time to go fishing and to engage at agriculture and they want some place large enough for the landing of fish manure.

The people of Bell Island are very industrious but at present they are working only week on and week off with the Company. They are intended to give their spare time to fishing and agriculture, and I think they should be helped out by having this wharf put in condition for the purpose they require it. In view of the present financial state of the country, I am not going to ask the Government to build new docks over on the Island, but to be fair to the country, to the petitioners and to this House I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries with the request that they send an Inspector there and have this wharf put in a suitable condition.

I would also like to refer to another matter in my district in connection with wharf extension. Now the public wharf at the beach is small and is not used by the mail boats and I would like to report this matter to the House and to the Department of Justice. Some years ago under the Morris Government there was a contract made with the Bell Island Transportation Company. The Company had a contract for 20 or 25 years and it was for building a wharf and a tramway from the beach to the top of the Island. Now I would like to draw your attention to two sections of that contract, numbers 11 and 13. Section 11 reads as follows:

(Reads Section)

Section 13 reads:

(Reads Section)

I want to point out that during the past few months this tramway company have been levying a fee on motor cars at Bell Island for going over this wharf. I think the Department of Justice should give a ruling on this matter as I believe the public have the free use of this wharf at all times. At present motor cars are charged 50 cents for using this wharf. Also there is a tax levied on freight coming from Conception Bay and landed on that wharf.

I beg to support the prayer of the petition and asked that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for consideration.

Hon. the Solicitor General presented Report of the Select Committee on the Closing of Shops Bill, as follows:

To the Honorable House of Assembly:

Your Select Committee appointed to consider the Closing Hours of Shops within the Electoral Districts of St. John's (City) East and West, beg to report the said Bill with the following amendment:

Add the following as Section 11:

Nothing in this Act contained shall render the owner or manager of a shop liable to any penalty for supplying at any time any article required for immediate use by reason of an emergency arising from sickness, ailment or death (Providing that nothing in this Section contained shall authorize any person whomsoever to keep open a shop after the hour appointed for the closing of such shop.)

(Sgd.) F. G. BRADLEY,
F. C. ALDERDICE,
J. A. WINTER,
G. G. BYRNE.

On motion this Report was received and it was ordered that the said Re-

port be referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men engaged in Logging.'" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time later.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the International Grenfell Association."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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 the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I feel that

I should express this afternoon, through the medium of the Chair, the sincere regrets and sympathy of the members of the House towards the sudden passing of Mr. Conroy who was Solicitor for the Municipal Council and who was primarily interested in the drafting of this Bill on behalf of the Municipal Council. He was a very young man—31 years of age. His grandfather, the late Judge Conroy, represented the district which I have the honor to represent to-day. I feel that I speak for members on both sides of the House when I say that we are very much shocked to hear of his death, and I feel that the sympathy of all will be extended to the widow and children, as well as to the parents at his very sudden passing.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

M. Chairman, I desire to associate myself with the honorable mover of this Bill. Certainly Mr. Conroy's death came with startling suddenness. He was deeply interested in this Bill. Like the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, I desire to say that we sincerely sympathise in the bereavement with the widow and children and the parents are now called to bear, and I trust that God in His mercy may soften their grief.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, in introducing this Bill I desire to say that there are amendments being considered. Section 30 is the last section of the Bill now, because we have taken out a great many sections. The idea of that amendment is this:

(Reads)

We remember that a short while ago there was a feeling that the Government were indebted to them on account of past years grants which were supposed to be allocated to districts in

the city, that is St. John's East and West, had not found their way into the Municipal Council. The Council feel aggrieved and consider that in some sense that they have a case against the Government. The Government, on the other hand, feel, and it is the general concensus of opinion of people on the street, that the Municipal Council have no action whatever against the Government. This amendment which the Government is putting in will do away with any action, one way or the other. While our friends on the opposite side may feel that we should not do that because it may not be altogether right, I understand that the Mayor himself has no serious objection to its being put in. I am told today—I have not seen him—but I am told today that he has no serious objection.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, it is not because the honorable gentleman argues that a great many men on the street say that the Municipal Council has no case, that therefore they should be prevented from appealing to the Supreme Court. I think the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs received a letter from the Mayor the other day. I received one, in my official capacity, in which he says—I read it very hurriedly—this paragraph is on the third page:

(Reads)

Probably the death of Mr. Conroy has delayed the withdrawal of the writ. I can't see where there is any attempt at justice in this amendment. If the City Council have no case, why do the Government need to introduce a section to prevent the Council from taking action? If the Council have a right to that money what right have the Government to prevent their taking action in the Supreme Court? I

think the whole thing hinges on these two alternatives: Either they have a right which should not be sacrificed, or else they have no right and there is no necessity for the amendment. I think it is a most high-handed proceeding.

If it be, as the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs states, that the majority of opinion is that they have no case, let them go ahead. Let the fool see his folly out—I will put it that way. If they have a case surely it is most unfair for the Government to try to stop them. Not only the City Council, but the next thing it will be some individual who will have a just claim against the Government, and then by some amendment and in some way in which lawyers are able to accomplish these things, they will prevent his taking action. I don't see any difference between the Municipal Council, which is merely a group of citizens, and this action taken by the Government, than if it were taken against one individual. Therefore, I will most certainly vote against the amendment.

PT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.
—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is right. Supposing the Council has a claim against the Government for \$100,000. If we thought there was a claim against us, we would immediately suggest it to the Committee that the amendment be made to this Bill providing that the Government will put in a Trust Fund all moneys as they go from the Government to the Council so that a Trust Fund may be created to liquidate any claim the Council has. Perhaps that would be a better way to handle it.

There is no reason why the Government should be paying to the Council every year thousands of dollars and then having paid out that money, find

that we have to pay it back. It is a very simple thing to settle that all these moneys should be paid into a Trust Fund so that the Government would be enabled to liquidate any claim that the Council may have against the Government. It ties up any grants that they would get this year. We don't want to tie it up.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I want to see justice done.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.
—It is not so advantageous to the City as if the thing were dealt with in a sensible manner.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.
Mr. Chairman, I never could see any sense in injustice. I see that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister wants to tie up the grants. Let him do so, by all means. I am the senior member for St. John's East and so far as my authority goes, I authorise him to do so.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.
—Mr. Chairman, the Government has no objection; but the Government would not desire to engage in a series of litigations with the Municipal Council and be tied up for the next four or five years, with a possibility of having the matter go to the Privy Council. It is not a situation which tempts the Government or which anyone courts, and I may say that I would not care for our taking the responsibility of a million dollar loan and handing it over to the Municipal Council and then find that they had actually signed and sworn to a document to be served on us, which would be served on us today after we had passed our Bill. I would not negotiate with them under these circumstances at all.

I might point out that Mr. Conroy had his writ made out and his affidavit sworn and he waited until the

Bill was received favourably by the House to serve the writ.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Chairman, may I say that I had a discussion with the Mayor the other day, and it is not his intention to go ahead with this claim. I might add that of late much relief work has been going on in the city and this might have been made the Council's responsibility. If we let the matter go to the Courts we will become involved in a huge lawsuit, the lawyers will be a year over the claim. I think the Mayor was quite right in writing the Prime Minister and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as he did.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I think it would be a stain on the Government to put in the amendment.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks on this matter. I don't believe that anyone is worrying about the workers of the city. We asked for permission to raise a loan and the Government wouldn't allow it, but they did raise a loan for us, and except for the fact that the Government secured the loan for 93, whereas the Municipal would have had to pay higher, everyone is talking about helping us. Now I'm speaking for the citizens of St. John's, and I would like to tell the Hon. the Prime Minister that if he'd given us permission to raise a million and a quarter dollars all this friction would have been avoided.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in explanation of the matter before the House, perhaps I should have made them at the beginning of this discussion. On Friday the Prime Minister was served with a writ by Mr. Conroy and he expressed himself rather strongly and with some heat. On Saturday Mr. Conroy called on me and

we discussed the matter frankly. He asked me my opinion and I told him he was wrong and explained why and he agreed with me, but he explained that the Council had no intention of taking action against the Prime Minister, or the Government, but at that time they did not know whether the Government would introduce this amendment into the Bill and they felt that if this was done, then this would be a forceful way more so than a notice, but they had no intention of proceeding with the prosecution.

I told him that I thought it was very poor diplomacy to call the Prime Minister out of the House and serve the writ on him. He agreed, but said that the Council had instructed him to do so as a means of showing that they did not relinquish their claim. Perhaps I should have made this explanation before. Now I think it resolves itself into purely a matter of whether the Government should or should not bring in legislation to take away the right of a citizen, or a number of citizens, to sue the Government. What you are doing is to take away A's right to sue B. Why should this be allowed? Every day people are suing the Government. Perhaps the Mayor has not intended, or does not intend to sue, but he won't be Mayor always. What about future Mayors? Why introduce this amendment if he does not intend to sue? Future City Councils may sue the Government. We have had 15 or twenty Mayors who have not sued the Government in this respect.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I think you are mistaken there.

MR. EMERSON.—Oh, no I'm not, this claim has been going on since 1880 when the Act was passed. This was before the Hon. member was imported or should I say exported. I think if the Hon. member will look

up the history of his adopted country he will find this fact correct.

I think this is a very important piece of legislation, possibly the most important we will have had before us this session and I don't see why the right to make this claim should be done away with and if the Council wishes to sue then let them fight it out in the Courts.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I suggest the Committee rise, I hope that Mr. Emerson has satisfied his leader that he has studied his Newfoundland History.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Cod-fish."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, if I went through the different sections and explained them, the members could ask questions afterwards.

(Reads)

That is compulsory. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries must call a meeting a month after the passing of this Act, and he then organises the As-

sociation and they appoint their president and officers.

(Reads)

There must be an annual meeting in April of each year.

(Reads)

Three men are to be appointed on the Board, that is the executive; one man must be appointed within three months, another within six months; the Association to fix salaries and fill vacancies, etc.

The Governor in Council has power to approve, they cannot reject and they have no power to amend.

In Norway and Iceland they have an elaborate system of inspection under Government control. Conditions are very different there from what they are here. The fishermen there only catch the fish; they do no curing. There are stations along the coast which purchase the round fish, and they do all the curing and grading, etc. In Newfoundland there are thousands of fishermen scattered along a coastline of 2000 miles, and they do all their own curing. In Norway and Iceland they sell their fish green.

• (Reads)

The Association cannot make a rule unless approved of by 60% of the members.

The only thing compulsory in the Bill is that every merchant must be a member of the Association and the Association must establish a Board within three months.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, we haven't got the capital that we had ten years ago.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, when we were returned in 1919, before taking office, five or six of the biggest exporters met with the

late Justice Warren and Mr. Dunfield, and we considered the establishment of certain regulations. The Government, under the War Measures Act, established a Board of seven exporters which comprised some of the biggest men in the country, and the exporters formed an Association, and all except three of four joined. The only mistake made under the old regulation was the fixing of a price on fish, that was the only weakness, and this was done at the request of some of the biggest men in the fish business.

With regard to Jamaica, they buy outright. This market was originally supplied by Halifax, and we are following the custom set up by them in selling outright. In Brazil there is no consignment; they like to buy outright, and the only trouble there is with regard to settling claims. They usually make a claim whenever the price goes down and that's where the powers of the Association would come in, in bringing about a certain amount of unanimity between local merchants regarding values and the settlement of claims and securing of information.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Chairman, as I take it a cask of fish can't be exported unless the stamp of the Association is on it. Won't this call for a tremendous number of Inspectors? We shall have to have Inspectors all over the country.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I want to say that my only reason in taking such an active part in the discussion was to try to get as good a Bill as possible.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Committee for the very close attention they have given the Bill. My only regret is that some of those who should have done most to help failed to do so.

I agree with the Hon. member for Placentia East who said in matters of this kind suggestions ought to be of a constructive rather than a destructive nature. After a period of two or three years I feel sure the benefits of this enactment are bound to be felt, and as we go on we can, from time to time, change and alter it as circumstances arise in order to attain perfection.

What we got to do in dealing with this matter is to be big enough to deal with it in a broad way. You must remember that this is an occasion when you are not dealing with the North or the West, but you are dealing with the people of Newfoundland as a whole, and you are dealing with them in such a way that you are going to do for them and the trade generally what they cannot do and will not do for themselves in a voluntary way. My firm can get through alright without any aid or assistance because of my long experience in the fish business; but there is a very considerable number of people who will benefit by the enactment into law of this Bill, whose experience has yet to be paid for if we go on as in the past.

Now I do not think the Association is going to do anything in the way of shutting out any man who wants to export codfish. A funny thing about the exporters is that at any meeting I ever had with them I found them the most reasonable lot of men I ever came in contact with; but they could never agree so far as regulating the exportation of fish went after the meeting ended. Now if there is anything further Hon. members would like to know concerning this Bill I shall be only too pleased to furnish the information if at my disposal.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I would like

to say that I am unqualifiedly in favor of this Bill and I consider that many years ago such a law should have been on our Statutes. It would, however conferred a far greater measure of benefit upon the people of the country generally if it was sufficiently clarified so far as the West Coast is concerned. Now, if the Bill passes in its present form the West Coast people will be placed in a most anomalous position. With the Bill framed as it is you got to have a premises and be able to export 2500 quintals of fish in any one season, but, owing to the natural conformation of the harbors on the West Coast, there are no places there to build a premises and no harbour there for schooners to lay and because of that a skipper is practically debarred. Now there are a few of the men on the West Coast who ship their fish in schooners to Halifax but do not send 2500 quintals; but there are a number of people who export from 1000 to 1500 quintals.

Unless the clause is sufficiently clarified to enable the people to do business in an unrestricted way I cannot support the Statute. We have no connection with St. John's. I was under the impression that we can do far better at Halifax than St. John's. We in St. George's District and in Port au Port are in the same position as the shippers from the Labrador. There are no water side premises on the Labrador, and I think that the present shippers at St. George's who are very many, will be absolutely put out of business. I will be quite satisfied if we get a change so that the regulations as enacted by the House will not affect St. George's District, and there are others that are in the same situation as ourselves.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I know of several who are of opinion that when

the Bill was drafted it was to be brought before a full Board. That has not been done. I know one large shipper who says that if this Bill goes into effect he will not purchase any more fish.

It is very hard to get a certain number of men to decide on a certain grade of fish. There is such a difference in grades of fish; it is a pretty hard job to get a recognized standard for fish.

I remember on one occasion Hawes sent one of their best men to pack a cargo of fish that Mr. Tessier would not pack; Hawes' man packed it and shipped it over; what was the result? No doubt the Leader of the Opposition knows too well that was done by one of the Hawes group who inspected that cargo and packed it. They knew it was not suitable, and I guess it cost them quite a few thousand pounds. One may say that fish is good and the other man may say it is not.

I think this is going to bring more disaster to the country than we have at the present time.

MR. PUDDESTER—How much cullage fish did we have last year? Take an average year, how much West India fish would we have in a million and a quarter quintals?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—I should say about 25,000 or 30,000 quintals. Last year, 1930, 49,000 quintals went to Barbados. West India is the worst grade of fish. We shipped 80,000 quintals to Jamaica.

We shipped 200,000 quintals of fish to the West Indies last year.

MR. PUDDESTER—My point is this; under this Bill how much fish would you have to ship? How much would it increase our sales to the West Indies?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—
It won't increase them any.

MR. PUDDESTER—We will have lots of fish under this Bill that we can't send to the Mediterranean as No. 1 and 2. We send it out and it goes into the market as No. 3. That fish, under this Bill can't go into these markets therefore are we going to have a large surplus that the West India market will not consume.

I know that in my district last year West India fish started at \$3.50 per quintal; it happened that there was so much of it there that it came down to \$3.00; then it went down to \$2.50. My understanding of the reason was that there was so much West India fish that the market could not absorb it. You could not send it out under the Bill. Won't your surplus be increased when you have so much fish that you can't send to European markets?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—
Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. member I might say that Nos. 1 and 2 is not West India fish. West India fish is broken slimy or dunn. We ship ordinarily about 25,000 or 30,000 qts. to the West Indies. Last year we had perhaps 100 per cent more because in curing the fish it became sunburned. It is very seldom that happens. The cull that we place upon Nos. 1, 2, and 3 will not make any more West India. The surplus No. 2 will go to Porto Rico and Jamaica. More fish is going to the West Indies and Porto Rico every year; probably in 5 years the exports to the West Indies have increased by 100,000 quintals. If we can only get the fishermen to cure a No. 1 article we will sell a lot more of fish in Italy. It wants a yellow, well salted fish for Italy. If we can give them that quality of fish, there is a chance of increased sales of 100 per

cent. The result is going to be that if we can get the people to improve the cure we will sell more; we will also sell more No. 2; it is the large size fish from 18 inches up; that usually goes to Oporto. Brazil is a market that is very important; if we can hold the Brazil market, we are safe in the sale of small fish, if we lost the Brazil market it would be just as good for Newfoundland to shut up shop. Jamaica takes three grades of fish. One is a rough salty fish, another grade is better still, another grade a fair quality. At our store at Port Union thirteen different grades of fish are packed.

MR. PUDDESTER—Do you think think under this Bill the quality will be improved?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—
That is what we hope; if we do the right thing, we have to establish a cull for taking fish in as well as sending it out. I believe in a local cull. It has to be established by a different board in a different way. We must cut out buying tal qual fish. If we pay an extra dollar for No. 1 and thereby penalize No. 2 we will find less No. 2 the following year. A lot of this trouble is in the making of the fish. I know cases where the fish was spread out and the whole family were away berry picking; the rain came and they were miles away; the rain spoiled the fish. The reason is clear, for when the fish was shipped it was taken as tal qual, if No. 2 fish was penalized, some one would have been left at home to look after the fish and prevent damage from rain.

More flakes for curing the fish are needed, it requires a lot of material to keep up flakes, and material is hard to obtain locally and expensive to purchase, but if fish is to be cured

properly additional flake space will be necessary.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—Mr. Chairman, this Bill is rather long and in order to save time it might be well if I take the Bill section by section and explain them.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Member would mind taking a seat at the table, I'm sure we all want to hear him and it's extremely difficult to hear him in that corner.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—Mr. Chairman, Section 4 relates to the Exporters Association, gives them the power to get together and makes rules

Section (b) of Section 4 deals with those who may become members of the Association, exporters who have premises and others may be added if they are willing to undertake to buy a certain amount of fish. (Reads.)

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, if in 1929 the Government had started in and spent the million they spent on the highroads on the fishery it would have been far more beneficial for the country. I don't think I am wrong in blaming the Government for this. If we had in the past spent on the fishery what was spent on non-productive work we would be in a better position today. But though I want to be fair I really can't see that this Bill is going to benefit the country. I don't think it will make the fisherman a cent better off. I believe that it will be three or four years before the markets come back to their true value. Now what about the half million we're spending on roads. The fishermen want better assistance than five or ten dollars a day. I admit that everyone of them wants his share still it's not helping the fishery.

CAPTAIN PARSONS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on this Bill. A few years ago I remember that about this time of the year all the settlements were hives of industry. You could start with Conception Bay and work around and everywhere you would find everyone busy, old men and young preparing for the fishery and in the mercantile premises it was the same. I think and confidently say that it was the neglect and indifference of past Governments and the exporters which are chiefly responsible for the state of the fishery at the present time.

The greatest curse in this respect is the irregular payment that takes place, that is the buying of talqual fish. One man takes every care when making his fish and the fish is accordingly of fine quality and another carelessly makes his fish paying heed only to the quantity and no attention to the quality and they bring their fish in and they both receive the same price for it. The man who has neglected his fish gets the same as the man who has cured his fish perfectly. This is no incentive for the fisherman and now the old men won't fish and the young men won't either. I honestly think that if this Bill goes through as it is, it will be the salvation of the fishery. I'd like to take some of the gentlemen opposite to the water front of this city. Let them inspect the fish stores and see the fish which the merchants are packing as No. 1 for sale in foreign countries. It is not fit for human consumption. We want this standardization of fish after it's caught.

I predict that within five years the markets for our fishery will be so improved that it will be a question of finding fish for our markets rather than as it is now, a question of finding markets for our fish. For there

is no doubt that the fish caught on the coast of our country are second to none, there is no better article of food when it is properly handled, it has a taste all its own.

I have been connected with the industry since I was nine years old, and I have watched it year after year and I know the condition the fishermen are up against. Eighty per cent. of the people with the exception of Grand Falls, Humbermouth and Bell Island are depending on the Government for employment. If this Bill comes into effect I have no doubt that conditions will be entirely improved in fact Gentlemen, they will be completely cured.

MR. MOORE—I would like to ask whether the list of merchants on page 9, may be taken as having voted for the Bill; are they in favour of it?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—Might I say they are simply a list of merchants who have been in the fish business, they had nothing to do with the Bill, they are, however, in favour of it. Anyone may come into the Association if they have a premises or undertake to buy a certain quantity of fish. They can make their own rules and regulations.

Last year the price offered at the start of the season was 45/—a year ago the price was 52/, but later on this 45/ fell to 42/, 42/ for number one fish.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, by this Bill we are making the first step to give the foreign buyers confidence in our products and in our selling, and sooner or later they will have to give us the same treatment as they give us in Brazil and we can cut out the tremendous cost attached to shipping fish to Spain, Italy and Greece when

it is shipped on consignment and has to wait in storage until it is purchased, "eating its head off" as somebody put it, the expenses entailed in this gives us a loss of one third of its value. If we are patient and are firm, we can demand outright sales. Iceland who only lately entered into the markets has increased its fisheries four times and Norway has increased about three times. We are standing still because we have not adopted modern methods. These countries are pushing us out of the markets. Unless we get the confidence of the purchasers on the other side they will go somewhere else. I have here a letter from a friend of mine in Oporto, I correspond with two or three people in these countries and I have typed an extract from this particular letter and with your permission, Sir, I will read it to the House:

(Reads.)

I think that my friend has touched the right spot. I often wondered if our fisheries are deteriorating and I finally came to the conclusion that the cause of the deterioration in our fisheries was due to slovenly methods of handling during the war. This was because the merchants would take anything from the fishermen and the people across the water would take almost anything from the people here. Norway and Iceland were out of the market and we got into slovenly methods and now we will find it difficult to get back to the standard that we had up to them. This Bill is, I think, the least drastic that could be introduced, this is the thin edge of the wedge, so to speak. I was just thinking what Dr. Thompson said to me when I asked him what he was here for, was it true that the people could not make good fish and he said to me the people can make good fish but they won't take the trouble. He said he might go to one man's prem-

ises and he would be making the very best fish and if he went next door probably a man there would be making poor fish. He said that the tal qual system was our greatest curse. It comes to this, that the man who makes good fish is not rewarded and the man who makes bad fish is not punished, and we have got to cure this before we can hope for any improvement. We should be alive to the fact that we should make good fish because if only for the reason that it pays to make the better fish.

I was on the Commission that was appointed in 1924, we had one meeting and at that meeting a man said that we have no cullers in this country and now that man is one of the strongest supporters of this present Bill. I think that it was a great shame that the Monroe Government dropped that Commission. With the exception of myself it was composed of very able men, men who knew the fishery conditions and I think that now should be the culmination of the efforts of that Commission and not have our fishery something to be ashamed of.

LADY SQUIRES—Mr. Chairman, I did not suggest that there were not one hundred men who could cull fish. I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition quite missed my point. I asked what redress a merchant would have if he felt that an Inspector was stricter on his fish than he was on another man's. I did not cast any reflection on our Newfoundland fishermen.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER — Mr. Chairman, I don't think that when the Hon. Member for Lewisporte addressed you, Sir, that the rules of the House were carried out. Every member of the House when addressing the Chair is supposed to be unhatted.

MR. EMERSON — "Uncovered", I think is the word.

The Chairman left the Chair until 8 o'clock.

The Chairman resumed the Chair at 8.10 p.m. o'clock.

MR. MURPHY—Mr. Chairman, as a representative of a fishing district and a very important one, I would like to make a few remarks about this Bill. There are sections of this Bill that I am opposed to, from the very first moment of their introduction. To restrain a man from doing business you are doing something that is not good; that should not be; truly we have often heard the word "restraint of trade."

Do you think it wise to legislate against the small man? How is the small man to be encouraged to build up a business if we expect him to export 5,000 quintals of fish in his first year. That, to my mind, is a very objectionable part of the present Bill. I would be lacking in my duty to the people who sent me here if I did not protest against that section.

Do you not think, Mr. Chairman, that there are large exporters of fish in Newfoundland today who did not export 5,000 quintals for their first year in business. My opinion, Mr. Chairman, is that no restriction should be placed on any man, or firm, who is desirous of sending away fish independent of any other person. His fish would be subject to inspection if this Bill becomes law, but it is not British fair play to prohibit any man from conducting his own business.

As a representative of the District of Placentia West which is a fishing district, not a farming district, a fishing district pure and simple, I am not prepared to voice my sentiments in favor of this section of the Bill. There is another section of this Bill and that is the clause requiring a man to have an export fishing premises before be-

ing allowed to export fish. This, to my mind, is also entirely wrong. This is another example of class legislation, and means that the broker who, in the past, has been able to get a better price for fish than the larger exporter, and if this section of the Bill goes through the broker will be cut out altogether. This is a Board of Trade Bill; there are names included in this Bill that have done more harm to the fish business of this country than all the brokers could do in a hundred years. I am also pleased to note the name of a large exporter not included in this Bill; a firm that has also played heavily and has been a menace to the fishing industry of this country.

I refer back to the Board of Trade. In the early days of this year; there was an election held at the Board of Trade. Two very representative men, to my mind, should have been elected on that board,, but when the election took place and the ballots were counted, neither of those gentlemen received sufficient votes to secure his election. One of those gentlemen was Capt. M. G. Power. Capt. Power has spent 10 years in the markets of Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal. Don't you think that he would be a qualified man to have on that Board? To prove that he would be an important man to have on that Board here is a letter from one of our largest importers of codfish into Greece, and with your permission I will read this letter:

(Reads Letter)

And the other gentleman, Mr. Chairman, who was defeated was the Manager of the Bank of Montreal. Do you not think that the present Manager of the Bank of Montreal would be also a qualified man to have on that Board of Trade. It is a well known fact that the Bank of Montreal is one of the largest financial institutions on

this side of the Atlantic and its local manager should know something about conditions, and he also would be an important man to have on that Board. So much for the Board of Trade election. Now regarding the clause of this Bill respecting brokers. Messrs. A. S. Rendell & Co. of this city are brokers, and if this Bill goes through and becomes law Rendell & Co. will be cut out.

It is specifically stated that one has to have fishery premises; whaves or stores or premises to export 5,000 quintals, and again before being allowed to export he, or they must give an assurance that he will export 5000 quintals. He must make an affidavit to that effect first. Are we going to make the minimum 5,000 quintals?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
No, that has been cut down to 2,500.

MR. MURPHY—Too high still. Until that section is cut out, Mr. Chairman, I am against the Bill. If this Bill goes through we have to have an army of Inspectors. If you would make the minimum 1,000 I think it would be more satisfactory. I repeat if this Bill goes through, we will have to have an army of Inspectors. Where are you going to get inspectors? You can't get them over night. The point raised by the Hon. member for Lewisporte this afternoon was a very important one and I don't think that question has been answered very clearly. We have numerous packers in Placentia Bay who pack their own fish and sell it subject to the inspection of the buyer. Are those people to be cut out if this present Bill becomes law? If we cut them out they will lose a dollar per quintal on their fish by bringing it here. The packing of fish in the District of Placentia West turns in quite a revenue; they make their own casks, saw their own staves and it turns in

quite a revenue to the fishermen of that district.

When I say that the fishermen or the small merchant will lose one dollar per quintal on fish, I do not mean that they will be robbed of a dollar, but it is the extra expense of getting the fish here, the insurance and freight would make them lose that dollar, and I am not foolish enough to come in here and register my vote to drive people out of business. I think if I supported this Bill in its entirety I would be a traitor to these people, and I have never been a traitor to any one yet.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity who was the cause of breaking the price of Brazil fish in the year 1930. It was a firm that is listed here, and a very prominent one, and I ask you again, Mr. Chairman, who was the cause of breaking the price of Brazil fish this year? Was it not also a firm that is listed here? I say it was, and I defy contradiction. Mr. Chairman, the fishermen are the bone and sinew of this country, and without the fishermen we cannot exist; so we have to look at the condition the country is in today. I shall not speak for the country, but I shall speak for the district of Placentia West, a place that I know something about. The condition existing there today was brought about by the short catch of fish in the year 1930.

I want to impress upon you that by the short catch of fish, I do not mean scarcity of fish; fish was never as plentiful around these shores as it was last year, but what was the good of the fish being there when they had no bait to secure it. I say if there was a Bill brought before this House today making provision that we should get bait depots in Placentia Bay it would have my support. As long as I can remember, and that is 25 or 30 years during

elections and election campaigns in that district the cry of the politician was "Encourage the fishery," but when the election was over and the votes counted, that was the end of it; when the smoke of battle was cleared off it was all over. I myself am in hopes of representing that district as long as my predecessor, and I am going to fight for the encouragement of the fisheries and the establishment of bait depots in Placentia West.

Mr. Chairman, before leaving my office I had a phone message from a member of a large firm which is opposed to the Bill. Just before I came to the House I received a letter from an exporter—not a small one either—one exporting thirty or forty thousand quintals, and with your permission I will read this letter.

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Chairman, it will give me great pleasure to associate myself with this Bill if the amendment suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is included in it.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, before we finish with this section there are one or two remarks I would like to make. Now I understand that every man who wishes to become a member of this Association may do so, but he must fulfil the demands of the Bill to export 2500 or 5000 quintals of fish as the case may be, but under this an unscrupulous man might make a lot of trouble for the board and I don't see how you're going to check up and find who's responsible for ruining the market. You might license everyone and in that way find out who is making the trouble, for it is my experience that when an opportunity for making money arises for an unscrupulous man, the temptation will usually prove so great that he will forget the pledge he made the Association.

Now, take the position where a broker not having a premises, and not being able to comply with the regulations regarding the exporting of a certain number of quintals, but having good connections. He receives an order from abroad for say 1000 or 2000 quintals and he knows a certain exporter has that quantity in his stores, he can go to that exporter, and if the latter is willing to sell, he can evade the regulations of this Board by paying a nominal rental of One Dollar. Now this Bill is not only of interest to merchants, I feel sure any patriotic citizen is as interested in this very important Bill as is every member of this House, and may I say that the advice given by England's "Commercial Traveller," the Prince of Wales, might be heeded by our local merchants, when he said at a public dinner to the manufacturers "To wake up, to consider carefully, and to act decisively."

With reference to what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said, I can only say that if this goes through, then you are placing the individual who has to cull fish for the market at a decided disadvantage. I am not referring to any particular section. I don't think this Bill is of any protection to the fisherman; no protection at all as far as he is concerned. It is really only a protection for the foreign buyers of our fish; there is no part of this Bill which deals with the fisherman. What we want is a rigid fish Bill to protect the fishermen.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, the Salt Codfish Bill now before the House has been discussed to a great extent and amongst those in the House we have some very much in favor of the Fish Bill and others who have expressed themselves as being very much against this measure being introduced. Three years ago a Bill of

somewhat similar nature was introduced and the same thing is happening tonight as happened when that Bill was introduced. In my opinion it is the jealousy of the fish merchants that is to blame, and as yet there has never been any satisfactory agreement made amongst the fish merchants. There is no law at present in force, and unless a law is passed compelling all fish merchants to abide by the same regulations, then I say our fishery will not improve. When I can see that this Bill will apply to all, I will certainly vote for it.

No interest has been taken and nothing has been so far done to improve the fishery conditions of this country and I feel that unless some Bill is passed the fishery is doomed. We hear both in the House of Assembly and outside about the necessity of Legislation in this respect and it is just about time that the merchants got together and made some agreement which would improve the conditions of the country today. I believe in fishery standardization and think that an Association to control the same is badly needed. The first thing we need is some experienced culler who can teach the fishermen the proper way to cull fish. Under the present curing system it is almost impossible to eat our fish and I feel sure that this has a very detrimental effect on the foreign markets. The principal of the Bill, as I see it, is standardization and I feel sure that the country which refuses to admit our fish today and are accepting fish from other countries would be only too glad to take our fish provided the standardization was carried out and they knew that the fish they would receive would be properly culled, properly cured and properly branded.

We must not, in the future, be stampeded into doing things which

are detrimental to the fishery, and the legislation that we put through in this House must be legislation of a national character and not legislation that would be favorable to some and unfavorable to others.

The mere fact that there has been so much discussion going on amongst the members of this House and that there is great difficulty in enforcing this measure shows that while some are in favor of it others are very much against it. I do not think, however, that we would be justified in throwing this Bill out and feel that we must have fish standardization throughout the country.

If we accept the principle as a good one we must ask ourselves first what in the Bill could be amended to make the Bill more favorable to all. This is not a party measure and various members, as I said before, have spoken on it, but what we have to find out is: Does the Bill carry out the principle as outlined. I can quite appreciate the aspect taken by certain of the members who say that certain parts of the country are more affected by this Bill than others, that is all well and good, but I do not think that this is a sufficient reason for throwing out the Bill and think that if it were amended that it would be acceptable and passed by the House.

The Squires Government of 1920 brought in two Bills, one of which fixed the price of fish and the other was regarding the cure of fish. I, myself think, that it is very difficult to have any rules or law that will set or fix any particular price on fish, that is something which we cannot control but which the law of supply and demand must arrange for us.

Under this Bill we are simply trying to fix standardization of fish and I feel that unless we do this we will

never improve our own conditions. I do not say that it will prove such a tremendous success the first year but many of the different problems will be overdone and as time advances we will be able to make amendments and make the Bill one that will be satisfactory to all parties concerned. I say that we should give this Bill a chance because as things stand now we are daily losing more of our customers in the foreign markets.

Norway and Iceland have taken our place to a great extent but I feel that if we put our efforts into this standardization scheme our people will get the benefit and we will again get our markets back.

Who is going to introduce the Bill? Are we going to do it, or, are we going to leave it for our successors. If this were made a party measure by the Government they would make themselves most unpopular because the fishermen will not get as good a price for their fish, but, I say introduce the Bill. I believe that it will have an ultimate result on the fisheries of this country, if it is carried out and if it is successful. I believe that the ultimate result of this Bill will be that the fisheries will be worth more to our country than ever before, our fishermen will be enriched and we will cease to lose our markets as we are doing today.

I remember at the Board of Trade dinner held in February of this year when Mr. Monroe read a letter from Greece signed by four importers of our fish and they said that there was no sale for Newfoundland fish, they said don't send us any more unless the quality is improved, they didn't want it at all and the Hon. member for Bonavista East read a letter the other day to the same effect. It is not a question of price but a question of quality. We are losing our

markets and unless we bring in a standardization Bill we will keep on losing our markets. This is not a party measure, if it does not pass the Government will not resign. I believe in the Bill; the principle is good and I hope that is will pass. The details will be somewhat difficult but that is a matter for the introducers. I hope that the Bill will pass and will be successful in operation.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—
How do you make out that the price of fish will be lower? I don't see any argument for that?

MR. EMERSON—The reason I had is that if this Bill is passed, naturally the cull will be much stricter; consequently this will lower the price of fish.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—
Mr. Chairman, if that is a fact it means that the fishermen today will get at least a \$1 a quintal more for number one fish than they ever got for tal qual. If there is a stricter cull of number one fish I say that the fishermen will get at least a dollar more a quintal for it. As I see it, the cull this year will not be affected, it may not be put in operation this year at all, they may not use their powers this year. I don't think they will go any further than instituting a standard for Labrador fish and the shoremen will not be affected, at least not this year. Even if it were put in full operation they can only touch on three of four grades. The merchants might take ten grades and the only grade that would be worth re-culling would be what we call "Merchantable" and that would be \$2.00 a quintal over and above "Maderia."

I don't see how the Bill can do anything else but increase the price of fish and if it is put in operation the

Labrador men will get a dollar or at least fifty cents more per quintal. There would be no difficulty in disposing of the number one article. There is a sale for 400,000 quintals of Labrador fish, but not the inferior article, it must be number one. If we get the number one article, we can sell easily 400,000 quintals, which is a minimum catch. The trouble is that if the Bill does not pass, I for one, would hesitate to fit out anybody for the Labrador. I shipped fish to Greece and they said they did not want it, only a portion of it was good, but if we have inspectors, it will mean that we will get our markets again. If the men are more careful in cleaning, washing, splitting, etc. and bring in the number one article, I feel sure that the merchants will pay at least fifty cents a quintal more for it if it is suitable for Greece.

I can see no harm that can come out of this Bill. I have had it in my mind for years, considering it, thinking it over, looking at it from all angles and I am absolutely sure and I can say without any misgivings that I think that Bill will re-act to the betterment of Newfoundland, its people and exporters. As I said before, this is a measure to help the exporters to help themselves. If we don't do this what will happen? If we get the same class of fish as we got last year, we will not be able to get anybody to buy it. We can sell easily inspected fish and we will have no trouble in finding a market.

MR. PUDDISTER—What happens if the fish is not passed?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—
Mr. Chairman, there will be a sale for some, they will take 20% of number two. We will get clear of what we can and what is left we will put in the driers and sell as West India.

I say that we should deal with this in a national way. This is a great big matter and if we do not pass this Bill we will have no markets in a matter of five years. If this Bill is passed and we have a cull for the local product, then Newfoundland will never need to seek markets, they will be saying "How much can you send us over." The people on the other side are eating fish, but is it the Norwegian fish, it is not our fish. The Norwegian fish is not as good as our fish but it is tidy and attractive, it is well done up and the people know what they are getting. They tell us to do the same as Iceland and Norway are doing. Isn't that a wonderful object to have? The placing of our fish ahead of the other countries? I can see a wonderful future if we only live up to it. I am going to vote for it and I think that members who don't know something about it should follow the advice of those who do know something.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, another point I would like to emphasise. This Bill takes care of the standardization of all fish. It doesn't matter whether a man is handling 2000 or 3000 or 5000 quintals as long as it is standardized. Why should a man like that be penalised. Provided the inspection is right and the quality and price is right, why shouldn't he be allowed to sell it direct himself.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—Mr. Chairman, it is a question as to whom you think most important to the country. The supplying merchant or the small man. The small man is causing tremendous losses in the industry and is doing an immense amount of harm. Some of the supplying houses have not made a profit for the last five years. The most successful fish merchant in the country is Sir John Crosbie. I myself could carry along a most successful fish

business on the same lines as Sir John Crosbie whilst the supplying merchant is always faced with the prospect of tremendous losses. The Trading Company has made profits, but it has also made losses that it shouldn't have had. I will give you an instance. Some four or five years ago a vessel was sent to Brazil, the fish had been sold there but the vessel took over sixty days to get there, and when she arrived the fish was cooked and unsaleable, and we lost \$17,000. No man could have foreseen that the vessel would have taken sixty days.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I am not a champion for those exporters, but I am anxious about bona fide fishermen who catches his own fish and who would like to send it to market in their own names. I would, therefore, suggest that a bona fide fisherman who catches and cures his own fish, has it passed the necessary inspection be allowed to export no matter how small the quantity. If we put in a couple of lines in the clause to that effect, would that meet the point of the Hon. Member for Placentia West?

MR. MURPHY—Mr. Chairman, if the minimum is made 1,000 quintals I am prepared to support the Bill. Speaking of 5,000 quintals, I know of people in my district who in 1929 and 1930 sold 5,000 quintals and are still owed their money and the most they have been offered for that fish was a free trip to Spain. I think that is conclusive proof that it is not the man who carries his office in his hat who has injured the fish business, but some of the big fish exporters of Water Street and elsewhere.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Member

does that mean that this Board will impose a tax on fish in store?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—No.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, it will be collected from the man who sells the fish, if there is a tax on fish the man who catches the fish will have to pay it, this is to defray the expenses of the Board. There are two or three men who will have to be paid salaries, there will be cullers and inspectors who will also have to be paid. My point is how many inspectors will there be, how many specialists will there be and who will decide how much they will be paid, I take it that the Governor in Council will have the last say but in grading the fish for export the man who pays the tax is the man who sells the fish to the exporter.

I have not made any remarks on this Bill but I would like to make a few preliminary remarks regarding the object of this Bill. The object is I take it, the standardization of fish exported from Newfoundland. I am in accord with the principle of standardization. This means that a lot of exporters are going to be told that they have to incorporate themselves into an Association, we don't know whether they will feel like doing this or not. Have you asked all these people to come into this?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—They have not been asked yet, but if they do not come into it they will not get a license.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, if they do not get a license they will not export fish. I don't want to express my opinion but I think that there will be many firms who will not export fish this year. I am in accord

with standardization. When I was on the Opposition side of this House, I advocated it and I felt that some legislation should be placed behind it to make exporters legislate for themselves and under this section there is nothing to compel exporters to become members of this Association and if 80% of the exporters refuse to become members, where will the fish business go? Take for instance Harvey & Co., the first on the list, they refuse to come into this Association they don't get a license, they say, well, we won't buy any fish and so on down the list. This is the point that worries me. The merchants on Water St. never agreed in their lives and I don't think that they will agree when they become members of this Association. There has been considerable said of brokers, men who buy fish on the street, and as was said: "Have their offices in their hats." I was a broker one time, I exported fish and I may do so again. I am in favour of brokers, I think that they keep the price of fish up, they get in touch with foreign firms in Spain, Italy or Greece and they get price lists. His overhead is nothing and say if he buys 500 casks at say 20s. a quintal, he can afford to pay a better price than the merchant who has a big overhead to carry unlike the broker whose office is in his hat. He can pay more to the man who catches the fish. The man who has a large business depends more on the supplies that he sells the fishermen in the spring. When the markets are well up they may make some money on fish but it is mostly on their supplies and they are sure to tack on a extra 25% or 30% in the spring, sometimes they make a bit of money on fish but the broker can give a better price. I believe in brokers and a lot of merchants on the street do a lot of business through brokers in London and he is at all times a

great help to the merchants on the street. Suppliers take the fish from the fishermen and sell it to a broker in London because he is in closer touch with the people who buy the fish, the credits are established in London and they can give a better price. That is my opinion.

Coming back to the point, it is impossible for this fee to be collected from anyone else than from the people who catch the fish, what the fee will be will be decided by the Association with the approval of the Governor in Council and the idea of this is to pay the salaries and expenses. I take it that it will be a half decent fee to pay the members on this board a half decent salary and this is one of the points that I would like to see cleared up. We will have to pay for an army of inspectors all over the country. How much do you estimate that it will cost, Sir William?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—The old act cost \$70,000.00 but this will not cost as much as that.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in the old act, there were no three men to pull down \$25,000.00 or \$30,000.00 and we could get a lot of cullers for \$30,000.00. I figure that this Bill is going to cost \$75,000.00. How would this affect a man wishing to ship fish to the West Indies. I can ship fish to the West Indies by sending it to New York and then having it forwarded to the West Indies.

MR. EMERSON—You can always avoid an act if you act in such a manner as to get around it.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—I will refer back. (Reads.)

There is always some trouble about who is going to be members of the Association, those in the list are the

principal merchants who exported fish last year, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked these firms about this Bill and eighty per cent. of them were to become members of the Association. This Bill was drawn up by the Board of Trade and is the same as last year's Bill except for one or two small changes.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, before this Bill passes in its entirety I would like to state for the benefit of the House that I am not opposed to the principle. There seems to be an understanding that I am opposed to the principle of this Bill, but I was opposed to this Bill as it was originally drafted, and like my Honourable friend, Mr. Emerson, I would say that this Bill or any Fish Bill is faced with many troubles in its enforcement, and that was one of the great troubles that I saw ahead of this Bill. Now, while my friend Mr. Quinton's idea was right as far as wishing every exporter to get a license was concerned, I think he missed a point. As far as I was concerned I am not opposed to the Bill on principle, but I am opposed to the body of men who, in my opinion, are behind the Bill. I need not mention names any more.

I am firmly convinced that there is a group of men down on Water Street who are trying to get this Bill railroaded through the House so that they will be a further menace than they have been in the past to the trade of this country, and we have men amongst the exporters of this country who have been a menace to the trade of this country. I state that emphatically and I wish that it be recorded.

The Hon. Member for Ferryland wondered where the money was going to come from to pay expenses. I am beginning to wonder that too; in fact I am not beginning; I have already

wondered. It must in the last analysis come from the fishermen. There are one or two men already in the running for these jobs. I do not know who they are, but I have a faint idea. No doubt my Hon. friend could tell if he wishes; he may know; I don't.

As far as the price of fish to-day is concerned and what we are facing in the foreign markets, it is not so much the quality of the fish but the question of supply and demand. In particular we are, the world is in general faced with conditions that we have never had before in my remembrance; world wide poverty, so to speak, and the general depression which is world wide is a dominating factor which has caused our fish to be such a low price to-day in the foreign markets. We might as well say what is the cause of flour or meat being so cheap. We are buying salt meat to-day at less than two cents per pound, when we take into consideration the price of the barrel and the price of the package. Is that due to civilisation? No; it is due to the question of world wide depression, and that is what is the trouble today with the fish markets. What is going to happen our second rate fish; we have to find a market for it somewhere, and there is no reason, if we have responsible fish concerns in this country, who are wanting to ship the right grade of fish to the foreign markets, there is no reason why those responsible concerns should not give those who purchase the fish from them the right quality of the fish that they need without having to enforce a law.

I have been very much interested, Mr. Chairman, in the remarks of many of the Hon. gentlemen because I happen to be a fish producer. The Government and laws are a matter of compromise pretty well, and

I see no reason why any exporter who wants to export 25 casks of fish should not be given that privilege if he can sell it to advantage in the foreign markets. I remember not very long ago one exporter on Water Street said that the license fee to export should be \$10,000. Why? To cripple the small man. The small man has been throttled ever since Adam was born, and that was not yesterday; the big fellow, the big fish is trying to eat the little fish ever since Adam came into being. It is a question of the big fish eating the little fish or trying to all the time, and that is the trouble with the big exporter or the big organization that we have to-day trying to dominate this country, trying to eat the small fellow, and I say that in all sincerity. That is what what we should not allow; the big fellow to gobble up the little fellow. We should give him a chance if he can make good. It is mighty hard job to get away, because they are going to bite on you if they can at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, about Iceland and Norway; conditions in these countries are entirely different to conditions in this country; they can centralize and collect their fish and make it standardized because it is collected from the fishermen. We cannot do that in this country; it is almost impossible. Getting a standard of fish in the different ports in this country is a hard job even by a competent board because you can get five men and put five lots of fish before them, and I will tell you here now that there won't be one agree with the other on the grade of fish. Every man has got his own idea unless he is educated and goes through a course of training which can't be done in 2, 3 or 5 months. It is no use to put a man from Port Union to inspect fish down in Fortune; it is no use to put a man from Fortune to inspect fish in

Port Union. The idea of standardization is good. I don't like restriction of trade, and I think that whatever Board is appointed they are going to find it a mighty hard job to carry out this Bill as it is made up. I don't want to be misunderstood. I entirely agree with the principle.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, before we pass that section there are just one or two remarks I wish to make in view of what has been said by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I understood him to state that he agreed with the principle of standardization; I think every member of the House does, but he is against this Bill on account of certain details. He further stated that there are certain people on Water Street who are behind the Bill. May I point out to the Hon. Minister that he is the Chairman of the Salt Fish Commission. He is a member of it, and the Salt Fish Commission, I presume, is not controlled by Water Street. He does not offer any solution other than the one brought into the House. That is the point that I make; here is an effort made to give us some solution to the trouble that exists today. It is criticised by the people who have the matter in hand themselves. That is all that is done. What is the alternative? Go on as we are. If we go on as we are why have a Salt Fish Commission. Give us some solution.

I don't say this Bill is perfect; I don't know whether the Hon. Minister has any solution which is better, but what is the use of coming in here and damning the Bill if you have no solution. I agree that the situation is serious; I agree that standardization must be dealt with. You have no solution to it and you simply damn this Bill. Give us some solution. I have been sitting here for hours, and I have been trying to find out something

about it; I, as a lawyer, knowing very little about fish, have studied this Bill to find out what is wrong. All I can get from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is that he agrees with the principle but he damns the Bill, but does not say what the solution should be. It is time to stop that. Why does he not tell us what we should do and come in with an alternative proposition that we can discuss. The House meets year after year; if somebody brings in a Bill it is damned by somebody, thrown out and nobody brings in an alternative. We have fish experts in the House who will say nothing in the alternative except the whole Bill is not good. The reason I voted for this Bill is because I have seen no alternative introduced by those who ought to know what they are talking about.

I have tried to study the situation; I discussed it last year with the promoter of the Bill. Until somebody can show me something better I will vote for the Bill. There has been nothing but criticism and nothing in the shape of an alternative except some amendments. What is the use of that. Unless steps are taken how are men not in the business who have had no experience to vote on this Bill when they get no more suggestions than we have got from those who are supposed to be experts.

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 for adoption of the report, Mr. Emerson moved and Hon. Sir. William Coaker seconded the following amendment, viz: "That section 3 (b) be amended by altering the

figures "1000 quintals" to "2500 qtls." Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment 17 and against it 15 so it passed in the affirmative, and was ordered accordingly, so it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Council."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 has 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 presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Council" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the International Grenfell Association."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 amendments.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the International Grenfell Association" 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.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Bill relating to amendments to the Sealing Act be stricken from the Order Paper. There is a wide divergence of opinion amongst sealing ship owners and insurance companies as to the matter of premiums that would have to be charged to cover the legal construction of the words as contained in the Bill. It would consequently take weeks, if not months, to accurately take into consideration

all the circumstances as to rates, and in this situation I would ask to have the Bill to remain over till the next session of the House to be dealt with.

The insurance figures quoted vary from 50 cents to as high as \$10 and \$12 per man. The wording of the Act has been changed several times, but as there has been no unanimity amongst the parties involved I think the wisest course is to drop the matter and have it considered out of session.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively: "An Act for the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes" and "An Act to give effect to a Protocol on Arbitration Clauses signed on behalf of His Majesty at a Meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations held on the twenty-fourth day of September 1923 and to a Convention on the Execution of Arbitral Awards signed on behalf of His Majesty at Geneva on the twenty-sixth day of September 1927" without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until half past three of the clock on tomorrow afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 13th, 1931.

The House met at 3.30 of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider "An Address to the King."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, I don't feel that I should enter into a constitutional discussion regarding this matter. The Resolutions have been before the House since the day of opening. Mr. Clerk, I think you have some extra copies there that may now be distributed. The wording of the Resolution itself is as submitted to us by the Imperial Authorities. That is the Resolution as printed. I propose to suggest to the Committee an additional clause for the drafting of which I have to take the responsibility, to come in at the end before "All of which we humbly pray." That additional clause will read as follows:

(Reads)

That forms no part of the Imperial draft which is submitted in the printed form; consequently I have not had that printed as part of the Resolutions, but I would ask the Clerk to distribute the copies.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, may I ask Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether he has any information as to what has been done in connection with this Address to His Majesty by other larger Dominions such as Canada, Australia, South Africa.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the Dominion of Canada proposes to pass the Resolution with a provision.

I am informed that New Zealand also proposes to pass it at their ses-

sion at the end of June or July; this is their Autumn now. I am informed that South Africa has, at a session passed the Resolution. I am informed that Mr. Hertzog proposes to proceed with the Resolutions at a suitable moment. I have received no word from the South of Ireland. I may say in the case of New Zealand I got a wire from Mr. Forbes in connection with the matter. He said they were dealing with it in July so as to come in the period before August.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, if my recollection serves me right the proposal for this Address to the King came from the Dominion of Canada and from South Africa, two Dominions which have problems very much different to those we have, and I put it as a question as to whether it is wise for us to proceed any further with this until we hear from those Dominions which were responsible for promoting the Bill.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, under the memorandum which is supposed to be certified to the Imperial Government by the end of July or not later than the end of August, action must be taken to date from December of 1931 so far as the Imperial Government is concerned. Consequently it is for us now to act or reject. The other Dominions—I cannot speak for the South of Ireland because I have not heard from Mr. Cosgrave—but the other Dominions propose to pass this Address to the King with such special items as affect themselves personally. In the case of Canada they have their Dominion reference to the British North America Act.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I take it the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister does not wish us to understand that it is a case of now

or never. There will be other years to come; there will be another Imperial Parliament, and if we ask permission to come in under Dominion status it will be accorded us.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, it has been agreed that it would be dealt with before the end of July or not later than the end of August. We will not be having any further session until June.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, would the Prime Minister consider accepting the draft Address saying that as the matter has not been discussed by the senior Dominions that we accept the principle of the Statute but ask that it be deferred until next year so that the views of others who are really more vitally interested than we are, be obtained. It seems to me that we are going to be the first.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Newfoundland has always been first from a constitutional standpoint.

MR. EMERSON.—I don't quite know what the Prime Minister means.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—We have always been the first.

MR. EMERSON.—Has it been on the motion of the Government?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—This is on the motion of the Home Government.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, if the Prime Minister will pardon me, it is not. It was suggested by the Canadian Government, and by the South African Government for the consideration of the Dominions. We are taking the first step. We are going to pass this Bill the very first of the Dominions.

We are the smallest; we don't know what points may be raised for or against, and I suggest that we could pass it with reservations as far as we are concerned. I think it would be a mistake if we had to divide. If there is any method whereby we can pass this Resolution without division it would be far better. One does not want to be contentious on a matter of this kind. I have views on the matter which I don't wish to express if I can avoid it.

(Reads amendment proposed by Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister.)

I think a few words at the end of that suggesting that the operation of the Statute be deferred so far as Newfoundland is concerned for 12 months to give us an opportunity of ascertaining the position of our sister Dominions would meet the situation.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, that would be entirely acceptable to me. I would prefer to let the Committee rise now and sit at a later hour.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to question No. 269 asked by Mr. Winter.

QUESTION

MR. WINTER—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement giving a

copy of all Orders in Council and all correspondence in connection with the sum of One Hundred Thousand dollars deposited in the Canadian Bank of Commerce in relation to the extension of the Memorial University College and all payments made in connection therewith.

ANSWER

Copy of Minute of Council
August 17, 1920.

The Committee of Council met a delegation from the War Memorial Committee of the Patriotic Association, on the 30th July last, when the following understanding was reached:

(a) That the sum of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) appropriated at last Session of the Legislature for the erection of a Normal School is regarded by the Government as their contribution to a National Memorial.

(b) That the Government approve of the Patriotic Association endeavoring to obtain subscriptions for, first: Erection of a suitable piece of statuary and, secondly: To augment the sum voted by the Government for the Normal School.

(c) That the Government approve the appointment of a Sub-Committee by the War Memorial Committee to co-operate with the Minister of Education and Government Engineer, on the subject of a suitable design for the building.

Copy of Minute of Council
June 29th, 1922.

It was ordered that from the balance of the 1922 loan there shall be appropriated for the Normal School the sum of \$100,000.00. The said amount to be placed under the direc-

tion of the Government Engineer, who will be authorized to draw against the said allocation, which will be placed by the Finance Department to the credit of a special account to be opened in the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

**Copy of Minute of Council
July 28th, 1930.**

As it has been ordered that out of the loan of 1930, the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the extension of the Memorial College Building, specifically for the purpose of giving additional facilities to the Normal School which provides special training for teachers who serve throughout the Island of Newfoundland generally.

It is further ordered that Hon. Dr. Barnes, Colonial Secretary, who was Minister of Education and consequently responsible Minister in connection with the planning, construction and equipment of the present Memorial College and Normal School, shall be the member of the Executive Council to whom special responsibility is assigned for the purposes of handling this extension programme.

It is further ordered that the estimated cost of construction shall not exceed \$150,000.

It is further ordered that the said sum of \$100,000 immediately available on 1930 Loan Account, be deposited in the Canadian Bank of Commerce on Savings Bank Trust Account, against which cheques may be drawn, signed by the Colonial Secretary, or in his absence, his Deputy, and countersigned by the Auditor General, or in his absence, by his Deputy.

Dept. of the Colonial Secretary,
St. John's, Nfld.

August 4, 1930.

Sir:—With respect to the cheque for \$100,000 deposited in your Bank a day

or two ago, I have the honor to intimate that the said amount shall be placed to the credit of a Trust Account in your Savings Department, to be headed Normal School Extension-Memorial University College. The Government desire that interest shall be paid by the Bank at the rate of 3 per cent on the minimum daily balance, that is following the procedure which has been adopted in relation to other trust accounts from the Government held by your Bank. The said interest to be added to the principal sum from time to time. The account will be subject to audit by the Auditor General in usual manner.

Will you please honour cheques against the said account signed by the Colonial Secretary or his Deputy and countersigned by the Auditor General or his Deputy.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd) ARTHUR MEWS,
Deputy Colonial Secretary.

E. Holmes, Esq., Manager,
Bank of Commerce.

**Copy of Minute of Council
October 4th, 1930.**

It was ordered that, for the purpose of saving interest on the debit balance of the Government Accounts in the Bank of Montreal, the sum of \$100,000 deposited in the Canadian Bank of Commerce for the extension of the Memorial College Building, as per Minute of the 28th July last, be transferred, with accrued interest, to the Bank of Montreal, to be placed to the credit of an account to be called "Memorial College Trust Account," the said sum in regard to its management and operation to be subject to

the conditions as set forth in the said Minute of the 28th July last.

Dept. of the Colonial Secretary,
St. John's, Nfld.

October 10th, 1930.

Sir:—Referring to my letter of the 4th August last, and to the deposit in your Bank of the sum of \$100,000 to the credit of the Normal School Extension-Memorial University College, I have the honor to intimate that the Executive Government have now decided to transfer this amount to the Bank of Montreal in order to lessen the liability of the Government on Current Account in the Bank in connection with the daily interest charge. Will you, therefore, kindly direct that the accrued interest be calculated and added to the said amount so that a cheque may be drawn to close out the account in your Bank.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd) ARTHUR MEWS,
Deputy Colonial Secretary.

E. Holmes, Esq., Manager,
Bank of Commerce.

Dept. of the Colonial Secretary,
St. John's, Nfld.

October 10, 1930.

Sir:—It is desired that you will open in your Bank an account to be called "Memorial College Trust Account" to which will be placed the sum of \$100,000, and accrued interest, for use in connection with the proposed extension of the Memorial College Building. This amount will be reckoned in the daily balance of the Government Accounts, thereby reducing the daily liability by the sum of \$100,000.00 approximately. Cheques

against this credit will be drawn by the Colonial Secretary, or in his absence, by his Deputy, and countersigned by the Auditor General, or in his absence by his Deputy.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd) ARTHUR MEWS,
Deputy Colonial Secretary.

A. A. Werlich, Esq.,
Manager, Bank of Montreal.

The Canadian Bank of Commerce,
St. John's, Nfld.

October 11, 1930.

The Deputy Colonial Secretary,
Colonial Secretary's Office,
City.

Dear Sir:—We have your letter of the 10th instant, and beg to advise that the balance at credit with the Normal School Extension Memorial University College account was \$100,000, against which a cheque was issued on October 1st for \$797.46, leaving a balance of \$99,202.54. The interest to date is \$558.10.

While we regret to note that this amount is being withdrawn, we would take this opportunity of expressing our appreciation of the deposit while it was here.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) E. HOLMES
Manager.

Auditor General's Office,
St. John's, Nfld.

December 5, 1930.

Dear Dr. Barnes:—I enclose a statement from the Canadian Bank of Commerce relating to the amount deposited in that Bank in trust for the Normal School Extension—Memorial University College.

You will note that part of the amount transferred, under Order in Council of date October 4th last is for interest on the principal sum. This interest, i.e. \$558.19, should have been paid into the Treasury, leaving the balance transferable to the Bank of Montreal, as follows:

Original amount deposited ..	\$100,000.00
Less cheque issued Oct. 1	797.46

\$ 99,202.54

The amount actually transferred was \$99,760.73. As this Account is under your management I shall be glad to be informed as to your intentions in respect of the disposal of this interest. Please return papers.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) F. C. BERTEAU,
Comptroller and Auditor General.
Hon. A. Barnes, B.Sc., Ph.D.,
Colonial Secretary.

Auditor General's Office,
St. John's, Nfld.

January 13, 1931.

Sir,—Permit me to refer you to my letter to you of date December 5th, last, relating to the interest on the appropriation of \$100,000 for the extension of the Memorial College and Normal Training School for Teachers. Now that the Prime Minister who, as President of the Bureau of Education is primarily responsible for Educational matters and educational policy, has returned from the Imperial Conference, I shall be obliged if this matter of the disposition of the interest is brought to the attention of the Executive Council for its decision and instruction to me.

In order that the facts relating thereto may be at your disposal, I beg leave to point out the following.

On October 10th, 1922, an account was opened, by order of the then Government, in the Canadian Bank of Commerce, entitled "The Normal School Trust Account," for the purpose of dealing with the expenditure in connection with the original construction of the Newfoundland Memorial College and Normal School for Teachers.

This account was continued in active operation from the time it was opened until November 19th, 1927, since which date, though it has continued in existence, having on the 31st day of December last, a credit balance of \$166.61 in the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

The arrangement originally made in connection with the interest accruing to that account was to the effect that it should be added to the principal and that it should be at the rate of 3 per cent per annum on the minimum daily credit balance. The Fund thus receiving the benefit of this interest and also that of any trade discount allowed for prompt payment of accounts. The total interest thus received amounted to \$2, 547.02.

When I received the Order-in-Council directing the transfer of the \$100,000 from the 1930 Loan Fund, appropriated for the extension of the Memorial College, to the Canadian Bank of Commerce I arranged with the Bank that the Fund should be handled in the same manner as was the previous one, with, however, this difference, that the accruing interest was to be credited to a separate account which was not to be operated upon without my approval, pending the decision of the Government as to its disposal.

The re-transfer of the Fund to the Bank of Montreal has affected its

position as regards interest. As the Government gave the Bank no specific instructions in respect of the Fund or the interest thereon, it included the Account in the Government Ledger, adding the interests to that paid to the Treasury on account of the Consolidated Fund Accounts.

I wish now to be definitely instructed as to whether the interest which this specific appropriation of \$100,000 earns is to be applied towards the same purposes as the principal itself, namely, to the extension of the Newfoundland Memorial College and Normal School for Teachers, as was done in connection with the construction funds during the years from 1922 to 1927, or whether it is to be placed to the credit of the Exchequer Account, and, so far as a credit is concerned, lost to the principal account.

It is immaterial which Bank holds this Fund, so far as the Dominion is concerned, as the conditions under which it is deposited are similar in each case. It earns the same interest no matter in which Bank it may be in.

The only point I want to make clear is as to whether the interest on this specific fund, which is in reality a Trust Fund for the purpose of which it was appropriated, shall be credited to the principal Account as formerly or be diverted to the Exchequer Account.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) F. C. BERTEAU,
Comptroller and Auditor General.

Hon. A. Barnes, B.Sc., Ph.D.,
Colonial Secretary.

**Copy of Minute of Council
January 27th, 1931.**

Committee of Council had under consideration letter from the Auditor

General of date December 5th, 1930, and a further communication dated the 13th January, 1931. Both letters were read for the information of Committee of Council.

It was decided that the same procedure as to interest should be followed in the matter of the deposit of \$100,000 for the extension of the Memorial College and Normal Training School for Teachers as was done in the case of the funds appropriated for the original erection of the said College, namely, that the interest of the fund be credited to the fund itself, and that the arrangement to be carried out by the Bank of Montreal in connection with the handling of the said Fund be as advantageous to the said Fund as if the money had not been transferred from the Canadian Bank of Commerce to the Bank of Montreal.

**Memo Re Memorial College Trust
Account**

Deposited in Canadian Bank of Commerce	\$100,000.00
Interest to Oct. 11, 1930	558.19
	\$100,558.19

PAYMENTS:

Oct. 1, 1930: A. J. C. Payne, travelling expenses visit to St. John's, survey and examination of site and making preliminary de- signs and plans	797.46
---	--------

1930:

Oct. 13. Balance transferred to Bank of Montreal	\$ 99,760.73
Dec. 31. Interest Bank of Montreal	647.75
	\$100,408.48

1921:

March 6th. Paid A. J. C.	
Paine amount on account fees for preparation of Drawings, Specifications, (First installment	2,753.44
	<hr/>
	\$ 97,655.04
	<hr/>

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men engaged in Logging,'" 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 the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, has offered to take charge of this piece of legislation.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, the old logging Bill which passed about 19 or 20 years ago was quite suitable for these days when the men were paid a monthly wage by the companies. However, about 1921 conditions became so bad that the companies changed their system and adopted what is known as the sub-contract system. By this they avoided all their

obligations as far as this Bill was concerned from 1921 up to the present time.

In some cases the old arrangement of monthly wages was kept up but in 90 out of a 100 the sub-contract system was adopted. Under this system the men are employed directly but get together in gangs and cut the wood themselves, find for themselves, and in return the company paid them according to the amount of wood they cut. In this state of affairs the Old Logging Bill was of no effect.

During 1925 and 1926 this went on and I have known men working and not making a dollar. They were put on land that had been cut before and I've known where they worked for 6 or 8 weeks and afterwards the Government had to pass them over the railway line.

In 1925 there was a case where a party of seven men worked for six months and when the wood was scaled and accounts fixed up they found they were each three or four dollars in debt. They were passed on by the Company to the end of the line. Three of them belonged to Mr. Puddester's district and four of them were from Mr. Halfyard's district and they came to me to see what I would do for them.

It is for these and other reasons that we have brought in these amendments to the Act.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, would the Hon. member for Twillingate be so kind as to point out what particular changes have been made.

I suggest that the Bill be read a second time and after that we go into Committee of the Whole House on the Bill.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I take it this Bill is to enable the men

to make better wages than at present. I don't see how this Bill will do this. Of course it gives the men the option of choosing which way they will work.

This doesn't do away with the sub-contract system. I know myself of cases where men have worked for 3 or 4 weeks and made nothing, sometimes of course men went out and didn't know how to work or wouldn't work and you can't blame the companies for not paying them.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the House, and I might point out that the main principal amendments deal with any changes that have become necessary since the passing of the original Logging Bill. There is nothing radical in it; it is felt that something should be done about giving the men the option of the method of employment, whether sub-contract or straight wages, but owing to certain circumstances it was thought too radical to press for at present.

Mr. Brown, Mr. Strong and Mr. Earle have given this Bill their full time and attention and we might have presented this Bill at the end of last season, only in the meantime Dr. Mosdell was preparing his Public Health Bill, and as Section 19 of that Bill deals with certain points of this Bill, it was thought better to wait and see how the former was received. For that reason we withheld this Bill.

This Bill also deals with "driving" and makes certain changes in this respect.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines has appointed certain sworn scalers. In the past there has been much trouble between the men and companies on this point and it is expected that the appointment of sworn scalers will eliminate this. If there are any other points the honorable

members wish to have explained, Mr. Brown or myself will be very pleased to do so.

Regarding scaling: up to the present there has been much trouble between company scalers and the men who often claim the scaling is not fair. I know of a case that happened in 1926 where some men cut wood and when the time came for scaling there was no scaler in the neighborhood, and as the winter was drawing on, the contractor estimated the amount of wood and the men were paid accordingly. When the spring came and the wood was properly scaled, the contractor was found to have grossly underestimated, and in this manner made several hundreds of dollars he really was not entitled to. If the Bill goes through, this condition will be altered. The scalers will be sworn and will not be employed by the company; they will be appointed by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honorable member if Section B provides protection for the men undertaking these sub-contracts? Is the contractor who is to deliver the wood protected? I think there should be some protection for him.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, the principle of this Bill seems to me to be a good one, and I believe that anything that would make conditions better for the logging men should be introduced. If this Bill makes their working conditions better and makes the men more contented it should and will be supported by the members of this side of the House. I have heard in certain sections where a cord of wood was being based at 142 ft., instead of the standard measurement of 128 ft. This, I think, was a gross injustice.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Chairman, a clause covering this section has now been inserted in the Bill. The members of the Select Committee discussed this phase last night and under the Bill the standard measurements of a cord of wood will be 128 feet. I myself have scaled thousands and thousands of cords of wood for the International Paper Co., and believe and agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he states that 128 cubic feet should be a cord of wood.

In the discussion that arose during the Select Committee one of the important items was the minimum wage that should be paid the men working in the logging woods, and we agreed that 35c. per hour should be the minimum. This work, as you are no doubt aware, is particularly dangerous work, and we do not think that 35c. per hour is too much. As an example of the dangers of this work, I would like to call your attention to a case that happened where a man by the name of Kelly, who was working with the A.N.D. Co. Ltd., and was one of the most competent drivers on the river. During the drive this man drowned, and he left behind him a wife and seven children. Examples of this nature may not be common, but I just quote it to illustrate the conditions that these men work under, and to point out that for working under such conditions 35c. per hour is only a fair wage and in my opinion not too much to be paid the men.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, when we take into consideration the fact that these men are in the water practically all day, and the laborious and dangerous work they have to perform, I certainly do not think 35c. per hour is out of the way.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I have already expressed my opinion regarding this Bill and I certainly do not think that 35c. is too much, and will support the Bill now before the House.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises, I would like to offer my sincere thanks to the Leader of the Opposition, the members on the opposite side of the House and the members of the Government for their help in getting this Act through the House. This means a lot to the men who have to go into the woods to earn a living, and I feel that when they hear that something has been done in their favor they will be very grateful.

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, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging'" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Cer-

tain Resolutions respecting the Export of Marine Shells.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 with some amendment and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide a National Flag for Newfoundland, and Colours to be Worn by Vessels," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide a National Flag for Newfoundland, and Colors to be Worn by Vessels."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the

Bill entitled "An Act to Provide a National Flag for Newfoundland, and Colors to be Worn by Vessels," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.
—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second Reading of this Bill I would point out that this is a matter of absolutely no importance, except from a clerical standpoint. Under this Bill the title of the Colonial Secretary will be in future "Secretary of State," which is the term recognized in all other parts of the British speaking world.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled 'An Act to Alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary.'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to External Affairs," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Speaker, whilst this matter is formal, it is really of some value. We have never had in Newfoundland any effort made whatever towards the preserving of papers on International Treaties, Imperial papers, Dominion papers and statistics of important research of other sections of the Empire. In this country today that matter is being handled partly by the Colonial Secretary's Office and partly by the Prime Minister's Office. Really, it is being done by Mr. Carew, Secretary to the Prime Minister, who has been collecting these things together. It is most important to have some responsible department in this connection, not a paid department beyond the scope of necessities of the ordinary departmental office, but as creating the Prime Minister officially to be in charge of external affairs, just as the practice it in all other parts of the Empire. My intention was to have Mr. Dunfield, the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, incur the expense of a filing cabinet for this purpose. A large quantity of import-

ant papers concerning Treaty questions with the United States and licenses and regulations of the Government service, such as the Marine and Fisheries Department and the Finance and Customs Department, should be got together, so that any Government may at any time have access to the files to get what may be thought to be of any use. It is work that really ought to be done.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to External Affairs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to External Affairs" 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 Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Address to His Majesty the King was read a second time.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I think in connection with a matter of this kind which deals with the relationship between ourselves and Great Britain and Northern Ireland, it would be a pity if we had a serious debate which would call for a division of the House, and I was very much pleased when the Prime Minister indicated that he would consider an amendment to the Address to the King which was before the House. I spent some time with the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, and as a result we agreed—I am speaking now personally—we agreed that the contentions which I intended to put forward personally before the House would be met by this amendment. In effect it means that the Statute of Westminster would come into effect when we decide to bring it into effect.

I think the Prime Minister agrees with that and it leaves it to our province from time to time to bring in laws which will bring in the Statute either in part or in whole from time to time as we think it advisable, and I suggest that that is a very reasonable amendment. It is one that was considered by the New Zealand representatives at the Conference. The Prime Minister this afternoon introduced an amendment which, I think, he had drafted with the Acting Deputy of Justice, and when Mr. Dunfield met him this afternoon I made some amendments to that amendment, but we both agreed that this provision that was considered at the Conference, I think, was better than either of the two in connection with the amendment, and I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for passing the resolution of which this amendment was made part.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, following the considered suggestion of Mr. Emerson;

he has suggested to make an amendment, or I have, whichever way he chooses to put it, but the inclusion in these resolutions of a provision which was agreed upon in connection with New Zealand.

(Reads)

I understand these words which are before me were copied verbatim from the 1931 report which we have before us; it will be found on page 21 of the Summary Proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 1930. If by the adoption of that section we could pass this unanimously, it would certainly have my support.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, I substitute this amendment for the one I first made. That will be inserted as the very last thing in the Bill before the words "All of which we humbly pray."

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider an Address to the King.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith 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 with some amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Resolutions 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 acquaint-

ing the House of Assembly that they have passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively:

"An Act Respecting a Reduction in the Public Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 1931-32"; "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances"; "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925"; and "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending the 30th day of June, 1931, and the 30th day of June, 1932, and for other Purposes relating to the Public Service," without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act for the Closing of Shops within the Electoral District of St. John's (City) East and West" was read a second time.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose in this instance of moving that this Order be stricken off the Order Paper. This is a very contentious matter, Mr. Speaker. A Select Committee of this House have been sitting for two or three weeks trying as best they could to make a friendly arrangement between the clerks who work in the stores on Water Street and those who are interested in small stores in other sections of the city. The object of the Bill, if it went through as it is now, would be to put a lot of small people of out business, and I hold, Mr. Speaker, that this House, in my opinion at any rate, is not the proper place to discuss this matter. If this thing wants to be brought into effect I hold that it is a matter entirely for the Municipal Council, because as I look at it, we are legislating to keep some people from work. If we pass this Bill to-day

we legislate for people to close their stores at 7 or 8 o'clock or whatever hour it may be, who may want to keep them open and work themselves in the evening. That is, in my opinion, legislating to encourage people who are anxious to work to try and make a living, not to work. On the other hand if we pass this Bill that is before us now we deprive a considerable bulk of the people of St. John's who are operating small stores and making a living out of them, we put them out of business because a lot of their business is done in the night after the large wholesale stores are closed.

On the other hand it may be argued that the clerks working in these stores on Water Street, or the large stores, who are behind this Bill, are part of the working people of the country, which they are, and if we don't pass it, that the people who own these shops will keep them working as long as they like at night. That is another argument. Going back to my original statement and that is this: I consider that this House is not the place to make these rules and regulations; that it is either up to the storekeepers themselves who have an Association, or it is a matter entirely for the Municipal Council. Therefore I move that this Order be stricken off the Order Paper if I can get a seconder.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I am not sure that a motion to strike off the Order Paper has to be unanimous. I will have to look that up.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I think I can relieve you from the obligation; it does not matter whether the motion has to be unanimous or not. I am going to vote against it.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, has to rule first as to whether this is a thing that has to

be unanimously adopted before being considered, or whether it has to be passed by a majority vote.

MR. BINDON—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion moved by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, and in doing so I think, Sir, that this is a most drastic, a most unfair and possibly the most serious piece of legislation that has been put before the Legislature.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the Hon. member has a personal interest?

MR. BINDON—I have.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, then he has no right to speak.

MR. BINDON—Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion I'll be frank, I think this Bill is unfair. It is drastic, it is legislating to put people out of business and I'm going to protest against it to the best of my ability.

There seems to be a feeling prevalent in this city today that the small man should not be allowed to do business, and this isn't fair.

If I may quote as an example of this an incident that happened in this House last night; I refer to the Standardization of Fish Bill. This Bill has the effect of putting the small exporter of fish out of business. The Hon. member for Placentia West, Mr. Murphy, moved an amendment to this Bill; Sir Wm. Coaker replying stated that one of the most successful exporters we have is Sir John Crosbie, because he gives no supplies and is not vitally interested in the industry, therefore he is in a position to buy and sell as he sees fit. This Bill does not debar Sir John Crosbie, but it does debar Leo Murphy. Why is this? Leo Murphy has just as much experi-

ence, he has just as much brains; the only difference is that perhaps he hasn't as much money as Sir John Crosbie. He exports every year from 1,000 to 2,000 quintals. Perhaps every year Sir John Crosbie exports 10,000 quintals.

I think that I have as much right to do business in this city as anyone else, and when just at present the prevailing conditions of trade are so bad that shopkeepers are at their wits end to know how to make both ends meet. I don't think it's fair that because a man has started out in business and overcome by hard work, the obstacles that have presented themselves that legislation should be passed to prevent them from doing business.

We're not all fortunate enough to be born wealthy. Some of us can't get a college education or go to the university or start out in an already well established business, we have to work and strive to get on and if I have enough ambition to try and make a living for myself so as to educate my children, and I hope they won't have to struggle as I have, I don't see why anyone should try and prevent me from doing so. I don't think I'm a menace, if I am by all means shut me up, if I'm not, then I don't think it is British fair play to prevent me from doing business in a legitimate way. If this Bill goes through there will be more insolvencies in the next two years than we've had in the past ten.

I remember the year after the war when prices dropped in the dry goods trade in some cases as much as 50 per cent, and I was caught, with lots of others, with goods bought when the prices were sky-high. I could have done what others did— compromise with my creditors—yes, I might have

paid 10 per cent and my creditors would have been quite willing to accept it. But I didn't, fought along and worked hard and succeeded. This Bill isn't for the protection of the clerks; there's no clause to that effect in it. If an outport buyer comes to town and buys from one of the big stores some thousand dollars worth of goods the clerks can be ordered back every night the owner of that store sees fit to pack those goods, but if the same man gets his feet wet I can't open my store after six o'clock to sell him a pair of socks. It isn't fair, we tried in every way to meet the clerks halfway, we offered to close on holidays and half-holidays, to close three nights a week, we did all in our power, but they wouldn't listen to us, they had canvassed the members of this House and there was enough of them on their side to outvote us.

These grocers must exist as best they can. The bulk of their business is done in the night time and I think that you should consider the great number of clerks in the small stores. This is class legislation, it is unfair, it is wrong. Why should anyone interfere with me in the carrying on of my business unless I am a menace to the community?

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding this resolution.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I find that in May's Parliamentary Practise, page 273, that this motion was made by the Prime Minister and the motion to withdraw must be made by the Prime Minister and Mr. Bindon is out of order.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to this motion. I move that this be given a six months hoist.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, it has been read twice already.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to stay here six months before I see this pass. I move that this House go into Committee of the Whole on this motion six months hence. I listened to Mr. Bindon and I have come to the conclusion that this Bill is not in the interests of the clerks. This Bill is brought in here to put the small shopkeepers out of business. This Bill was introduced so that the large merchants may get control of the business on Water Street. I contend that we are not here to pass legislation along these lines. We had a similar incident last night in the Bill for the exportation of salt fish. I contend that this legislation is vicious. The clerks on Water Street are being used by the merchants. I want to see fair play and I don't think that this Bill is going to ensure that and if I am voted down and it goes through Committee and we are supposed to close tomorrow, I am prepared to fight this for six months. This was originated in vicious minds in order to get control of business so that they might enrich themselves. Take the poorer classes, the men who are working on the docks, on the wharves, etc., they work ten hours a day and when they come off work they cannot get a pound of tea because the merchants have closed up the shops. That is not British fair play, that is class legislation of the most vicious kind. I held up this House before for six hours and I'll hold it up again for twenty six hours if necessary. Just because some poor unfortunate is trying to make a living they try to shut him up. Why not Bindon, why not Murphy, or Mike O'Brien on Middle Street. Why should they not be allowed to go to work, when the Water Street merchants are

too lazy to go to work themselves and now they are trying to put these men who do out of business.

This is the most peculiar Bill I ever saw, this is trying to keep men from going to work. I say to the outport members that anything that we do here effects the whole country. If a man in Port Union or Bay Roberts wanted to close up the stores what would happen? We have to consider the general welfare of the country and I consider this an impertinence and I say to the clerks that they have been used and they will find that out within twenty four hours after the passing of this Bill. Look at the Fall trade, a man buys a lot of stuff, say at Bowrings, and it not able to be all packed in the day, the clerks will have to go back and pack it in the night. I say that this is vicious legislation and I never made that statement before with such enthusiasm and sincerity as I make it now. If I am voted down I am prepared to stay here six months before I will allow this Bill to pass.

MR. STRONG—Mr. Speaker, I agree in part with the remarks of Mr. Bindon and the Minister of Finance regarding this question. I see no reason why as an outport man and as an outport member I should come to St. John's and assist in legislation to put men out of business in that locality. I look on St. John's the same as I look on Little Bay Islands. If we wanted to close the stores there at 6 o'clock we would get together and decide whether we would close or not and I think that the business men in St. John's should do the same. I think that this should not come before this House, I think that this is a matter for the Municipal Council. I must admit that I am in sympathy with the clerks of the city. I was talking to

one of them this morning and he was telling me that they were threatened with no holidays if the shops did not close.

To my mind this is a very good idea of the sentiment behind this Bill. I believe in fair play. In Little Bay Islands we are always kept fairly busy and sometimes we keep open in the nights after six o'clock, we don't kick, they are welcome to make a living if they want to do so, we never brought in a Bill to prevent them from so doing. I consider it just as reasonable for Sir William Coaker to propose that the smaller shopkeepers at Port Union be closed after six o'clock and I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the Minister of Finance.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if Mr. Bindon, in his remark, was speaking as the representative of St. Mary's District or a St. John's District. It seemed to me that he was not considering the Bill in general but his own interests in particular. During the meetings that were held by the two different sides who were interested in this Bill it was decided that the closing of shops would be allowed with the exception of certain stipulated times beginning in December and going on until after the Christmas trade. It was thought that this would be unfair to the owners of the Middle St. shops and they were to be allowed to open on the three nights a week, Tuesdays, Fridays and Saturdays. seemed to me to be reasonable.

If the larger shops on Water St. were to keep open it would mean that young girls and young men would be working for fourteen hours a day. When the Hon. member said that we had been hounded into advocating this Bill it was too absurd and as I

said before I think that if the Middle Street men can keep their shops open Tuesdays, Fridays and Saturdays, which in my opinion are ideal nights, then they should be satisfied.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Speaker in regard to what Mr. Bindon said it was not only the small shopkeepers who disapprove. As you will remember the day the Committee met to discuss this Bill in the Members Room and they were there for two hours or more and could not seem to make any suggestion that would be suitable for both sides. In fact they agreed to nothing.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Speaker, I want to place myself on record as associating myself with what the clerks in the store are looking for. This petition for the closing hours has been signed by twelve hundred wage earners and so far there has been nothing said that could be used as an argument against the petition. True one small storekeeper has spoken against it, but that is not so with others, they do not say they cannot live if the stores are not opened in the night time and when we consider that the small stores of both Water Street and Middle Street are to be allowed open for three nights a week I do not think that there is anything unfair in this treatment. I myself thought that it should have been done many years ago.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I did not speak on this Bill previously but I hope to when it went into Committee stage. I had hoped that the principle of the Bill would have been accepted by the House and then we would be able to make some small but necessary amendments, but now the question before us is whether the House is going to receive and accept the principle of this Bill. If it comes down to discussion what parts of the Bill

can be amended and can we do that until this Bill goes into Committee stage or until the principle has been accepted by the House. Nobody spoke against this Bill previously to this and I cannot see why the House cannot receive it. It is true that the Minister of Finance and Customs spoke from the floor in a great heat and called this class legislation but I want to point out to the House that every Bill that passes through this House is class legislation of one sort or another. For example, if a Bill is passed against larceny it is class legislation against thieves, and all that flap-doodle that has been spoken about as class legislation is nothing but utter twaddle.

I can see no argument, or cannot understand why the Minister says that the Bill was fostered for the benefit of half a dozen merchants on Water Street, if, as it was said, the clerks might still have to go back in the night to pack goods during the busy season they will not be any worse off than they were before. Things of this nature are bound to happen in every business. I, myself, have spoken to and been spoken to by many clerks, and the first question that was brought up was whether or not the employers were interested in this Bill or if they had signed a petition. In every case I was told "No." I believe that half the trouble is that the Select Committee was so bombarded by questions from both sides that they really did not have the time to consider the Bill. There was quite a number of people that I knew were opposed to the Bill, but when they had received a full explanation of it they could see nothing wrong with the Bill. When the Bill was first introduced the Prime Minister sent me a copy of it and in the draft copy I found many defects. I discussed this with several

small shopkeepers who were clients of mine, and on their suggestion made many slight alterations, but all of them were only of minor importance. The position is this: the Prime Minister gave me a copy of the Bill before the House opened; the small shopkeepers objected to the Bill until certain alterations had been made which were suggested by them; after these had been made they were satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to say is, the matter ought not be considered as a party measure. My honorable friend has just proposed an amendment which I am not sure I altogether agree to. The question seems to be causing a lot of acrimony and heat and I think it ought be considered solely on its merits.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I still think that this measure was inspired by the big fellow to put down the little fellow. I said before that I was prepared to fight it for six weeks if necessary, as it was then, and I still say so.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 14th, 1931.

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

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Jamestown in the District of Bonavista South asking for a sum of money to repair the road from Middle Brook to the Railway Station.

This road is the only means the people from these three or four sections have of getting themselves and their goods to and from the railway station, and is therefore of great importance to them. This road, should for obvious economic reasons be repaired in an efficient manner and no trivial sum will be of any practical use. I beg

this matter be referred to the Department to which it belongs, the Department of Public Works, and trust it will be in due course be referred to the Highroads Commission.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my hearty support to the petition just presented by my friend Mr. Quinton.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Hon. Member for Bonavista South, Mr. Quinton, asked a lengthy and complicated question concerning educational returns. I have secured from the Secretary of the Council of Higher Education and from the Educational Superintendents of the several Religious Denominations the detailed data sought and I have much pleasure in giving the following information:

(COPY)

Superintendent of Education,

(Catholic Schools),

St. John's, Nfld., April 28th, 1931

The Right Hon. Sir R. A. Squires, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.B., P.C.,
President Bureau of Education.

Dear Sir Richard:

With reference to the question asked by Mr. Quinton concerning certain educational statistics I beg to submit the following information:

1. SALARIES: The following table sets forth the highest, lowest and average salaries of Roman Catholic teachers for the year 1919-1920:

Grades:	Associate		First		Second		Third		O	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Highest Salary	1353	584	980	678	722	565	593	492	305	210
Lowest Salary	574	417	446	340	416	267	248	236	180	120
Average Salary	1076	532	779	507	502	377	404	312	200	173

The above table includes secular teachers only. As you are aware, many of our schools both in the city and throughout the country are staffed by religious who live in community and do not receive individual salaries. If these were included the average salary would be much lower than shown above.

The highest, lowest and average salaries for the year 1929-1930 are given in the following table:

Grades	Associate		First		Second		Third		O	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Highest Salary	1293	768	1205	1001	920	728	584	517	200	210
Lowest Salary	738	510	600	456	628	205	300	216	120	110
Average Salary	1044	629	853	558	729	431	411	339	133	142

We have not given the figures for the nine intervening years as it would take considerable time and difficulty to compile same. It may be observed,

however, that since the 40 per cent. increase in Augmentation made in 1920, salaries remained practically at the same figure for those years.

2. THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN OPERATION for the past ten years is set forth in the following table:

Year	No. of Schools	No. of School Departments
1920-1921	321	468
1921-1922	323	471
1922-1923	325	472
1923-1924	326	472
1924-1925	329	477
1925-1926	329	477
1926-1927	330	480
1927-1928	335	481
1928-1929	335	482
1929-1930	337	485

We have not been tabulating in our school statistics the number of half, three quarter and quarter year schools. It may be stated that in the past ten years the average number of half year schools would be approximately twenty-five.

3. The following table, giving the number of teachers who have retired from the profession during the last ten years, is based on statistics kept in connection with the Teachers' Pension Fund, and as ungraded teachers are not members of this fund, we have no record concerning their retirement.

Date	A.A. Grade	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade	Total
1920-1921	2	4	8	17	31
1921-1922	3	2	9	16	30
1922-1923	2	7	4	15	28
1923-1924	2	4	3	22	31
1924-1925	0	5	7	27	39
1925-1926	4	3	8	21	36
1926-1927	5	4	11	23	43
1927-1928	7	4	12	17	40
1928-1929	2	5	15	14	36
1929-1930	6	9	10	23	48
Total	33	47	87	195	362

Yours faithfully,

R. K. KENNEDY,
Supt. Education, R.C.

(COPY)

Superintendent of Education,

(United Church),

St. John's, April 28th, 1931.

The Right Hon. Sir R. A. Squires, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.B., P.C.,
President Bureau of Education.

Dear Mr. President:

In connection with Mr. Quinton's questions seeking certain Educational Statistics, I beg to submit the following figures:—

1. SALARIES: The highest, lowest and average salaries paid graded teachers of Public Schools under United Church Boards for the year 1919-20 are set out in the following table:

	A. A. and First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Highest Salary	\$1864	\$1119	\$659	\$716	\$423	\$500
Lowest Salary	571	371	484	346	352	283
Average Salary	960	626	575	456	393	383

The highest, lowest and average salaries paid graded teachers of Public Schools under United Church Boards for 1929-30 are set out in the following table:—

	A. A. Grade		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Highest Salary	\$2196	\$1142	\$1532	\$1557	\$735	\$1146	\$464	\$650
Lowest Salary	780	620	600	468	500	296	320	200
Average Salary	1173	829	803	662	579	489	379	385

To give the list covering the ten years in question would involve much time and labour, but if found really essential I will be glad to furnish the information as quickly as conditions of our office will allow.

The average of salaries changes very little from year to year.

We have no tabulated record of salaries paid to ungraded teachers, as they are usually employed for part of year only.

2. THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN OPERATION under United Church Boards for varying periods since 1921 is set out in the following table:—

	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930
Full year schools	299	305	304	324	347	355	361	379	380	408
½ year schools	21	20	25	27	18	19	26	10	24	17
¼ year schools	65	68	66	47	49	47	47	40	37	35
⅓ year schools	20	14	21	14	12	11	11	10	9	6
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	405	407	416	412	426	432	445	439	450	466
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

3. We have no record of the retirement of ungraded teachers.

The following table shows the number of United Church teachers who have withdrawn for the past ten years:—

	Grade A. A.	Grade First	Grade Second	Grade Third	Total
1920-21	15	11	14	12	52
1921-22	13	4	17	22	56
1922-23	17	12	17	24	70
1923-24	18	18	16	9	61
1924-25	12	13	19	18	62
1925-26	13	14	24	16	67
1926-27	19	16	22	19	76
1927-28	72
1928-29	13	11	35	15	74
1929-30	14	15	23	15	67
					656
					—

Of those recorded as withdrawing from year to year about 20% re-enter the service after an absence of a year and over.

Yours faithfully,

E. LODGE,

Ass't. Sup't. of Education, (U.C.)

(COPY)

Department of Education,

(Church of England),

St. John's, Nfld.,

April 28th, 1931.

The Right Hon. Sir R. A. Squires, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.B., P.C.,
President Bureau of Education.

My Dear President:

In relation to Mr. Quinton's question seeking certain educational statistics I beg to supply you with the following information:

I. SALARIES: The highest, lowest and average salaries for the year 1919 to 1920 are set out in the following table (Church of England teachers only):

Grades:	Associate		First		Second		Third		O	
Sex:	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Highest Salary	1332	321	1913	852	932	655	663	667	510	300
Lowest Salary	811	600	672	433	310	237	266	189	183	100
Average Salary	1071	695	1023	653	672	466	481	364	328	209

The highest, lowest and average salaries for the year 1929 to 1930 are set out in the following table:

Grades:	University Associate				First		Second		Third		O	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Highest Salary..	2400	782	1536	1632	1202	1137	1047	786	545	480	405	339
Lowest Salary ..	1045	782	849	852	611	526	412	350	200	227	160	100
Average Salary	1437	782	1155	1045	839	725	670	495	419	359	295	213

It will take a good deal of time to supply the figures for the nine intervening years, but it can be stated that there has been no material change in the teachers' salaries during these ten years. If there has been any tendency at all it has been towards a very slight decrease. If the information for the intervening years is indispensable then I shall be glad to compile it as rapidly as the circumstances of my office will permit.

2. THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN OPERATION under the Church of England Boards for varying periods for the last ten years is set out in the following table:

	Full Year	¾ Year	½ Year	¼ Year	Total
1920-1921	303	38	58	32	431
1921-1922	317	41	61	30	449
1922-1923	326	25	62	35	448
1923-1924	327	30	62	26	445
1924-1925	342	28	73	13	456
1925-1926	364	25	54	14	457
1926-1927	358	28	62	33	481
1927-1928	366	28	65	28	487
1928-1929	381	19	67	21	488
1929-1930	417	25	48	21	511

3. We have no record of the retirement of ungraded teachers. The following table gives the number of Church of England teachers who have withdrawn from the profession during the last ten years:

Date	U. Grade	A. Grade	Grade	First	Second	Third	Grade Total
				Grade	Grade	Grade	
1920-1921	2	4	11	19	36	
1921-1922	6	5	13	20	44	
1922-1923	2	8	14	24	
1923-1924	3	5	5	34	47	
1924-1925	3	5	9	36	53	
1925-1926	2	1	9	17	29	
1926-1927	2	5	15	35	57	
1927-1928	3	2	15	23	43	
1928-1929	2	2	17	21	42	
1929-1930	3	4	5	14	22	48	
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	3	27	36	116	241	423	
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) W. W. BLACKALL,
Supt. Education, (C. of E.)

(COPY)

Rates of Salaries Paid to Salvation Army Teachers for Year Ended
June 30th, 1919.

	Associate		1st Grade		2nd Grade		3rd Grade		Ungraded	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Highest Salary	523	389	384	416	349	395	290	305	274
Lowest Salary	203	196	340	285	157	144	158	81	
Average Salary	523	362	350	349	305	253	235	163	157

1930

	Associate		1st Grade		2nd Grade		3rd Grade		Ungraded	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Highest Salary	1270	688	856	624	598	462	585	320	300
Lowest Salary	1270	688	656	440	320	372	272	150	150
Average Salary	1270	688	750	590	550	420	398	250	210

Number Of Schools In Operation During Year Ended June 30th, 1919.

Full Year	40
¾ Year	10
½ Year	4
¼ Year	4
	—
Total	58
	—

For Year Ended June 30th, 1929.

Full Year	73
¾ Year	4
½ Year	4
¼ Year	2
	—
	83
	—

For Year Ended June 30th, 1930.

Full Year	71
¾ Year	5
½ Year	5
¼ Year	1
	—
	82
	—

Number Of Teachers Who Have Left Profession For Year Ended
June 30th, 1930.

MALE			FEMALE	
3rd Grade	Ungraded	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	Ungraded
2	6	3	5	9

Number Leaving To Take Up Other Work.

MALE 3rd Grade	FEMALE			Ungraded 5
	Ungraded 4	2nd Grade 1	3rd Grade 3	

June 30th, 1929.**MALES**

A.	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	Ungraded
1	2

Number Leaving To Take Up Other Work.

A	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	Ungraded
1	1	2

FEMALES

A	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	Ungraded
1	2	2

(COPY)

Council of Higher Education,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
April 29th, 1931.

Dr. V. P. Burke, M.A., B.Sc., O.B.E.,
Secretary for Education,
Militia Building, City.

Dear Sir,

I beg to submit the number of candidates who entered and sat for the C.H.E. Examinations for the years 1919 to 1930, inclusive, together with the number of passes in each year.

Year	Entered	Sat	Passed
1919	3107	2858	1770
1920	3857	3587	2248
1921	4816	4508	2859
1922	5231	5054	2639
1923	5118	4936	3040
1924	5491	5248	2738
1925	5757	5538	3490
1926	6437	6110	3736
1927	7021	6637	3820
1928	7586	7181	4343
1929	7903	7436	3886
1930	8126	7645	4955

(Sgd.) M. G. KING,
Secretary.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Closing Hours of Shops within the Electoral District of St. John's (City) East and West."

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I am sorry we have to discuss the principle of the Bill which I thought we had agreed on at the second reading. Regarding the merits or demerits of the Bill, I have little to say. I think it should be discussed in Committee, and if we cannot make a Bill out of it, it can be filed in the reports.

There are 250 small shopkeepers, and I would be very sorry to think that they should suffer as the result of this enactment. I think the Bill might be amended so that this hardship, if it can be so called, might be eliminated. I think the honorable member for St. Mary's was mistaken when he said the Bill was class legislation. There is no favoring anybody, it is only to arrange that no one will have to work on holidays or half-holidays. We are merely seeking equality for everyone. I think that we should go into Committee and see if we cannot make a Bill of this, even if certain amendments are necessary.

MR. BENNET.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with Mr. Puddester regarding this Bill. Representing as I do a section of this City, I think it is my duty to air my views on this matter. I disagree with the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs. This Bill is backed by an immense number of clerks who have the authority of their employers. I think we should go into Committee on this Bill with an open mind and see what can be done.

In reading this Bill I find there are many points about which I am in the

dark, and I have no doubt that there are many members on both sides of the House who feel the same way about the Bill as I do. It will only be during debate of the full Committee that we will hear the contentious parts explained. I will particularly ask the attention of the outport members during the discussion of this Bill, as it only affects individuals in the City of St. John's, and this is all the more reason when they are voting on the Bill that they give the City people a chance. I am not asking them to vote in any particular way, but as one not interested, I want them to have a chance to understand the contentious parts of this Bill, and I would ask that the Bill go before a Committee of the Whole House for full discussion.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the other members of this House regarding the Shop Closing Act. There are, I should say, a good many who like myself are not fully aware of all the contentious matters contained in the Bill. I do not think, however, that the motion of the Minister of Finance and Customs to give the Bill a six months hoist is a good one. I think that both sides of this House should go into the Bill, section by section, amend the difficult parts and bring in a Bill which would be suitable to all.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Speaker, as far as this Bill is concerned, the main principle with which I am concerned is to protect and help the working people who are employed on Water Street. I do not agree that this Bill should be given a six months hoist, but think that all the sections should be aired before a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Speaker, I have purposely waited before saying anything about this Bill in the hope that

some member of the other side who was opposed to the measure would say something in connection with it, but it would be unfair if I were to let it go without registering my protest.

I personally don't think that the members of either side know much about it, and I think it would be very regrettable if the Bill does not reach the Committee stage. All the information we received when the Prime Minister introduced the measure was he informed us it was a Bill which affected the closing of the stores, and he further said that the Bill was supported by a petition signed by 1200 clerks; at the same time, he said he had received a counter-petition from certain store-owners.

There was a Select Committee appointed, of which I was a member. But before dealing with what the Select Committee did in regard to the matter, I would like to point out that this Bill was solely for the benefit of the clerks. Firstly, it relates to the closing hours of stores, and secondly, to compel certain storekeepers to close on Sundays and half-holidays, and also to compel these storekeepers to close on regular whole holidays, such as Armistice Day and Empire Day. The clerks in the stores, as patriotic citizens, like to celebrate these holidays, but unfortunately they are prevented from doing so.

These are the only two objects of this Bill, and without giving it any consideration, certain members on the other side say to turn it down. If this is done, I say it will be nothing less than criminal. It is unnecessary for me to point out to this House the work done by the clerks in the stores during the four months they work from 8.30 in the morning to 10 o'clock at night. Some of these clerks have to come from the town extensions to work, and from the time they start

at 8.30 in the morning they work continuously, with the exception of one hour for dinner and one hour for tea. In other words, they are on their feet continually from 8.30 in the morning to 10.30 in the night.

This Bill is brought in simply to regulate the closing hours for the stores. There is nothing novel about this; other countries have these regulations and surely we want Newfoundland to be as far advanced as they are. Wherever you go you find that there are certain closing hours for shops and I don't see why we can't have the same law in this country.

When the matter came before the Select Committee we had a copy of the counter-petition which was to a large extent signed by small shop-owners and their friends; or in other words, the first petition was from the clerks and the second petition from the storekeepers. Members of the Government have said that this is class legislation, and that we are trying to legislate against the smaller shop-owners. My answer to that is, that we are trying to protect the under-dog; trying to protect those who are made work from 8.30 to 10.00. When at the meeting of both parties to the measure, both were represented by counsel, the clerks did not produce any evidence with the exception of the petition. At that meeting everything possible was done for a compromise. Certain suggestions were offered regarding the opening of small shops, but the small store-owners were adamant in that they would hear nothing, except having the petition thrown out entirely.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Speaker, at the Select Committee both bodies to the petition were represented by lawyers, and they were for two hours discussing the Bill, but neither side would yield.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Speaker, the clerks suggested that certain shops should remain open on certain days and remain closed on other days, and I do not think there is anything drastic about the measure. It is surely fair to all.

If all the shops have certain closing hours, I cannot see how they are going to lose business. If they all close together and all open together it should be as fair to one as to the other. I greatly admire the man who wants to work in order that he advance himself, but I don't think that any man has the right to expect employees to work hours and hours on end that the employer might be further enriched. As I said before, these people have some long distances and they are standing all day in the shops where they are employed. The young girls who work in these stores are the future mothers of Newfoundlanders, and I do not think it right that they be allowed to stand from 8.30 in the morning until 10 o'clock at night. I would particularly ask the honorable member for Lewisporte to take this matter into consideration.

The honorable member for St. Mary's admitted that he had a personal interest in this Bill and, therefore, his remarks should be discounted. He said that his business is at stake; but how? He didn't say how. He says that this legislation will put him out of business; but how? If all the other shopkeepers are closed, how can he be put out of business? As regards the claim that this is class legislation, I think that this is rubbish. How does the class element enter into this Bill?

With the point raised by the honorable member for White Bay, I disagree, when he claims that outport members have no right to vote on this matter. We are not here to represent

certain small districts; we are here to protect the general welfare of the country. From time to time we have to deal with matters of a purely local nature; only a few days ago the honorable member for Bell Island introduced a Bill that only concerned Bell Island, but that does not mean that we have not the right to consider it or vote on it. If a certain class of people petition this House and introduce a Bill, I think that it is our duty to consider it and vote on it, and if their request is a reasonable one we should see they get it. It is unfair that at this stage we should peremptorily give this the six months hoist, as suggested by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it is fair that this Committee should sit six months hence, because I regard a petition from any body of men to be an important matter and a public man has to be fair to every interest. If we go into Committee on this motion it will show these people that we at least are giving it consideration. If we do not like the things in the Bill we can have them taken out. Let the House decide. Let us go into Committee and if the amendments are unfair, we can cut them out, but do not let us shut the door in the faces of the men who are asking us to help them. I don't think that it is fair to close all the stores, but I would like to see the petition get some consideration.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, as the honorable member for St. Mary's said yesterday afternoon, this legislation now before the House is easily the most important and most far-reaching matter that we have had to deal with this session, and no matter how it is decided one or other section of the community will be seri-

ously hampered. I am opposed to this Bill on principle; firstly, because this legislation is in restraint of trade; secondly, because it is class legislation, and thirdly, because under conditions today we should be encouraging people to work instead of legislating to put them out of business, and there are two hundred and fifty small shop-keepers involved, and I submit that we should not pass legislation of this sort that would jeopardise them in their business.

Mr. Bindon yesterday told a story of the development of his business and he has been criticised on the grounds that he is personally interested in this Bill. But the fact that he is a business man does not detract from what he said, and when he spoke he expressed the sentiments of every small shopkeeper in St. John's. These men who come in here and ask that this House do not consider this Bill are men who have developed small businesses through their own hard work. Their success has been due to the fact that they rolled up their sleeves nad dug right in and they were not circumscribed by having their time limited; they hoped that they would live and prosper in a free country unhampered by legislation of this kind.

This is class legislation, nothing more or nothing less. It is true that the clerks have a grievance; they get no consideration for working overtime; and it is also true that it was suggested that they be given overtime and a standard eight-hour day, and it was not accepted. There is a "nigger in the wodyle" somewhere, and it is up to us to see where that nigger is. It is the people who are willing to work overtime to develop their business who are the object of this legislation. If they have to live in a country where one section is pro-

tected more than another, I think it is time for us to haul down the flag.

In the last few days also we have had the same sort of legislation brought up and discusssed, class legislation along tthe same lines. Why tell the man on the back streets that he is not to work after certain hours? Why tell a man that if he is prepared to make sacrifices to build up his business, that he is not allowed to do so? It's all very well for the big fellow. The big fellow doesn't want to come back after six. He wants to drive around in his motor car. If we are going to legislate the small shop-keeper out of business in St. John's, why not let us be consistent and do the same all over the country?. Let the Act apply to Port Union and the Humber area and all small businesses all over the country. Why apply it only to St. John's? Let it apply to all clerks all over the country. Why has it to apply to one particular class and section? The reason is that the big man is not prepared to make sacrifices and the small man is, and the big man now asks for lligislation to prevent the small man doing so.

Mr. Speaker, this House is made up largely of outport members. How can these men consistently vote out of business men of the same class as themselves. We have business men in my own district who don't know daylight frcm dark, and who work every available hour and have a hard struggle at that to keep their businesses going. A great many of these men have built up their businesses as a result of a life-time effort, and what justification have we to come along now and legislate them out of business. Let me say to the men who oppose this amendment that the small man doesn't make his money between 9 and 6. It is only in the night-time that he gets a chance to make his hay,

so to speak. If that is so, it's nothing less than criminal to try to put this man out of business.

I say this is not the time for legislation of this nature. That is why I seconded the motion that it be not introduced into the Legislature until such time as we get an opportunity of finding out the viewpoint of everyone concerned. At the present time we are practically under suspended rules. I say that such a far-reaching measure should not be brought into this House and railroaded through its three readings at a time like the present.

HON. SOLICITOR GENERAL.—Mr. Speaker, This is a matter which ought to be discussed absolutely without heat. The situation is rather complicated. On the one side we have anywhere from 1500 to 3000 clerks and on the other 250 shopkeepers. As a matter of fact we know that some are in favor of it. One then begins to doubt the statement that these men will be put out of business. Surely these men must have considered the effect on their own business before making their decision. I can't see myself how a 44-hour week could be introduced when most of these clerks are not paid by the day or hour, but by the month. These men do work overtime at times, but on the other hand they get holidays for which their pay is carried on, and if they happen to get sick their pay is carried on, at least for a reasonable time.

If we start the 44-hour week system we are going to upset the whole system on Water Street, and upset 3000 clerks. It has been suggested that this Bill will prevent small shopkeepers from going to work. There is no objection whatever to any man rolling up his sleeves and going to work. The objection is to his rolling up someone else's sleeves and making them go to work. These 1500 clerks

who signed the petition have surely some rights too, and this is the case where the majority ought to be considered.

As to the matter of three nights a week, that was a provision which was agreed to by the clerks, but it was a provision which would not be accepted, up to the time I left town, by the shopkeepers in the back streets, and it does now seem to me that the clerks have gone further towards making a compromise than the shopkeepers in the back streets. In considering this matter we have to remember that if the interests of 250 shopkeepers are affected by this Bill, against that you got to weigh in the balance 3,000 citizens in this town whose interests are also affected and who do not want to be deprived of their evenings by the minority. There is no reason why a man who wants to go back to work in the nights should compel his clerks to go back too.

The question for the House to decide is which class of men is entitled to the greatest consideration. I submit that we must do the greatest good for the greatest number. Surely the fact that there is a possibility of some 250 shopkeepers may be to some extent affected is not conclusive satisfaction to this House that the clerks should not get the reasonable relief that they ask for.

On the motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Closing Hours of Shops within the Electoral Districts of St. John's (City) East and West."

It was moved by Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, and seconded by Hon. Mr. Lewis, in amendment, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on the said Bill this day six months.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment:—Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Hon. Dr. Campbell, Messrs. Downey, Lake Bindon, Strong, Murphy, Fitzgibbon, Hibbs.

And against it:—The Prime Minister, Sir William Coaker, Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Puddester, Hon. Minister Posts and Telegraphs, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Bennett, Hon. Mr. Bradley, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Winter, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Godden, Lady Squires, Mr. Smith, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Greene, Mr. Earle, Hon. Dr. Mosdell, Mr. Skeans, Mr. Brown.

So it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion was put, was passed in the affirmative, and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Closing Hours of Shops within the Electoral Districts of St. John's (City) East and West."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to move an amendment to that Section. The amendment will be to Sub-section C, and it will be by way of addition. I am sorry that I have not go a sufficient number of copies. I will read it first, doing it slowly:

"Or such establishment wherein during the hours of closing herein provided no employee other than the immediate members of the family, that is to say, the owner, wife or husband and children is employed."

That will be in addition to the words already in Sub-section C.

(Reads Sub-section C)

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—If I own a shop down on Water Street and I live on Waterford Bridge Road, can I come down and open that shop?

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, not under this amendment. If help is employed during the day, and you want to open the shop at night, you can't employ help.

MR. FITZGIBBON.—Mr. Chairman, I asked that very question of those representing the early closing, and I was given to understand that I could not do that.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Would you mind making your amendment to cover a man that does not live in the shop, then I will support it.

MR. BENNETT.—I agree with the Minister of Finance and Customs.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, in other words, anybody who wants to open his store without any employee at all other than his immediate family, that is to say, the owner, wife or husband and children. Is there any serious objection to that?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Or two brothers, if they own it.

MR. EMERSON.—If they own it; "The owner, wife or husband and children." I will read it:

(Reads Sub-section C.)

I suggest the adding of the following words:

(Reads proposed amendment)

SIR W. COAKER.—It does not matter where he resides?

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, it does not matter where he resides. It was on that basis I spoke the other day. The honorable member for Ferryland said it came from Water Street.

So far as I am concerned, it only comes from the clerks. I am dealing with it as a clerks' measure. I am not interested in it otherwise. If any man wants to turn up his shirt sleeves and work at night, I don't see why I should stop it. On the other hand, I think that the Legislature might reasonably interfere to stop the bringing down of employees. That is what I am considering ;it is the bringing down of employees after regular working hours, and it is to limit their hours of work.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—I was going to suggest that there might be other members of the household who are not children; why should they be prevented?

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, you must make a rule and you don't want to make it too wide. There are a number of provisions that you can put in. The only question is, how far are they going to make this Bill complicated? This provision of mine is that anybody who owns a store, he can live on Waterford Bridge Rd. and have a store down in Maggotty Cove, and provided only he and his family work in that store during prohibited hours, then there is no objection.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—Is there any objection to his taking down a stenographer to do some work at night?

MR. EMERSON.—I presume that my honorable friend would treat his stenographer as an employee.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—If a shopkeeper cannot take down a stenographer at night—

MR. EMERSON.—It all depends upon the definition. I think the word "employee" is wide enough.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—Mr. Chairman, why should one be able to

have office clerks down at night and a shopkeeper not be allowed to have office clerks if they have to get letters off?

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I don't see why they should not. Under this, I take it that any employee can be brought back at night provided that he or she is a member of the family.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—Mr. Chairman, suppose an employer wants to bring down his secretary to do some work at night, why should he not be able to do it?

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, if the shop is not open it does not matter. My honorable friend goes back to his office at night; we all have to do it, and have clerks come down; but the office is not open in the sense of expecting clients. There is nothing to stop anybody on Water Street either before or after the Act is passed, to stop bringing clerks back to do special work; but the shop must not be open.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Chairman, what protection is that to the clerks? The employers can bring the clerks back every night and not have the shops open.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, they have not asked for that protection; if they want it and want to put it in the Bill, well and good. I am dealing with the Bill that they proposed. You take the stock-taking period; the clerks come back at night and work. I don't suppose there is a single business, law or medicine or anything else, where clerks are employed, that there are not periods when the employees have to go back to work at night. That is bound to happen. The clerks have asked for this particular protection about the

closing of the shops, that is, for business, I take it, over the counter. There are cases where the employer is going to say to his clerks "You must come back tonight; we have to take stock." That is not in the Bill at all.

HON. SOLICITOR GENERAL.—Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this Bill to prevent every shop on Water Street from bringing back the clerks every night in the year.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, you have got to bear in mind two factors in connection with business. One is when they are open to the public. We lawyers are open to the public; coal merchants are open to the public in the day time. We may have additional work to do at night because we are not able to attend to it during the day; we will bring our clerks back in the night to attend to it. That is not dealt with in the Bill. The purpose of the Bill is to do away with the opening of shops where clerks are employed during the night.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That is the idea of the Bill.

LADY SQUIRES.—Mr. Chairman, is this going to bring about protection for these women who work night after night? That's what I'm here for, to protect these people. That is what they elected me for. If this does not provide protection for these people, why call it a Clerks' Bill?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, when we come to the particular section I'm waiting for, I have an amendment to suggest.

(Reads)

I am going to suggest this amendment whereby every shop will close from 7 p.m. to 8 a.m.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, the amendment we are considering is not a matter for party politics. You seem to forget that this Bill isn't perfect. There are two classes of work, I might say three—the ordinary work of the day, the work in the night-time on what might be termed the recognized nights for opening, and then there is the work done after the shops are shut in the night and the employees are called back to make up work that there hasn't been time to do in the day, for instance, stock taking. I quite agree with the honorable member for Lewisporte when she says that we should try to lessen the working hours.

LADY SQUIRES.—Mr. Chairman, then we should try and alter the number of nights they work from six to three. It seems to me that it is just as well to have these clerks serving in the stores as to have them working behind closed doors. In fact it provides some variety, and that is surely better than the dreadful, dull monotony of what might be termed the "house-cleaning" of the stores.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I might remind the honorable member for Lewisporte that this keeping the stores open will not avoid this, for the work which she terms house-cleaning must be done sometime.

MR. EARLE.—Mr. Chairman, I think what this Bill really needs is an overtime clause, but as yet we do not seem to have got far enough advanced in labor legislation to bring this about. There would be fewer stores opened and less clerks brought back if we had this clause. This could be brought about, in my opinion, by an eight-hour day. This does not mean that you would work only eight hours. Under this system I have worked 48 hours. The Bill, as Mr.

Emerson has outlined, won't give the clerks much protection. However, as I said before, we don't seem to be able as yet to effect any labor legislature, but I am glad to think we have got as far as we have, and I would like to repeat that an eight-hour day doesn't of necessity mean only eight hours work, and I think there ought to be an amendment put in dealing with this phase of the matter.

MR. GREENE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the amendment and on the Bill generally, and though I am with the majority in this respect, yet I think we ought to pay attention to the requests of the minority, but I don't think it fair that we should withhold for six months this Bill, which is the petition of 1200 people.

I think every man is entitled to his rights and it's our business to see that he gets them. The honorable member for Harbor Main, when speaking, said that it was not fair that four or five merchants should dictate to the smaller fellows.

There has been much controversy over this Bill. Both sides made propositions and counter-propositions, which were not accepted. The Select Committee held numerous meetings and failed to reach any agreement. It's our duty to make amendments to meet the faults of the Bill as we consider best, whether they like it or not.

(Reads)

This Bill does not provide any protection whatsoever for the small grocer, and that isn't fair. Now we've got to make amendments to protect these small men and generally make the best Bill we can out of this. I don't want to oppose the majority, but I do think that these 1200 petitioners should be considered.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what protection is given the clerks. Can they be called back after the shops are closed? If this is so, it provides no real protection. I think when we come to the section dealing with this we should give it serious consideration.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, this Bill which is now before us has caused considerable consternation in the House. I have been told that this Bill does not prevent employers from bringing clerks back to work at night, but allows them to come back to work provided they keep the stores closed to the general public. Now we have heard much talk from the members of both sides of the House about looking after the interests of the city clerks, and if these men are in earnest—but I very much doubt it—they will have to support the amendment which I am bringing in for Section 3.

Now we will see if the Bill was not sponsored by the Water Street merchants. This amendment will call their bluff.

(Reads amendment for Section 3)

The reason that I objected to this Bill was because I thought, and still think, it was organized and controlled by 5 or 6 Water Street storekeepers whose object is to force the smaller storekeepers out of business.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, will this amendment cure this. Supposing a clerk goes to work at 2 o'clock, will he then have to work until 10 o'clock; and if he goes to work at 6 o'clock, will he still have to work his eight hours?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, make the shopkeepers open at regular hours,

supposing they start at either 8 or 9 in the morning, and then let them stay open for the 8 or 10 hours, as this Committee decides. Here's what would happen: the merchants would refuse to pay their clerks overtime, and the first man who would have the courage to ask for overtime would be fired; that is why I say that this is class legislation, simply autocratic legislation.

Gentlemen on both sides of the House have voted that the Bill go into Committee stage and some of these men are members representing centres and districts far removed from St. John's. If I proposed that this Bill was to be applied all over Newfoundland, then I feel sure that these members would not have voted that we go into Committee on it.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—If the clerks from any other electoral district would ask this House to legislate for them, then I say we should do it; but until they ask us, we should not bring it up here.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I hold that this is no place to discuss the differences between employers and clerks.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I think the clerks in the stores should organise, and if they find it necessary, strike for shorter hours.

MR. EARLE.—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks of the Speaker, and if this Bill passes and the clerks find that after a while they want it amended, then they should come forward and ask this Legislature to amend it.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I think the member for Grand Falls misunderstood me. I say that instead of the clerks asking us to legislate for them, they should or-

ganise themselves and make their own requests to their employers, and then if they are refused they can approach this House to act for them.

MR. EARLE.—Mr. Chairman, they would get nowhere. It is a well-known fact that it has been found impossible to unite in this country, and I am glad to be present in this House to back up the requests of the clerks.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to enter into any discussion as to the merits or demerits of this Bill, but as I seem to have been drawn into it I might just as well express my views on it for the benefit of the House. The first thing we received was a petition from the clerks asking that the stores close in the night-time. This was ostensibly the purpose to limit the working-day to a certain number of hours, but not to affect the ordinary storekeeper or to make him keep his store closed in the night time. The clerks contended that if they weren't forced to go back and work at night, they don't care what the ordinary storekeepers do. I think that the statement as outlined by the Minister of Finance and Customs fills the Bill, and if worked along certain lines, that is limit the working hours of the store clerk to certain hours, and then if he finds it necessary and they are willing to pay the overtime, let him go back. I feel sure that they would be willing to work if they knew that they were going to be paid extra for it. That, to my mind, is the measure that is required by this Bill.

This legislation is wrong fundamentally, as it is one in restraint of trade, and if, as the honorable member has said, it is to affect St. John's, why not the rest of the country. I do not think we should be asked to vote against people who are desirous of working at night; and the only thing that we really can do is to reject the application of the clerks.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment on this amendment. If the gentlemen in this House are legislating in favor of the clerks, I submit that we should reject the amendment. This amendment brings back the same conditions as existed some years ago when the stores were open for five months out of the year. I came here in 1908 and I worked as a clerk all hours of the day and night, and I think that this Bill provides some mitigation for these hardships. I do not contend that this is a perfect Bill. The whole idea of this Bill is to decide whether the clerks will go back after 6 p.m. or not, and if this amendment goes through it will mean that the clerks will have to go back in the night time for about 5 months in the year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Oh no, it doesn't.

MR. GODDEN.—Mr. Chairman, Yes, it does. The only period of the year that the merchants are anxious to bring back their clerks is in the late fall, during the month of December. If this amendment is cut out, we will be doing something for the clerks, and if you pass this amendment you are legislating for the business man and not for the clerks. If the closing hour is fixed at seven o'clock, it will mean that the people who desire to buy goods will know that the shops are closing at a certain hour and will go into the store and buy their goods and the clerks can finish the work easily. If the stores are kept open, it will mean that customers will be coming in at all hours and expect to get served and get their purchases wrapped up and sent home; thereby keeping the expressmen out all hours of the night. The Bill is a good start, but it is not perfect. I think that speaking at length would defeat the object of the Bill, and at the moment

I object to the amendment for the reasons stated.

MR. SKANES—Mr. Chairman, I think there has been a lot of unnecessary talk about this Bill. When this House is delayed on account of this Bill, I think that it should be put to a vote. I don't know whether the other members know how to vote, but I know how to vote on this Bill. I understand this Bill; I have gone over it carefully several times, and when it is put to a vote I will vote how I like. The trouble in this House is that there is too much nonsense going on. As far as the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs' amendment is concerned, I didn't see it. I was out of the House when he proposed it, and if somebody will pass it along to me, I would be glad to see it. I have heard the amendment discussed and I understand that it may affect the outports?

HON. MR. LEWIS.—No, no; it will not affect the outports.

MR. SKANES.—Well, I think the right thing to do is to put it before the House and have it finished with.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I would say this much, this Bill is not on behalf of the clerks, but on behalf of the merchants, and I will prove conclusively that it is under the supervision of the merchants. The solicitor for the clerks was approached and he never said that the clerks did not want over-time; the employers disagreed with it and refused it.

I move this amendment to Section 3, and in moving this amendment I would say that we will find out if we really have the interests of the clerks at heart.

(Reads)

If you have the interests of the clerks at heart you will vote for that; if you haven't you will vote against it.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the amendment, I think that the honorable gentleman is not strictly correct. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, they could work all the time and be paid overtime. I am voting for the clerks, but they don't want to be brought back, even if they are paid over-time. That is the whole question.

Speaking as one the Select Committee, I may say that the reason why we could not make progress was because a few Water Street stores blocked the proposed amendments in Select Committee. We are still talking for the 1200 clerks who signed that petition. As far as over-time is concerned, the clerks did not want to be in the position where they could be brought back at all, over-time or no over-time.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I have considerable sympathy with this amendment of the Finance Minister. I think possibly it is not worded as it should be. I want to say that I think that in principle he is right and I think the amendment should pass. Now when it comes down to wording an amendment of this kind it really does need a lot of consideration. I think that some scheme could be worked out to carry out the views of the Finance Minister on this subject. The suggestion I had to make is that the Committee rise and that Hon. Mr. Lewis, Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, Mr. Downey and myself collaborate on the amendment during the tea hour, so that it could be put in proper form.

There seems to be an idea that all the Opposition are in favor of the Bill and that the Government is against it. Now there are a number of the Opposition against it. It is not a party measure. This amendment of the

Finance Minister is an important one.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I notice that some people in this House are very anxious to make regulations for everybody but themselves. With regard to the consideration of the question of an eight hour day what the clerks were really afraid of was that certain unscrupulous shopkeepers would reduce certain rates of wages on an eight hour day working basis.

The Chairman of Committee left the Chair until 8 o'clock.

The Chairman resumed the Chair at 8.20 p.m.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, when we rose the Committee to consider some amendments I proposed for Sections 4 and 5 of this Act, it was to hold a consultation on the amendment.

In the interval Mr. Emerson, His Hon. the Speaker, and myself, assisted by the Deputy Minister of Justice, have considered the amendment and the following is the revised amendment. It is substituted for Sub-section c, Section 2, and will be called 2 D.

(Reads)

Then we intend to delete sections 3, 4, 5 nad 8 and substitute the following Section 3:

(Reads)

The Sections are therefore renumbered. 3, 4 and 5 become 3; 6 becomes 4, 7 is 5, 9 is 6, and 10 is 7.. Then in Section 4 (the old Section 6) we are cutting out Regatta Day. We are amending the title of the Act to read "An Act Regulating Employment." These are the amendments, and it has been a great pleasure to me to co-operate with the Hon. members I have just mentioned in this respect.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure in seconding these amendments. In the heat of debate much was said, and I think we may look upon these amendments as being in the nature of a compromise in which the more objectionable demands of the clerks and the more unimportant objections of the shopkeepers have been stricken out. This Bill is the best we can do and still preserve the principle of the Bill. For three weeks this Bill was discussed before a Select Committee and no arrangement was reached.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Hon. Solicitor General and myself, assisted by the acting Deputy Minister of Justice who always gives such valuable service in matters of this nature, and the amendment we finally agreed upon is one which should bring the greatest measure of satisfaction to both sides. I will take great pleasure in supporting this amendment. I have done so from the first. If, however, it is defeated, I shall consider that the only thing to do is to give way to the majority and support the Bill by voting for it.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, I want it distinctly understood that I am going to vote against this amendment. Since the House adjourned this afternoon three of four members of the House met and drafted this amendment, but I want to say that the only thing that I am interested in is what the 1200 clerks who signed the petition are looking for, and not in an amendment that was drawn up by members of this House without any reference to these petitioners who are the wage earners of this City. The Bill as it stands is the Bill that the clerks desire us to present to the House and that Bill is good enough for me without any amendment.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this amendment will be satisfactory to either party, and I see no reason why we should enter into and try and destroy the confidence and trust that exists between the employer and employee in St. John's today. None of the clerks, to my knowledge, have made any suggestion that they should receive overtime, and if they are willing, when it is necessary, to work without overtime, I say we should not interfere with the pleasant relations that exist today. 150 out of the 250 shopkeepers who have signed the counter-petition are willing to fall in line with the requests of the clerks, providing that everybody will have to follow the same law. The only objection they raise is that certain shops will keep open, while the balance of the stores are closed, and they are not satisfied with that. They say what applies to one must apply to all, and if that law is brought into effect they are satisfied.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, before the House closed to let the Minister of Finance and Customs go into the amendment, I stated that I was satisfied that if certain conditions were fulfilled that the clerks should be paid overtime for their work. I contend that they should be paid over time if they work for more than nine hours a day at certain periods of the year and eleven hours a day at other periods.

I figure out the time as from 8.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. is $4\frac{1}{2}$ hours and from 2 to 6 is 4 hours, and we have agreed to call this a total of nine hours. The nine-hour day to apply seven months of the year, and the 11-hour day to apply for the remaining five months. I want it understood that all stores on Water Street and all stores on New Gower Street, with the exception of

those which are exempt under the Bill, will have to pay overtime if they bring back their employees after these specified hours.

The trouble with this amendment is that it does not compel the stores to close at any time or at any hour, and it means that young girls, though they may be paid overtime, can be kept at work every night of the year, and in my opinion that is outrageous and is what we are trying to prevent. Leave Section 3 in the Bill and I will support the measure, but do not allow the amendment, as that defeats the object for which the clerks of this city applied to this House for protection, and lets shorekeepers all over town bring their employees back from one end of the year to the other.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. member who drafted this amendment, is there any evidence that the clerks want to work overtime? Is there any evidence at all before us? I submit that this amendment is put in in the interest of the shopkeepers and this Bill was sent here by the clerks. This amendment should not be put in, we are here to protect the clerks.

This is my attitude, and this amendment lets every store keeper on any street keep open after hours and besides this amendment was drafted by a legal gentleman who is acting for the shopkeepers.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the previous speaker. I think that this is a clerks Bill and if they had seen fit to put in the section referred to, I think that they would have thought of it before this. This Bill came here to us and I do not think that we should amend it. The clerks today enjoy the confidence of their employers and the employers enjoy the confid-

ence of their clerks. When the clerks today get sick they are paid just the same, when they go on their holidays they are paid. Now if this amendment is interjected, it will mean that the employers will have to pay their clerks for every hour overtime and it will also mean they will not pay them for every hour undertime that they might be sick or when they are on their holidays. If I am in order, I don't know whether I am or not, I vote that this Bill be accepted without amendment.

MR. TOBIN—Mr. Chairman, I listened to the several speakers and as one who voted against the amendment this afternoon, I voted against it unless section three was left in. I submit that there is no evidence that the 250 shopkeepers are all against this Bill. There are twelve hundred city clerks who signed that petition and I am voting for them.

MR. GREENE—I disagree with Mr. Tobin, I represent a labour district and I claim that the men who work on Bell Island are entitled to be paid overtime and then why should the clerks not be paid overtime?

MR. TOBIN—I have no objection to any man getting overtime.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I am trying to prevent the clerks having to stand on their feet over hours to serve the public, they should be only open to the public after hours during certain stated periods.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, it is usual in this legislature that we should legislate for the country as a whole and I now move a further amendment. We have heard a lot about the interests of the clerks and I claim that this Bill is not in the clerks interest. Mr. Chair-

man, I have the right to speak here without being interrupted, I was sent here by the people and I hold now that this amendment has been defeated primarily because it was in the interests of the working people of this country. This Bill was not brought in here to control the closing hours of shops but was brought in here to put certain people out of business and time will tell whether I am right or not. That is the sole purpose of the Bill. The whole idea of this Bill is to try and control the business of this city, so that a few men can have it all in their own hands. Legislation in this House is supposed to be for the benefit of the country as a whole and this affects only St. John's East and West, that is why I say that if we are to legislate for the shopkeepers we should legislate for the shoopkeepers all over the country. Why should not stores in Port Union, or Grand Falls, or in the Humber district adopt this legislation? There are clerks there as well as in St. John's.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
Because the clerks in St. John's petitioned.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, yes they petitioned. They should have petitioned the Municipal Council, we should not be debating it here. The Government offered to put in it the Municipal Bill but those who fostered the Bill refused and the Leader of the Opposition admitted that the proper place for it is in the Municipal Bill. That is why I move as an amendment;—that the word "St. John's" be struck out and the word "Newfoundland" be inserted in its place. And in moving this I do so for many reasons. The small storekeepers have a right to live as well as anybody else and if they are prepared to take off their coats and work overtime, I hold that they

are entitled to do so. The idea of overtime was not accepted because the people who own the stores are not prepared to pay it, they are simply and solely trying to put the small storekeepers out of business. The small storekeepers are the men who are keeping the city laborers, the middle-men. Can the poor man go down and get credit on Water Street, or do they get their groceries on credit at O'Brien's or Worrell's or some place like that? Do they go down to Mr. Ayre or Mr. Bowring or somebody like that? These Water Street Czars would have them arrested. I would like to see the accounts of the small shopkeepers.

These little stores keep the city, there would be a great deal more poverty in the city to-day but for the small sorekeepers. Who is keeping the unemployed? Do they go down to Bowrings or Ayres and ask for three or four dollars on credit or do they go to Middle Street or the Higher Levels and get it on credit? Where do they go? We are here to legislate for the country as a whole and I contend that this is a Municipal affair and has no right to be here in this legislature. We are in a critical financial condition today and here we are squealing over a clerks Bill instead of doing something that would benefit the country. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is more debate on this Bill than there was on eleven million dollars worth of estimates presented to the House. I have sat here three weeks and I did not hear as much discussion in connection with the estimates as I heard here this afternoon.

Here we have this Bill before us, and we are doing nothing else but make politics out of it. It is being used as nothing else but a political football. I now move the amendment that the word "Newfoundland" be inserted

in this Bill instead of St. John's. Everybody is quite prepared to go through with this Bill until it begins to effect himself.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, being an outport member and representing, as I do, a purely fishing district I have to say that I am not personally interested in this Bill. I can honestly say I do not know how I stand in the matter. I agree with the present amendment as made by the Hon. Minister of Finance. As regards the previous amendment I was afraid to vote for it, because I was afraid if I voted for overtime it was bound to re-act unfavorably against the clerks. I was afraid the clerks would be made to pay in some other manner. When the matter came up before I voted that the Bill be given the six month's hoist. I hope when the people of Burin West hear of this they will know that I have at least tried to be sincere. I have always tried to be fair and sincere. If I were not sincere I would retire altogether from politics. But I can honestly say now that I do not know where I stand in this matter.

I have no personal interest in the matter, but I claim that this is really a Municipal Bill, and I know that, like myself, fully half the members here do not know how to vote. I say, therefore, that the Bill ought to be thrown out. I don't want to go down town tomorrow and have clerks asking me why didn't I do this and why didn't I do that. I do know that the clerks of St. John's ought to be very careful, otherwise they are bound to be penalized.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I really think the amendment as proposed by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs most illogical. He denies the right of the

clerks of St. John's to shorter hours and now he wants it to apply to all the clerks in the Island. Surely that is illogical? I can't myself agree in the suggestion that this measure will ruin the small shopkeepers. No matter what time the stores close there will always be somebody trying to get in after hours. A number of hard working shopkeepers have told me that if they kept open till five in the morning there would still be people trying to get in.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I want to say that I don't think my amendment was illogical. When this House is supposed to legislate for the whole country and not any particular part of it. I want to protect the underdog and that's what I'm fighting for. If I can be assured that an amendment can be put in whereby the small shopkeeper will be able to carry on the same as now, personally I am going to support it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support this Bill provided the underdog in this community is afforded protection therein. Let him work as long as he likes and keep his shop open as long as he likes; but don't try to legislate him out of business. I move now that the amendment proposed by Mr. Emerson in the afternoon be deleted; that section 3, 4, 5 and 8 be deleted and that instead a section be drafted to the effect that no employee be required to work longer than nine hours exclusive of meal hours on any day except Saturday except in the months of December and January; that any employee who is asked to work longer than this be paid overtime at the rate of 50 per cent of regular pay for such overtime

and that the penalties under the Act apply in the case of employees having to work at times other than those mentioned; further that an employee be entitled to take civil action for double the wages in case of his having not been paid overtime. The hours after 7 p.m. till closing to be deemed overtime except on Saturdays and in the months of December and January.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered in the evening I suggested that the Finance Minister and others who were more or less opposed to the Bill in general would meet during the recess in the hope that an amendment would be drafted that would be satisfactory to the entire House. I think I stated then that I would vote for the amendment and that if the amendment was lost I would support the Bill. I think the Finance Minister will agree with me when I say that I discussed with him and others all the phases of the amendment in the hope that some agreement would be reached. The amendment was brought down in the House and we are now left with this Bill be dealt with.

I have to admit I have been a supporter of the Bill. I think that possibly the cause of the heat that arises in the debate this evening was due to the fact that the House was filled in a large measure by supporters of the Bill, and, consequently, from time to time they exceeded their rights in their enthusiasm when arguments were put forward in favor of the Bill. No promoters of the Bill have a right in this House to enthuse and excite members.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the whole debate on this Bill tonight is on the question, first as to whether this Bill is going to do injury to the small shop

keeper and secondly whether it has been promoted or fostered or assisted by the big shopkeeper; both these charges have been made by those who are against the Bill, and not a tittle of evidence has been produced; there has not been a word said to show in what way the small shop keeper is going to be hurt; there has not been a word said to show how the big shop keeper is behind the Bill, and those who are opposing it base their whole case upon these factors. Now, how is the small shop keeper going to be hurt? If the small shop keeper is going to be hurt, then I would like to know how, because if he is, then I would like to try and draft an amendment that would protect him.

This is not a Bill dealing with politics; this is not a party measure; I dare say that those within the hearing of my voice will remember that one of the first things that the Leader of the Opposition said tonight when I spoke on this Bill was that I had failed to inform the House that I was speaking for myself alone. I thought that was clear to everybody. I am speaking for myself alone now, too. The Hon. member for Ferryland informed us that this Bill was a political football. Let me point out to him that he has failed to shoot the goal, and if anything he did his best to make sure that the Bill would pass.

These attacks upon merchants, appeals to passion leave most people cold. If there is evidence that the small shopkeeper is going to be hurt, I should be very glad if somebody would introduce an amendment to protect them; quite frankly I do not believe that they are going to be hurt. The amendment which I suggested and which was accepted by the Committee seems to me to clear up the whole situation in that respect.

I agreed with the amendment by the Hon. member for Ferryland this evening, in fact we drafted it together in the hope that this debate would have been over in half an hour. I believe myself if the Committee had accepted it it would have been a good amendment and would have satisfied all parties. It has been rejected, and now we are faced with the Bill, and I say that the Bill should pass and pass with very slight amendment.

The Hon. member, in the course of his very heated argument, referred to the fact that the clerks thought that this was their Bill whereas it was really being promoted by the merchants and being fostered by them and the details and so forth being looked after by them; all I have to say is this if the Hon. member thinks that he is making a very grave reflection upon the intelligence of the House.

Surely with a Bill like this with 1200 or 1300 people involved, if there was any such plan as suggested that would have been discovered before this. There may be cases where a Bill is promoted by three or four people and they did not realise that they were being worked from outside. It is a terrible reflection to suggest that there are 1200 or 1300 imbeciles being taken in by their employers. That is the position suggested by the Hon. member for Ferryland.

I intended to refer to the amendment that my learned friend, the Hon. member for Ferryland, suggested there about crossing out "St. John's," and putting in "Newfoundland." I think that he was right in withdrawing it; I don't think it would improve the situation. I may say, with the exception of a small amendment in paragraph 6 of the Bill crossing out "Regatta Day," the Bill has my hearty support.

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Chairman, I wish to repeat again what I said this afternoon in opening the few remarks which I made at that time; that I agree in what was said by the Hon. member for St. Mary's District on yesterday afternoon that this is the most important and easily the most contentious piece of legislation that has come before this House for this session, and before this Bill passes and becomes law a good many words will be thrown across the floor because the principle of the Legislation is wrong at its base, and anything which is corrupt at its base cannot bear fruit, fruit, at least that will be beneficial to those who are expecting to enjoy it.

We were asked when this Bill was introduced to consider a Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the closing hours of shops within the Electoral District of St. John's (City) East and West." and when we came to look into the Bill, and to dissect it, we found that the Bill was in really a wolf in sheep's clothing; that not alone was it an Act to protect ostensibly the clerks of this city, but it was an Act clothed, clothed I say with that ostensible sheen for the purpose; not of protecting the clerks, not of limiting their hours, not of paying them reasonable wages, but to close out the small shop keeper in this community under the guise of a Bill to protect the clerks. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was dealt with in Committee, and amendments were made along the lines which this Bill was ostensibly meant to be, a Bill for the protection of clerks, and that amendment was for the purpose of regulating hours of clerks and regulating the pay of clerks, it was voted down and the same argument was put up against the amendment as was put up against

the original motion to hoist this Bill this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say this that the shopkeepers in St. John's expect to be protected in this Legislature and apparently they have not many friends, but I look at this matter from a wider aspect than St. John's City; I look at the principle of the Bill as a Newfoundland; I look at it as a British subject, and I expect and I think every man and woman in this country expects whether he lives in St. John's or in any extern district of this country, that he is going to live here and prosper and rear his family, and if he is going to live under the British Flag, he may expect British fair play, and if he does not get British fair play; if he is going to see his rights legislated out of his hands; if he is going to find himself, as it were, on the street over night because of a piece of legislation such as this, then I say it is time to close up this Legislature.

As long as I am here I am going to oppose that measure; I am opposed, not uncompromisingly opposed. I am prepared to go halfway if the people who are behind this Bill are prepared to come half way. I am going to oppose this Bill; oppose it section by section; oppose it on the motion to adopt the report. In doing that I think that I am doing my duty as a Newfoundland. If this was a measure affecting my own district then I don't think I would be properly representing the men who sent me here if I was to foster a piece of legislation which would tell each and every business man of Harbor Main when to close his store. I think the condition of this country financially, economically and every way industrially is such that people should be encouraged to work not an 8 hour day, not a 10 hour day but 24 hours.

Who are the men who put this country on the map? Were they the men who went to work at 10 and knocked off at 6 and spent the rest of the day riding around in their motor cars? Who are the men who made it possible for the business men to have stores on Water Street. They are the men who turned out of their bunks at 2 in the morning and spent until 12 in the night hauling codfish. These are the men who put the merchants of St. John's in the position to have business places today where they can employ clerks, and it is men of the same stamp who are running independent business places in St. John's and whose interest we are here to protect. If we allow this measure to go through. If we say that each shop in St. John's must be closed at 7 o'clock what is going to happen to the small shopkeeper? What is going to happen to the man who has every dollar tied up in his business? Is he not going to be bankrupt? What keeps the small shop keepers in business? It is not the trade in the morning or in the afternoon; is it not rather the transient trade that is done by night? If we cut off that source of revenue it means that he will be in the bankruptcy courts. That spirit of legislation is wrong; it is radically wrong; it is sectional legislation; it is prejudiced legislation; it is legislation based at the man who is prepared, as I said before, to put in extra hours work in order to keep his business on the map. If, as a result of that extra energy that he is prepared to put into his business; if, as a result of the thought, care and attention which he is prepared to put into the job so he can increase his business, why should he be penalized? Why should he be put out of existence in order to satisfy a group of hungry

mongrels who are ready to grasp everything in sight.

Would the Minister of Marine and Fisheries vote to close his store in Fortune at 7 o'clock so that he would not be in position to sell a hogshead of salt to a man who came along for it? Would the President of the Fishermen's Union vote to close his store in Port Union in order to forbid a fisherman from selling a quintal of fish? If he did so, would he not be crazy. If, on the other hand, this measure is a measure for the protection of clerks then we say "Alright," regulate the hours of the clerks and pay them for their overtime.

The time has come, the hour has struck when I feel it my duty, Mr. Chairman, to get on my feet and protest against this sort of stuff which is being legislated in this House today. For here today, Mr. Chairman, we are witnessing an attempt of one class to legislate out of business, to all practical intents and purposes, another class simply because this latter class has offended them, who are in reality less privileged than themselves.

When attempts to legislate in this manner are made, it is time to call a halt. Such legislation is drastic, it is unjust. Why should men be legislated out of business because their only fault, if it can be called a fault, is that they have made a success of their business? Now, all I am asking for, Mr. Chairman, is fair play. Because one man works hard and by so doing makes a success, is it right that the man who, in the meantime, has been driving around in his car, should try and close him out. Jealousy is all it is. I'll drive around in my car, but Jones who is a hard worker isn't permitted to take off his coat and work.

Yes, this law is based against the man who is prepared to go to work in the night after everyone else has gone home. This is the spirit in which we attack men who work hard and attend to their business. Well, I am prepared to stay on my feet and fight this Bill as hard as I know how and defend these men to the best of my ability. I hold, Mr. Chairman, that this Bill is vicious, it is seditious, it is radical.

I am ready to support these men who are being downtrodden; to protect these classes which, through force of circumstances, are unable to protect themselves.

This Bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It comes into House under the guise of one thing and when we look into it and start debating on it, it turns out to be quite a different sort of thing.

The Select Committee appointed to go into this Bill have informed us that they could not come to any agreement, that no matter what was tried neither side could see eye to eye with the other.

Well, you can't expect a man to agree to a piece of legislation when he knows that if it becomes law it is going to ruin his business. I think most of us would have something to say if we knew a Bill was before the House which would make us bankrupt in three months and that is how these small shopkeepers view the Bill, and rightly so.

(Reads)

I don't think I'd be doing my duty as a Newfoundland if I were to stand by and let this go through. It is the duty of any member, be he elected from an outport or a city constituency, to support any motion

against this Bill which is directed against the small man. No matter who they are they're entitled to fair play, and if they are not going to have it, then we might as well forget our Constitution. If this condition of things is going to endure, it will be impossible for a man to do business.

Now perhaps I've talked plainly but there are my views and I'm prepared to stay here and stand by them as long as it is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I said at the outset of my remarks that I'm not uncompromisingly opposed to this Bill. I was agreeable to the amendment drafted by the Minister of Finance and Customs; I felt that this was fair.

Now, there seems to be an idea that this legislation is for the protection of clerks. This isn't so, for we tried to get the parties to agree that if clerks work over their nine hours then they should be paid overtime, but somehow this didn't find favor, this Amendment was defeated in no uncertain manner.

Well, I know who this legislature is directed at and though names shouldn't be mentioned in this House, still I'm going to inform the House who it is. It's directed against Phil Murphy, that's who it is. Well, I've nothing to say either against or for Phil Murphy, but whatever he is he's a hard worker and that is why certain merchants on Water Street seem to be opposed to him.

This Bill is directed against the middleman. Well, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this country today is dependent on the middleman. Some while ago I was speaking of an Amendment suggested by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs; it was defeated in spite of its compromising attitude and I suppose that all other amend-

ments of a like nature will be similarly treated. The Amendment I have in mind is one I consider fair and just to all parties interested in the Bill. That is that all stores in the city, both East and West be allowed to remain open for two nights a week exclusive of Saturday.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, why make an exception of Water Street? There are other stores besides those mentioned that are going to be hurt. Take, for example, the stores of Messrs. Dyer and Summers. My contention is that the legislation should be general and not confined to any particular Street.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, you say you are trying to protect the smaller store keeper and still object to giving the stores of Water Street any advantage when you know, as well as I do, that the majority of the smaller stores are those not on Water Street.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Make it Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday for the whole city and I will be satisfied and accept it. I think that if there is to be a compromise it must be acceptable to all.

MR. EMERSON—I don't quite follow how this effects the small stores.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I think that the Stores on Water Street, if they want to open, should be allowed to do so.

MR. EMERSON—The result would then be that all the stores on Water Street could be open every night.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Let them all stay open if they are willing to pay the overtime. That is up to themselves; we are not compelling them to open.

MR. EMERSON—Any shop where they do not employ outside help can be open every night.

HON. MR. LEWIS—It isn't British fair play to prohibit one man from opening.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Please don't use the phrase British fair play when referring to Mr. Murphy. He stays open Empire Day, St. Patrick's Day, Armistice Day, July 1st and all the other holidays.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—That is his own affair.

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Chairman, because Murphy is desirous of improving his position by hard work is no reason why he is not entitled to British Fair Play as well as anybody else in this city. We brought in a compromise of three nights a week but you are not willing to accept it; all you want to do is to put certain men out of business whether they like it or not and I claim that there is no justification whatever in this measure and all we want is justice and fairness to one and all. We don't want Sectional Legislation. We want Legislation that applies equally to everybody.

MR. EMERSON—Are you agreeable to accept an Amendment that will allow the stores to open on Saturday nights and one other night during the week.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—We want Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday.

MR. PUDESTER—If that amendment is allowed we won't be legislating to help the clerks but every clerk will be working for three nights a week during the whole year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—If they do, pay them the overtime.

MR. PUDESTER—I am agreeable to the overtime, but the point is that the clerks want to be protected so that they won't have to work in the night time all the year around.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment of Mr. Emerson should be accepted.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, we are quite agreeable to any shops that are run entirely by the owners, their wives, sons and daughters, being kept open as long as they like.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Until this Amendment was introduced you were quite agreeable that Murphy be put out of business.

MR. PUDESTER—We agreed last night that this clause should have been inserted.

MR. EMERSON—I think that this was a mistake made in the drafting of the Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—To get back to business, I think Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday should be accepted. There is another class of man left out entirely and that is the butchers.

Why were the butchers left out?

MR. PUDESTER—I didn't leave them out, ask the people who introduced the Bill on the other side.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, we put out our sheet anchor and stand. We are driven to the position where we have to go on our knees and ask mercy. As I pointed out before this is not a Clerks Bill, it was suggested by the Government that it go into the Municipal Act.

MR. EMERSON—And the Municipal Council lacked the courage to put it in.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, why are we dealing with it? But it is here now and we got to do one thing or another with it. This Bill does not belong here. I don't want to hold up this House until tomorrow afternoon, I do not want to put forward that threat. We were prepared to go fifty fifty and pay them overtime, isn't that fair? But no, they want to put these smaller shops out of business. We are, therefore, prepared to close three nights a week and if they work overtime, we will pay them overtime, isn't that fair? If it isn't I don't know the meaning of the word. We came half way and now it is up to them to come half way.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of supporting the Amendment just proposed. If you go back to the history of this petition, it might enable us to make some headway. Shortly after the House opened, a petition was received from some 1200 clerks for the purpose of having a law enacted to regulate the closing hours of shops. A few days afterwards another petition was received, signed by 2400 people, including 250 small shopkeepers and their customers who claimed it was a great advantage to them to keep these stores open. They asked that the prayer of the first petition not be acceded to. I would ask the Clerk of the House to let me see that petition for a moment.

It appears that the Clerk has not got it. At any rate it was decided to bring in a Bill and it was also decided that it would be a non party measure. I submit that as an outport member it is no concern of mine to

vote for an act applying to St. John's alone. These parties had several meetings and counter meetings and they could come to no conclusion, the delegates of the petitioners and their lawyers were sent for and they met as you will remember, Sir, in the Members room outside and compromise after compromise was offered but still they could come to no agreement and it was decided to refer it to the House of Assembly. Several outport members expressed the opinion that this measure should go into the Municipal Act but that was not acceptable to the clerks. I do not see why we should be forced to vote on this Bill and in this I was supported by several outport members. The Prime Minister moved the House into Committee of the Whole. It was moved that the Bill be given six months hoist. I objected to that motion and voted against it for one reason and that is that as a fair minded body of people, as legislators, we should come to a compromise and I still think so. We crossed over the House and we went back into Committee. At 6.45 we adjourned in the hope that a compromise would be affected.

The House was supposed to have met at eight of the clock. These gentlemen got together until nine. They came in here with what I considered was a very good Amendment and it was turned down. If we are to get anywhere in this House tonight we must be prepared to get together in a spirit of compomise. Let the stores keep open if they want to but let them pay overtime. That is as fair as anything I can think of. Though I voted against the Bill being given the six months hoist this afternoon, I want to say now that I am in favor of this Amendment. What I say is that we must compromise. Certain of these restrictions and suggestions must be

compromised if this Bill is to go through. I was elected to this House by working men and clerks and I want to be fair, and that is why I supported the Amendment when time and a half of their current rate of pay was suggested. I quite candidly believe that the Water Street firms are behind this Bill. I say if they want their clerks to work over time then pay them time and a half.

Times have been very bad for the clerks last year and I believe this Amendment for time and a half will give them a chance to make up any cuts they have received. I know what I'm talking about. I was a clerk myself. It is a very difficult matter for a clerk to get along in this town. They have high rent and high coal bills to meet, and this amendment gives them a chance to add to their income. I think the best we can do is to get down to a basis of three nights a week and overtime. Those opposed to this have been talking about majorities but surely minorities have some rights too. These people have some rights and this Act is intended to put these people out of business. Surely this is not British fair play. I say to the clerks unless they want to stay clerks all their lives they ought to be against this measure, for under this Bill every opportunity of starting off on their own is cut off from them. I know everywhere of very promising little businesses, which have been built up by continued industry and by working from 15 to 20 hours a day. Are we going to take from these men the fruits of a life time labor.

If a man is a clerk now he will have to stay one. I know of one case in particular where a man came over from Bell Island and started up a business in the annex and by sheer hard work and industry has put it on its feet. I think in this case all

that is wanted and expected is a spirit of compromise. We have been on this Bill all day and now we seem to be no further ahead, and I do think the matter is capable of being amicably adjusted.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—There is no provision in this Bill whereby the clerks cannot be brought back and made to work until midnight.

MR. PUDDESTER—The clerks had the Bill drafted and for the information of the member for Bell Island they paid ten cents each for the work in connection with it. The clerks made the Bill and they are the best judges as to their requirements, not you or I.

MR. GREENE—I voted today against the six months hoist in a spirit of compromise and I am sorry I did so; but there are members in this House who promised to support the Bill but when the vote was taken they did not do so.

MR. PUDDESTER—Do you mean me? If you do, you are stating what is untrue. If the Hon. member misinterpreted my position in connection with the Amendment and the Bill, I cannot help that.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, the whole argument so far as the Finance Minister and the member for St. Mary's is concerned seems to centre around the big merchants on Water Street and the profits they are making. Now I think that Mr. Bindon should be put in the category of a big merchant because I want to know what merchant on Water St. made more profit out of the sale of his goods within the past couple of years than did Mr. Bindon, who helped to supply the Government institutions. Mr. Murphy, as already

referred to, is another large business man and these are the two men primarily responsible, it is said, for the holding up of this Bill.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, we got to protect at least 1200 clerks who signed the petition from going to work every day in the year from eight in the morning until ten at night, and if this Bill does not pass certain Water Street stores will remain open and the merchants will open their stores also on the nights referred to.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—When discussing things in the House you say this is for the protection of the Clerks so that they won't be brought back to work.

MR. PUDDESTER—And as you said "you were going to make them pay time and a half."

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is what we want to do.

MR. PUDDESTER—That Amendment did not prevent them from opening; they could open all the year round under that amendment.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—What is the Amendment suggested? Three nights in one street and only two nights on Water Street, and an admission by the Leader of the Opposition that the object of this thing is that because two or three people up there keep open every night. That is the reason that this Bill is in here.

MR. EMERSON—The Minister does not realise that these suggestions are in the hope of some agreement.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Every suggestion brings

out some ulterior motive behind the Bill.

MR. EMERSON—The Minister brings out some ulterior motive that is in his own mind.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The Leader of the Opposition said this, not me. When he said it, I got up.

MR. EMERSON—Every voter of the Bill has been suggesting matters that are foreign to the Bill.

MR. PUDDESTER—It serves no good purpose for any member to be getting up throwing slurs.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—What is the Amendment suggested by the Leader of the Opposition?

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I think if we exclude daylight time.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The Amendment I am in favour of is, I don't care what it is, as long as everyone is treated alike.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 3 pass.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, you are moving that Section 3 pass as it is. There is an Amendment before the House.

MR. EMERSON—What is the Amendment.

HON. MR. LEWIS—That all the shops in St. John's remain open for two nights as well as Saturday; that is 50/50.

MR. EMERSON—Your idea of 50/50 is 100 per cent. for yourself.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—According to the Bill that

is here at present they are allowed to open Saturday until 9; that is one night a week; before this Bill was brought up, they were allowed to be open six nights. Our conception of 50 per cent. is half of six, that is 3, not half the Bill, 3. The Amendment is before the Chair.

MR. EMERSON — What is the Amendment.

MR. PUDDESTER—You realise that the Amendment is turned down.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that this Amendment is made to the effect: (Reads.)

Is that not a serious motion to make in a British House of Parliament, discriminating against the same people in the same town. I don't think we are quite sane if we get down to this to bring in a discriminating motion in a self governing colony. We are supposed to represent the minority as well as the majority. We as public men have just as much right to protect these two store keepers as any other people; in other words we are going to legislate two gentlemen out of business. In other words Hon. Members representing outport districts come in here and they vote on putting two gentlemen out of business; that is very unfair.

MR. PUDDESTER—We are putting everybody out of business two nights in the week.

MR. GREENE—I do as a Newfoundlander think we should treat everybody right. I did not think this motion was really serious. I think it is very unfair to ask us to come in and vote on this matter.

MR. BINDON—I am interested directly, Mr. Chairman, if you will in the motion before the Chair. I have been called a shark by men I expected better from. I might say in rising now

that I am as much in favour of clerks as any other men and, as I said here yesterday while I was speaking I was prepared to take the sacrifice if the members coming from all over this country East, West, North and South will come in here and legislate me out of business. I am, as I say, prepared to take the sacrifice. I will tell them they will not put me down and out. They might drive me off Water Street, but they won't put me down and out.

I am going to make a proposal, or ask the Minister of Finance and Customs to add to the Amendment, and see how this will take: That we allow the shops to open three nights a week on Water Street and on Middle Street. Now there are a great number of men and women clerks, if you will, walking around this town idle, seeking employment, and I would ask him to add to that that we be allowed to open three nights a week any store that wants to but not employer be allowed to bring back in the night time any clerk that has worked eight hours in the day. That should fill the Bill; anyone who wants to open his store should employ extra help night clerks as well as day clerks. I would like to hear from some one supporting that.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, there are only two men on Water Street that they are after, Bindon and Murphy. I have here a list of stores that are affected besides Bindon and Murphy; there 12 more; these are the particular ones that they are after. Here is the position, we are only giving them two nights a week and we are prepared to give the others three. Let Bindon go up on Garrison Hill. He has been called a shark. He is a human being and has got a right to live in this country. You are discriminating in this Bill. It has been admitted by the Leader of the Opposition that it

was brought in against Bindon and Murphy.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—That is what Mr. Lewis said.

HON. MR. LEWIS—I agree it was said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I also said it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—There are other people on Water Street: (Reads a list of Water Street stores). There are several of them that rang me up this morning, some of them before I was out of bed.

MR. EMERSON—You must have been out of bed late.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I was up before many men on the Opposition were up. I want to tell them that I am used to getting up at 3 or 4 in the morning and working. I am not prepared to come in here and allow a Bill to come in that is aimed deliberately at two or three individuals because they happen to work hard to keep their stores going. Have you asked the clerks would they agree to this? Have you asked them to-night? No. because you know they would not accept it. You're confirming my point that you don't represent the clerks but you do represent someone else.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—The clerks say this kills the Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—It doesn't kill the Bill, it merely provides equal rights of all the stores. This Bill is the biggest piece biggest attempt to class legislation that I have ever seen.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Why not pay 50 cents an hour overtime as the minimum fee

after regular working hours then I'll agree to it. Three nights a week in every street and after seven o'clock 50 cents per hour.

MR. PUDDESTER—I've prepared an Amendment; two nights a week for Water Street and three nights for the other streets.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—They wouldn't consider any opening on Water Street in the nights other than Saturday.

MR. GREENE—I would like to make the suggestion that time and a half be paid for overtime. It's not fair to force the small man to pay fifty cents the same rate as larger competitors, it would ruin his business.

MR. PUDDESTER—I have another Amendment I would like the House to consider: Every Water Street store open Tuesday and Saturday after seven or eight, whichever you think best; other streets Tuesday, Friday and Saturday.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, we've done our best to meet the supporters of this Bill half way but it doesn't seem to be of any use. The Leader of the Opposition has objected to Water Street stores opening, he says there's only two or three of them will. Let me tell him there's ten or twelve and they've been called sharks and everything else and their only offence is that they've tried to do as much work as they can, they don't ask for protection in their business from the tariff they don't ask that foreign products be taxed 15%, to protect them the treasury doesn't have to suffer and loose money to afford them protection.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I didn't bring in this Bill. I understand that those who did wanted Murphy's store closed in the nights..

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Well he's not here to protect himself and I'm sorry for him, in this respect.

MR. PUDDESTER—The Member for Ferryland has either said too much or too little, there's been too much smallness exhibited in the discussion of this Bill. Many of the shopkeepers themselves are in favour of it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, some of the honorable members seem to have gone to wing. I suppose the newspapers are interested in this Bill.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, Let me tell you this, Phil Murphy is our best customer. I don't bring business into this House. I'm here to say that this Bill is going to help the clerks for the next three months, during the summer time.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that everyone is referring only to Water and Middle streets. The shops who are largely affected by this are not on Middle Street; they are at the back of the city, Cookstown Road and Hamilton Avenue. I may not know my history but I do know the geography of this city.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker has received certain messages from the Legislative Council and I would move that the Committee rise, report progress and sit again presently, and in the meantime the Speaker might read the messages received.

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 presently.

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

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay upon the table of the House two reports, the first being that of Mr. R. F. Horwood who acted in capacity of Chairman to the Committee in charge of the South West Coast Disaster, and I wish to express on behalf of the entire House our sincere appreciation of the work done and the service performed by both the Committees in charge of the affair. Particularly do I want to thank Mr. Horwood who worked ceaselessly and tirelessly to make a success of the work of the Committee.

I also want to lay on the table a copy of the report received from the Inspector General of Constabulary in connection with the arrests, convictions, fines, penalties, etc., imposed during the past year.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively: "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921," "An Act Relating to the International Grenfell Association," "An Act Relating to the Department of External Affairs," "An Act to Provide a National Flag for Newfoundland, and Colors to be Worn by Vessels," "An Act to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging,'" "An Act to Alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary" and "An Humble Address to His Majesty the King," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish," with some amendments in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the amendments suggested by the Legislative Council in connection with the Salt Codfish Bill consist in deleting the words "United States of America" from the Bill. It will be remembered that these words were put in as an amendment in which it was to be permitted that certain small codfish that were not fit for the European market were to be allowed to go to Canada and the United States. They want the United States left out, otherwise they think that unscrupulous exporters might use New York as a point of transhipment to foreign markets.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Fish Bill, I would like this opportunity to ask if it would not be possible to make some guarantee as to the price that would be paid for certain classes of fish. For example No. 1 fish might be guaranteed: Large Maderia \$6.00, Small Madeira \$5.00; No. 1 Labrador \$4. I thought that as this Bill was in support of the fishery, it would be a good opportunity of mentioning this. I believe if that were done it would have a two-fold advantage. Firstly, it would increase to a large extent the number of men that would prosecute the fishery, and secondly it would encourage the fishermen to make better fish.

The said Amendment having been read a first and second time and concurred in, it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said

Amendment had been concurred in without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shell from Labrador and the Islands Adjacent Thereto," with an Amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The said Amendment having been read a first and second time and concurred in, it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendment had been concurred in without amendment.

And, is being past midnight,

FRIDAY, May 15th, 1931.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Closing House of Shops within the Electoral Districts of St. John's (City) East and West."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Smith took the Chair of Committee.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, before starting the debate on this Bill again, I would advise that certain aspects of the debate be left out. In the first place it is claimed that this Bill is promoted by Water Street merchants, as I said before, there is no evidence of this. If this Bill is for the benefit of the clerks it doesn't matter who is behind it and that is the whole question. As far as I know this Bill was promoted by the clerks and it is only a clerks Bill to assist the clerks. We want to eliminate certain factors

which engender heated discussion. If this Bill hurts certain people and if an Amendment is proposed to help these people, well and good. I look at this measure as a clerks Bill and I think we should help. This Bill is not perfect, there are sure to be objections from somebody and the only thing we can do is to make the best Bill possible for both sides. We can't have a perfect Bill, each party must give way and I hope that the discussion will be along these lines.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Hon. member for Bell Island what he means by time and a half. I suggest that a flat rate of fifty cents an hour be imposed.

MR. BINDON—Mr. Chairman, might I ask if my suggestion would be considered? Allow the stores to remain open 3 nights a week if you wish, but obtain different employees. There are a number of clerks under notice of dismissal from the various stores on Water Street and I think this would be an ideal way of providing another avenue of employment for these men and girls.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I move that the words concerning Regatta Day be stricken out, as every small store opens on that day. If the annual Regatta does go on, it will not interfere with the principle of this Bill.

MR. BINDON—Mr. Chairman, in that Amendment the larger stores can keep open on Regatta Day and why kill the Regatta?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, as President of a Club which is prominently identified with the Regatta, may I ask why try to ruin the Regatta by leaving in that wording?

Mr. Chairman, we had a very enjoyable evening and morning discussing this Bill. It has been a case, in my opinion, at any rate, of money versus property, with the result, as is generally the case, money wins. It is just like a man playing a game of poker, the fellow with plenty of money comes out on top and the fellow with very little generally loses what he had. While I don't propose to speak at a very great length on this Bill, I want to make a few final remarks. As this debate progressed last afternoon I was more than convinced that the Bill which has been brought in here under the guise of being a help to the clerks was never intended to help them; that there is not one clause in it referring to clerks one way or the other.

The Bill, today instead of being a clerks Bill, is the Closing of Shops Bill. We, who were trying the best we could to fight the cause of the under dog or the small shop man were prepared to compromise. The Leader of the Opposition stood adamant; he was not prepared to move; he had down his kedge anchor; he was not prepared to move; he was supported by members of the Government. When we saw that there was no such thing as a reasonable discussion at the time we tried to discuss it on a basis of fifty, fifty; no move. We finally included one street for two days and the rest for three days with overtime.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Bill is going to become law, and the final section of this Bill has proven more conclusively than ever to me that it was intended to put the little man out of business. If any unfortunate chance the little man had to be caught two or three times opening his store he was going to be fined \$500; the fine was deliberately put in here for that

purpose, not by the Clerks, because the point has been made here that it was suggested to the clerks that overtime would be paid for and they refused overtime for the simple reason that their employer did not want to pay overtime.

The Leader of the Opposition has told us that the Bill was to go after a certain number of sharks on Water Street which meant that this Bill is aimed, not so much in the interest of the clerks, but aimed to get some individuals who happen to be doing business on Water Street. That has been admitted here in the House after very much cross-examination.

Now we are passing it and we have been sneered at by supporters of this Bill who came down here deliberately to do it, which I resent, and I am not afraid to express my resentment even if I am thrown through the window, because we who represent the fishery districts had the gall to tell these people that the men who are keeping them there are the fishermen, they are keeping us all here, and that the trade on Water Street, Duckworth Street and every other street, the Ropewalk, Imperial Tobacco Company or any other company would be nowhere if it were not for the fishermen of this country. Because I happened to mention fishermen of this country two or three ignorant people sneered at me from the gallery.

I claim that all this has been the deliberate attempt aimed at half a dozen business men who are trying to make a living. I want to know if there is a clause in there; there have been so many clauses moved and seconded, lost and gained last night that we are at sea even yet as to how the Bill reads. I want to know if there is a clause to the effect that no clerk working in a store is to come back

again to work at night even if he gets 50 cents an hour. Therefore, we have done the best we could.

I don't like this Bill even yet. I am between two minds now as to whether I will stay here for the rest of the morning. I don't mind any threats because we may have support behind us to drive this thing through. If I thought that was the idea I would stay, if main strength and brutal ignorance is going to drive this thing through then I am prepared to stay till 6 or 10 tonight if necessary, and we won't get any overtime for it either. I want to go back again and say that this has not emanated originally from the clerks; why did they leave out the butchers? Why did the Select Committee overlook the butchers? The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was on that Committee and the Hon. Dr. Campbell.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Chairman, while I was prepared for any outrage that never occurred to me.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, we were prepared only for hoping to be lucky enough or unlucky as the case may be to come in here and legislate that crowd out of business. Supposing for argument sake some one had not seen it? Does not that make the argument stronger that we rushed into this thing over night without giving it proper consideration. It was before the Select Committee and they split and did not bring in an unanimous report; they brought in a piece of outrageous legislation to put some people out of business. We have got to the stage now where some people can't live without going down and asking certain gentlemen on Water Street "By your leave." That is the Bill, pure and simple.

MR. SKEANS—Mr. Chairman, I think that we have lost time enough

on this Bill; there have been various people talking; we have lost a lot of time considering this Bill, this Shop Closing Act, and I think it is undesirable altogether; there has been too much talk going on. I vote, Sir, that all words in this Bill after "Be enacted?" be omitted from the Bill.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a third time.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE &

CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be not read a third time now; that it be read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of retracting a statement I made the other day in this House. When we were discussing the extra payments made in the Colonial Secretary's Department, Mr. Mews was listed as having received a certain sum for his services in connection with immigration work. I stated that Mr. Mews has made a request for this payment to the Monroe Government and had been refused. I now find I was absolutely mistaken. The first application for this fee was made in 1929 to the present government. I find that Mr. Mews has done this work for 16 years without receiving any extra fees, and it was only when he became informed that Mr. LeMessurier has received \$1,000 yearly for this work that he made a request for payment in this

respect. The Government, feeling that Mr. Mews was entitled to some payment, allowed him \$150 a year. His whole claim for the sixteen years being allowed at \$2,400. I would like to put myself right with the House, as I would be very sorry to cast any reflection on one who has served the country so faithfully and so well.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until this morning at eleven of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 15th, 1931.

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Holyrood which I would ask the Clerk to read.

(Clerk Reads Petition)

Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in bringing this petition before the House and endorsing the prayer thereof, it has to do with the request of certain residents of Holyrood for a special grant for a road known as Kennedy's road. This road runs through the heart of the settlement and connects the Salmonier Highroad with the Main Highroad around the Bay. The people who signed this petition are wayside farmers who own the land along this road. This road has been there for upwards of a hundred years and has always been kept in a fair state of repair until recently when it became very dilapidated and at the present time it is almost impossible for the people to get to and from their land. They there-

fore ask for a special grant for the purpose of repairing this road.

Our local grants are entirely inadequate to meet such a situation. We have in our District some 400 miles of roads, exclusive of the Highroads, and our local grants are entirely inadequate to keep them in a decent state of repair.

In indorsing the prayer of this petition I do so with the hope that our District will be put in the position where we will have money available for roads of this kind. We spend a great deal on Highroads every year, and I think that these roads that are used by the local farmers are just as important as these Highroads. If it were possible to have money available to repair these roads it would be a great boom to certain people of our district.

I have very great pleasure in presenting this petition and I give it my hearty endorsement. I feel that other members of this House are in the same position as we are and the principle affects them as well as us. I may say to the members of the Opposition that there are a great many signatories to this petition who are supporters of the Opposition, they are not supporters of mine.

I do support the prayer of this petition and hope it will not fall on deaf ears.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by my Hon. friend the member for Mr. Main. I hope it will receive better consideration than most other petitions, that is that it will be considered on its merits and that the members of the Government will use every means in their power to carry out its prayer, if at all possible.

Some years ago I heard a member of this House say that he looked upon a petition as being as effectual as a man talking to himself. With regard to the present petition I see no reason why it, asking as it does, for a small sum of money to repair the roads leading to and from various farms and gardens, ought not to receive favorable consideration. After all people don't get up a petition for nothing. I have not the intimate knowledge of the district as my Hon. friend, but it appears to me that most of the people of his constituency depend for their living in a large measure out of the land. Moreover a large number of the people of the district have had to return recently from abroad, and this money asked for may be a very great assistance at the present time. For that reason I would like to give the petition by very heartiest support.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, the sentiments of the Hon. member are almost exactly the same as my own, and I give his petition my heartiest support.

MR. BINDON—Mr. Speaker, I would like to joint in supporting the petition. From what I have seen of petitions, I would consider that most of those that have been presented here have been treated in almost a farcical manner.

I have presented a number myself and I find that they have been almost absolutely ignored. I think at least that they should be referred to the Department to which they relate, and at least be given some consideration so that the member can at least tell his constituents what has happened. I think myself that some effort should be made to keep up local roads. Some sort of policy should be initiated in order to handle this. I have very great pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. FITZGIBBON—Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in associating myself with the Hon. gentleman who have gone before me in endorsing this petition. I know that in a great many cases it results in a great hardship if the petition is not granted, and I think in this case the results will justify the expenditure.

MR. MURPHY—Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers. Last year I presented a petition from the residents of North Harbor and I haven't heard a word from it since.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, several scores of petitions have been presented in the last score of years and I wish to give them all my heartiest support.

MR. MURPHY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House on the grounds that there is an important matter to be dealt with in relation to the district of Placentia West. The matter is in connection with bait depots. The fishery last year in Placentia West was a distinct failure, and, as a result, the Government spent approximately \$90,000, whereas if there had been two bait depots, or at least one in that district, the Government would have benefitted by about \$100,000. There was plenty of fish to be had in that section last Fall; but there was no bait to be had and men had to leave their boats on the beach and go to work on the Highroads in order to try and eke out an existence for their families. It is really heart-breaking to receive letters from real fishermen who had to give up their avocation and go to work on Highroads. Here is one of many letters I have received:

(Reads Letter)

However, in a great many cases the Highroads work was a blessing and I have no reflection to make on the officials of that organization. For the past thirty years I can remember the promises made by politicians in respect to the encouragement of the fishery so far as the whole of Placentia Bay was concerned; but without result. Last Spring I had to fight all kinds of odds. I was told publicly that if I was elected that I would bring trawlers in the district, but I gave my word that no such thing would happen and the people believed me and they will believe me again. In fact the Jude Island episode did not affect my election, rather did it affect my opponent.

When I was 13 years old I went fishing and donned my oil skins like any experienced fisherman and I am not ashamed of it either; just as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries rose from the dory to be master of his own vessel and to conduct an export and supply business.

Now I know that the Amendment inserted by the Legislative Council in the Salt Codfish Bill is a very important one. There has been a lot said here about herring also and one gentleman said that the United States would accept all our herring if certified. I know that to be wrong, because I have been on piers in New York when the Jews, who principally bought our herring, slipped the heads off the full herrings and put them on the filling herrings. You must remember you are dealing with Jews in New York and some of them will stop at nothing. I had 500 barrels of herring in New York last year on consignment and trouble arose and I had to go there to have matters satisfactory adjusted. Otherwise, I would have been \$1,000 out of pocket on ac-

count of the way these Jews transact business.

However, I went there and fought my case and won. Four years ago I had 500 barrels of herring at the railway station here and had them sold to a New York firm subject to Government inspection and also the inspection of the Jews who were here at the time. I brought the Jew to look at the herring and he offered me \$2 a barrel less than I quoted. I asked him what was wrong with the herring and I compelled him to tell me the reason. He told me that they were frozen, which was wrong. I immediately communicated with the Marine and Fisheries Department and I got an inspector and two other gentlemen to examine the herring, during which process the Jew "beat it" and the Jew would have beaten me to the extent of \$1,000 but for the Inspectors here.

Inspection on the herring going to the West Indies market is costing \$20,000 or \$30,000 per year to this country and the fishermen of this country are losing. Mr. Speaker, the herring that go to the West India market should not be subject to inspection, and I will tell you why. The Trinity Bay fishermen and the Placentia Bay fishermen, if the herring were not subject to inspection could pack them in herring barrels; no doubt herring barrels would contain more fish than pork barrels. If you pack herring in pork barrels for the West India market you will be turning into the revenue of this country \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year. Anyway, it is true that a pork barrel will contain more herring than a herring barrel, but that does not make any difference if in the spring of the year herring are plentiful. Herring in the spring are not as fat as they are in the fall. The West India market does not want fat

herring because the fatter the herring are the quicker they will deteriorate in that country.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, are you satisfied that the Hon. member is in order?

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—The Hon. member indicated that he wished to discuss a matter of importance. He referred to the question of cold storage which is definite, but I think he is wandering a little too far from the subject.

MR. MURPHY—Mr. Speaker, pardon me if I am out of order. Why I mentioned the herring business is because the bait stations will be filled with herring in the spring of the year. At the present time Placentia Bay is teeming with herring as it was also last year in the spring; in the fall you could not get herring for goodness sake; the fishermen could not get bait. If we had bait depots, I say we would have had 15,000 quintals of fish more than we had. That was my only idea for bringing in the question of herring. I say here again that bait depots are needed in Placentia Bay—I don't know about any other district—but I do say that bait depots are most necessary if we are going to continue the codfishery.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I take up the cudgel of my Hon. friend, the member for Placentia West, Mr. Murphy. I think the matter is one of very great importance to this country, and one to which we should give very serious consideration. We are taking up the question of bait depots in a small way; there is a bait depot which was financed up to a point by the Government last year under the management of Messrs. Penney & Co. I am pleased to state, for the benefit of the

House, that that bait depot is now in operation fully equipped and the bait is ready for the fishermen, and through the means of the West Coast Fishery Protection boat last year we were able to supply that bait depot and also to the fishermen of the West Coast. The bait depot has been the means of saving quite a lot of fish for the fishermen because they are able to get their bait from that source.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Hon. gentleman what he has done to put bait depots on the West Coast.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, we have put a bait depot in Ramea. The Government put up the money and Messrs. Penney are the managers. This, in my opinion, is the only sane way that a bait depot can be operated in this country. We have also arranged that the cold storage plant at St. Pierre be supplied with bait from the West Coast. I think the Government has in mind the placing of another one or two depots on that coast. The matter is now under consideration. Every member knows that I happen to be an advocate of cold storage. I just want to confirm the remarks of my Hon. friend, Mr. Murphy.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of the Shop Closing Bill. The Bill passed the House last night and was up to the third reading this morning.

Now that the Prime Minister is in the House I will give him the opportunity to move for the third reading of the Shop Closing Bill.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—At the present time there is a motion before the House by the Hon. member for Placentia West. He has referred to the matter of the establishment of

bait depots in Placentia Bay. The motion is not seconded at all. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries spoke on it, but he did not second it.

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Speaker, I intend to second this motion, and I have very great pleasure indeed in supporting the motion of the Hon. member for Placentia West. I think that the question of bait depots, particularly at the present time, is one of most urgent public and national importance. It is a matter of national importance to this country, not only today, but for years, and it is only within the last year that any practical steps whatever have been taken as far as I can see, or as far as I know of, by any Government to deal in a practical way with this very important question.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to know something about the bait situation in this country. My people have been identified with deep water fishing in Newfoundland for a generation. We have been interested to a very substantial extent in the bank fishery of this country, and as everyone knows it is essential, in order to carry out the banking industry, that there be a supply of bait. I also happen to have been born in a place which is practically the best bait centre on the coast line of Newfoundland, and it has been the work of years to establish in that centre some means for the curing and storing of bait. Holyrood is noted as a point where full supplies of bait fish can be obtained at practically any season of the year when these bait fishes run to land. There are three schools of bait fish, herring, caplin and squid, and it is with reference to the squid that I wish to make particular reference. The local banking fleet and the Canadian fleet and heretofore the American fleet always centralized on that point; they feel al-

most certain that they would procure bait when they came to land if they took a chance on Holyrood, but in many instances, owing to natural causes, bait was not available when they came, and the only alternative, the only possible way—

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, Rule 41; the last part of Rule 41 says:

(Reads)

If ten members support the motion, the motion is in order; if ten members do not rise the motion is out of order.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—The member's point is well taken.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the motion is out of order; it has already been moved, spoken to and seconded, and it is entirely out of order.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I rule that ten members rise now.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill for the Closing of Shops in St. John's (City) East and West End be read a third time. I would like to say in reply to Mr. Puddester's remarks that I had to defer another order to do this.

After we adjourned this morning I got in touch with Mr. Gushue and asked him to get in touch with the Clerk of the House and have the Bill, in its Amended form, printed to be at hand when the House opened this forenoon. I also arranged that the Legislative Council should read the Bill on the House of Assembly Order Paper, thus avoiding delay. I would like to draw attention to section 3 of the Bill:

(Reads)

I can only think that this is a printer's; not a legal error.

(Clerk Reads Section)

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move an Amendment to the motion before the Chair, I move that this Bill be read a third time six months hence.

Mr. Speaker, after much strenuous fighting the Bill has passed its second reading and has passed through the Committee stage and is now at the final stage. This Bill has been fought strenuously on both sides and fought, I think I might say, in a most uncompromising manner. This Bill affects the interest of a great many people and therefore it is one which calls for much serious and deliberate consideration. It is a matter which, without doubt, might bring untold suffering and hardship on a certain class of the community, and it is because of these principles that I have so strongly opposed the many Amendments which have been made. It is legislation which is pointed against certain sections of the community.

It is legislation which is primarily and really in restraint of trade; and legislation which is directed against an individual or a corporation so that he cannot do his business unhampered; it is the type of legislation which must be looked at as jealousy.

If this power is not used wisely and it is the tendency of modern legislation to enact many laws rather rashly in some cases so that men are not free to do the thing which their fathers before them did, and this power must be used carefully, and that is why I think we should treat this Act which is a curtailment of liberty, hesitatingly, and this legislation, I submit, is on all fours with the case I have just mentioned. It isn't right that the liberties of a subject be taken away just because matters have not been given the consideration they should have received.

That is why I have protested so strongly against this Bill; that is why I have suggested the holding over of this Bill for six months in order that it might have the deliberate and mature consideration which it deserves.

I see no reason why a Bill of this nature should be brought in at this late session of the Legislature, or, I might say, at the dying moments of a session of the House. Why was this measure not taken up months ago; why were the different aspects of the parties concerned left till this late hour. I feel, Mr. Speaker, and I feel that all the members of the House feel the same as I do; there is nobody who wants to pass any legislation that will be detrimental to the clerks of this City; but I also feel that there should be no member of this House who wants to pass Legislation that will be detrimental to the small Shopkeepers of this City.

I feel that this is purely a Municipal matter and should be dealt with by the City Councillors. It is true that the suggestion was made that a section dealing with this should have been incorporated in the Charter vesting the necessary authority in the City Council. Invariably they put up the argument that they did not want to be burdened with something that would cause them unnecessary trouble. I say that if these men are prepared to put themselves up for nomination as Councillors, then they should be prepared to accept the benefits and shoulder the responsibilities that go with their appointments. They should have looked upon the welfare of the clerks and seen to the closing hours of the stores and not shirked their duty or pass the burden on to members of this House. The fact they were not prepared to shoulder the respon-

sibility and take upon themselves the odium which was likely to react on them, does not mean that we should accept it.

I have no desire to prolong this acrimonious discussion regarding the terms of this Bill. It has been fought out in this House since yesterday at noon and all members have expressed their opinion either by voting or by voice. There has been more discussion on the Shop Closing Bill, one which only affects one section of the country, than any that has effected the whole of Newfoundland. There has been legislation vastly more important than this but still it has passed with little or no discussion.

We offered a compromise of 50 per cent but even that was not acceptable by the other side and I think that our offers were going as far as any fair minded member of this House would accept, but our compromises fell on deaf ears because each and every compromise suggested met with counter rebuttals and it is clear to us that our proposals must be of a detrimental effect to those who are claiming that they are only looking to the interest of the clerks, and not for their own interests.

We made offers of paying all clerks time and a half for overtime work but that was turned down showing us that it was not the interest of the clerks that was in the minds of the men who are opposed to our views. We further made amendments that nobody who was working during the day would be asked to come back but once again we were opposed.

We feel that we made every offer that it was possible to make to give the clerks better hours and better money but none of our proposals were accepted.

That can be done as suggested last night. But that is not the idea behind the Bill. It is not the interest of the clerks that is at stake, it is not the curtailment of closing hours that these people are concerned with, it is not the payment of overtime to these clerks that cause certain parties to worry over the passing of this Bill, oh, no, a blind man could see the idea behind this measure. A blind man could see that the primary motion behind those who conceived this measure is the diverting of the trade into one single channel in this capital city of the Dominion of Newfoundland, and I repeat what I said last night, that no free thinking British subject would stand for it, no British subject would stand for anything that would curtail the freedom of his activities in a free country, it is his birthright to be able to carry on his business in a manner in which he thinks fit.

Who could vote for such a measure and still be true to the principles of British justice and British fair play. Why are we so proud of our Constitution? Why do we point with such pride to the unwritten Constitution of Britain? Why do we feel that is the best Constitution ever developed, the best Constitution ever known to man? Isn't it an accepted fact that no matter what nationality a man lives under, he does not get more freedom under any nationality than under the British Constitution? Does he not get more freedom under the British Flag than under any other flag that floats in the breeze? Is it not true that in the elasticity of the British Constitution which grew out of the development of the conventions of our ancestors, that was born of the customs of our ancestors, is it not true that it is because of this elasticity that we are enabled to live and work with proper freedom within the British

Empire. Take that away from us, legislate in restraint of trade and you remove the props from under that consolidation of the greatest Commonwealth of Nations that has been known in this history of man.

Mr. Speaker, as it is now 1.10 I would move that we adjourn until this afternoon.

MR. PUDDESTER—I think that you might continue.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any precedent laid down that the debate can not continue over meal hour.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—The only rule is that the House opens at 3 o'clock and the Speaker leaves the Chair at 6.30 until 7.30, there is no provision for a morning session.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I think that I remember a session in 1921 or 1922 when we had a morning session and we adjourned until after lunch. Maybe Mr. Puddester can enlighten us? I remember the House was open at 10 one morning and we spoke until 1 and then adjourned until 3 o'clock.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I suggest that you continue until 1.30, if you are not finished at 1.30 we could take a motion for adjournment.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—No.

(Speaker puts the motion which is defeated.)

HON. MR. LEWIS—As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the principle of this Bill strikes at the very root of what we know and hold sacred in our British Constitution. Legislation like this is obnoxious, and when, in addition to

that fact when it is backed by an uncompromising force that intends to pass this legislation by brute force if necessary, there is only one thing that we can do and that is to oppose legislation like this as strenuously as we know how and personally I intend to do it and I can fight as hard as any member in this House. If we are defeated we are prepared to accept it but not until we have strained every effort to prevent such a measure becoming a law and becoming engrossed on the Statute Books of this country.

The condition of Newfoundland today, economically and financially, is one that calls for and requires the most serious consideration of the members of the House. Unemployment is rife throughout the country, every district has its share and the responsibility thrown on the Government under such conditions is not a light one. Before the 30th of June comes around this year, the Government of this country will be faced with the situation that they will have to find employment or some means of relieving unemployment.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, what constitutes a quorum?

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—Twelve constitutes a quorum, I think that there are thirteen present.

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, before the 30th of June comes around this year, the Government will be in the position where they will have to find employment for a vast number of our people and if the Government does not find that means of employment or some source of revenue for the people, the condition that will exist in our country will be a serious one. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that and appreciate it and

in the face of the fact that there is an almost universal depression today, almost every country in the world today is in bad economic straits, in the face of that, see coming into this House a measure pointed at the ruination of a great many of our citizens and if it goes into effect, it will add no small number to those who are already in the army of the unemployed. They will be treated under this measure not as revenue producing citizens but they will have to close up their doors and shut down the little businesses that they have taken years to develop.

Such a condition of affairs I submit, Sir, is abhorrent and intolerable and should receive scant toleration from this Assembly. Supposing, Mr. Speaker, that these smaller men who are directly affected by this Act have to close their doors and go out of business; supposing these men have to put up their shutters and go into the insolvency courts. What is the result going to be? Where is the pinch going to be felt?

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would like to point out to your Honor May's Parliamentary procedure which reads as follows:

(Reads)

(Hon. Mr. Lewis ruled by the Speaker to be in order.)

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Speaker, the motion of my learned friend to prevent our even talking about this measure is consistent with his policy all along. If he had his way the whole matter would have been stifled and nobody would have been entitled to raise his voice. But, Mr. Speaker, we have the freedom of Speech and some of us are going to use it when we consider it in the interest of the public. To continue the matter which re-

ference to the matter before the House. Every imaginable business that could be carried on in St. John's has been provided for in this Act. Every building where five cents worth of trade could be carried on has been thought of, and if it went through, Sir, I say the city of St. John's would look like a grave yard.

I repeat again, why if this measure is in the interests of the clerks that it has not be so framed? The reason is not obvious, but it was made clear during the course of the debate yesterday. It is nothing more or less than an attempt by a few merchants to monopolize the trade of this city.

In moving, therefore, the Amendment that the consideration of this Bill be deferred for six months, I do so in the hope, that all parties concerned will have time to adjust their differences in an amicable way and will be able to take advantage of a more opportune time to submit a measure that will be acceptable to the great majority of our people; a measure that will not bristle with such difficulties and will not tend to produce such disastrous results as the Act that is now attempted to be brought into force.

Give them an opportunity to function as they are entitled to function and give them what they are entitled to as British subjects, the freedom of trade and the right to be treated on the basis of equality, and forget your closure methods and your discriminatory legislation, and forget your sectional ideas and forget your own personal interests, if you are to legislate for the benefit of all concerned.

Why do you oppose the payment of overtime to clerks and why do you oppose the working hours for clerks? What is the object? If you are sincere,

why not put the Amendment through now? If the clerks really wanted this measure, I submit they would have received more in that Amendment than what they ask. But it was at no time the intention of the members of the Opposition to vote for such an Amendment as that. They simply play on the fact that they can get sufficient men from this side of the House to support their measure no matter what it contains.

On that ground they are prepared to sit tight and allow this Act to be enacted into law. I, therefore, move as an Amendment that this Bill be read this day six months.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached this position that this Bill has been sufficiently discussed for every member of this House to cast an intelligent vote thereon. The motion is that the Bill be now read a third time; the Amendment is that the Bill be read this day six months. The Amendment referred to by the honorable member for Hr. Main has not yet been seconded. I beg now to move that the previous question be put to this House.

MR. EMERSON.—I second that, Mr. Speaker, and would say that that must be put without debate.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I rise to support the Amendment.

MR. PUDDESTER.—The question must be put without debate.

MR. FITZGIBBON.—When Mr. Lewis sat down I arose with the intention of seconding the Amendment.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You were not quick enough.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Then I have very great

pleasure in seconding the Amendment now.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I rise to a point of order, and I appeal against the ruling of the Speaker.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER.—I rule that the previous question cannot be moved, and I do so according to the Rules of the House. The honorable member for Bay de Verde has moved that the House be appealed to on this matter. I presume that requires to be seconded.

MR. EMERSON.—I second it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I rose a few moments ago to second a motion so very well and ably proposed by my honorable friend and colleague Mr. Lewis, representative of the District of Harbour Main. I rise to second that motion and in doing so I am being consistent with the attitude I have taken in connection with this legislation ever since it came into the House.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER.—I would ask the indulgence of the House if the Speaker would be allowed to leave the Chair for five minutes.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think we might concur unanimously.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, before recess a difference of opinion arose; you had to give a decision which was sustained by this House. Before that I pointed out, before I went out, that the honourable member for Harbor Main had moved an Amendment to this Bill which is entitled "An Act to Regulate the Closing Hours of Shops within the Electoral District of St. John's East and West."

Now Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. Lewis has just moved an Amendment, that this Bill be given its reading in six months time, and I take great pleasure in seconding the motion of my Honourable friend.

In order that I may keep as close as possible to the question under discussion, it will be best for me to read this Act section by section, explaining each section as I go along and giving my views as to what effects this Bill will have, if it is adopted, on those of our community who will be affected by it. (Reads.)

There is as yet no such Act as this recorded on the Statue Books of this country and one wonders who was first authorized to put this into law. Even the Select Committee appointed to go into this Bill found it so incomprehensible that they could do nothing with it. It is unfair and unjust to the people affected by it and who had nothing to do with drafting it. It will bring about much suffering and hardship to a large body of citizens.

(Reads.)

Now, in this connection might I point out that if I did nothing else of a constructive nature to this Bill I did, at least, correct this error in the Bill, and how serious a mistake this was I will presently explain. A butcher is in many respects different from a grocer or other store-keepers, he has to get up in many cases in the morning and dress the meat which he has killed, sometimes the night before so as to be able to sell it when his shop opens at eight or nine the next morning. Perhaps after the shop is closed he will go to his slaughter house to kill his cattle so as to be ready for the next day's business. It is also well known that it is a practice of the butcher shops to remain open until eleven o'clock on Friday evening in order to cater to the wants of the

citizens. I think I have made it fairly clear that had this Bill gone through with the mistake in it much inconvenience and hardship would have been the result, and I am proud to be able to associate myself with the correction of this mistake. I might further say that these shops are in the habit of opening in the night for four days in the week in order to cater to their customers. May I say that this furnishes just another reason why this Bill should be given the most mature consideration as it is essential that such error be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I see it mentions soft drinks here, well there's no other drinks here, well there's no other drinks in the country except at the Controllers. Auto supplies, well, Gentlemen, I think that automobile supplies are a luxury, these were so included so as no discomfort would be caused the people who really promoted this Bill. Sale of newspapers; well, I don't think these constitute necessities in fact if I may say so if we could cut out newspapers, we'd eliminate the source of much of our trouble.

While we're on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the editorial appearing in this morning's Daily News. I understand this wasn't a party measure but the Daily News here is trying to make a political football of it. I will now read this editorial for the House.

(Reads.)

What is hinted at is that the Prime Minister had this rigged whereas I never discussed the matter with the Prime Minister. When the Prime Minister made this a non-party measure he gave myself and my colleagues freedom to discuss this matter as we personally saw it.

Section 3 of the Act has been fought out by both sides and last evening it

was practically decided that there would be a friendly Committee of three or four lawyers who would draw up an Amendment to this section. That Committee was to consist of my friend the Member for Placentia East, Mr. Lewis the Member for Harbour Main and the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice all of whom are prominent members of the Legal Profession and aptly suited to draw up the Amendment. They draw up this Amendment which provided that all clerks who worked at night whether they worked on Water Street or elsewhere would be paid overtime. This Amendment was moved by me and seconded by the Member for Placentia East but was voted down by the members of this House. I will now read for the benefit of this House the Amendment that was turned down. (Reads.)

Instead of this they wanted Section 3 as it now stands this also I will read. (Reads.)

Our side was prepared to meet them 50/50. Before this Act was altered the stores could open every night of the week, we agreed to remain shut four out of seven nights but we asked to open the remaining three nights but this was not agreeable, they wanted some stores to open two nights and the remainder three nights or in other words as I have said before they wanted sectional Legislation. The other side would not budge but would only favour the Legislation that would put the small man out of business. They thought that Power, Might and Money should rule the City and put the small man out of business. If I were to allow such Legislation I would be unfaithful to my trust.

I will now read Sub-Section 2. (Reads.) That section as originally intended was to allow any person who lived over a store to open it at night-time but any person for example who

lived on Rennie's Mill Road and had a business on New Gower Street was not allowed to open the store even if he was prepared to work it alone without any outside help. This Amendment was only allowed to be inserted after continuous fighting by our side.

There was a party who went to this country having as a slogan a "square Deal to All" and I feel that if Legislation of this nature was to pass that we would not be giving a square deal to the small storekeepers of this City but some would be getting a round deal while others would not be getting any kind of a deal at all. As was said here the other night the big fish eat the small fish; now the big storekeeper or merchants of Water Street wish to devour the smaller shops.

I know of eight fishermen who are in this City at present who paid their accounts for last year but who can get no supplies for this year. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that I am not wandering away from the subject of this debate but I want to say that this afternoon I have to go down town and see if it is possible for these men to get fitted out for the fishery. The big shopkeepers are not prepared to advance these supplies to these men so that they may prosecute the fishery but are looking to the Government to guarantee the accounts.

My first principal objection to this Bill was on the grounds that it was not a question for this House to Legislate on but a matter for the Municipal Council and I still contend that there should have been a clause inserted in that Bill that would have given the Municipal Authorities to open or close the shops at a certain time and to look after the interests of the clerks.

There was a Municipal Bill brought into effect in 1921, it was 100 pages and I think consisted of 390 Sections and

I think that the drafters of this Bill should have included a section that would have given the Council authority to close the stores at certain hours. Why should we, as Members of this House, have this burden thrown on us?

There are so many sections in this Act, I will glance through the various heads. (Reads.)

Mr. Speaker, I brought in the Estimates here a couple of weeks ago, covering the expenditures of the country for a period of twelve months and I feel as Minister of Finance and Customs that the coming year will be, economically, the most serious one in the history of Newfoundland, from an economic and financial standpoint, and we heard less from the members of the Opposition on these Estimates than we heard from them on this Bill. What is the reason? The reason is obvious. There are one or two reasons. The first is that they have not the financial prosperity of the country at heart, the second is because they are fostering this Bill because they are personally interested in its adoption and I hold now that the Leader of the Opposition is personally interested and did everything he could to get it through. I came in here as Minister of Finance and Customs and I sat here in that chair, I am young, I grant you and maybe I have not had as much experience as some previous Finance Ministers, but I sat there for three weeks and I say that we did not have as much comment on the expenditures of the country as we had on this Bill. I claim that they are not sincere. When people are sincere and mean what they say, I take off my hat to them, but they are not in that calibre. The Budget Speech is sort of an auditors report, telling how the country stands financially. This year I brought in my Budget and I regret to say as Minister of Finance

and Customs that I could not bring in a better showing. I received fair criticism because the members of the opposition who criticised us were only concerned with two or three points where we had erred and they only pointed out three items where we could eliminate amounting to \$27,000.00. They moved amendments to wipe out an expenditure of \$27,000.00. Why, some of the merchants who are behind this Bill get more than \$27,000.00 in a year.

To come back to the point why this should be included in the Municipal Act. Every man in this House agreed that it should be in there and why did they not put it in there? Why did the people who are fostering this Bill try to railroad this through by brute force, by the influence of their money and greed? I am still holding out in seconding the motion made by my colleague. He is the youngest man who ever sat in the Executive Government, he is a better man than any on the Opposition and as good a man as any member on this side. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that my name and that of my friend and colleague, Mr. Lewis will be hauled through these rotten sheets and our family history raked up and any mistakes we made will be hauled out and thrown at us in the editorials of these papers.

These papers are controlled by those "financial wizards" of the country. If they spoke on behalf of the underdog, they would not get any advertising. Why, Cassius was a giant compared with them. They are not here to take the insult that I give them, I only wish they were, but I say that there were people brought here to interrupt me and prevent me from speaking and I say that as a Newfoundlander, I suppose I am at least entitled to call myself that, I resent such insults. Because I represent people of a fishing type, I come from

a fishing class, I do not wish to boast about the fishing class but 90% of the members of this House are men that came from the fishing class. We all came from the working classes with the exception of two or three monopolists on the other side. Last night in this House some people were called "sharks" I pointed out that the real sharks were on the Opposition side of the House; people whose business has prospered at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. I say that there is not a word in that Act that suggests that the clerks be protected and I defy any man to point it out. This is a Shop Closing Bill brought in here to put a few small men out of business. A certain man was called here last night, a "shark" and the greatest shark of all is on the other side. I was a member of a Government here when at a party meeting right here in this House when Mr. Monroe, the then Prime Minister was discussing the tariff measures, and the now Hon. Leader of the Opposition was telephoned to see if he was agreeable to eliminating the duty on lines and twines and he refused and now he has the unmigrated gall to come in here and call some shopkeepers sharks.

Now we come down to Section 10 and we find a deliberate attempt to fleece possible violators of this Act, for the first offence they will be fined from \$10.00, for the second \$10.00 to \$100.00 and the third \$100.00 to \$500.00. We were successful in the course of the debate in getting this cut down 50% and we have come to the position where we have to be thankful for small measures. Now is the time if they have the interests of the working people at heart, they never had a better opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the drums beating, I hope that it is not an army

advancing, I can hear the trumpets sounding and I am wondering if an attack is going to be made.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—We are going to die sooner or later.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, yes, we are all going to die sooner or later and if there is one thing I admire more than another, it is on a sinking ship the last man to leave the ship is the captain, but I will go down with this if necessary, gloriously, if you like, but if this Bill is passed it will be over my dead body, if you want to go that far.

Mr. Speaker, to-day I received an anonymous letter which threatened me with violence, I am going to hand it over to the authorities, I know where such letters come from, I have a good idea, this was done to frighten me so that I would lie down and let this aggregation walk over me. If I lived for a hundred years I am prepared to go down for my views. I am sorry, Sir, that the Hon. Members of the Opposition are not here that I might tell them what I think about them, the only thing I can say is that they are cowardly.

Coming back, Mr. Speaker, to the question as to why this matter is before the Legislature at all, I want to point out that this is entirely a Municipal matter and as such it should have been nothing more or less than an appendage to the Municipal Act. Compared with other countries the city of St. John's does not fare off so badly. The Fire Brigade receives government support and a great many other matters which in other countries are treated entirely as municipal affairs. In this my honourable and learned friend Dr. Campbell will bear me out. I might say in assing that the opinion of the Honourable Member has

hardly been considered by the Committee, and yet he represents the largest constituency in the country, and this Bill affects his constituency more than any other.

If this legislation is brought into affect the burden of it will be felt in his district more than in any other, is it any wonder that he and his colleague, Mr. Fitzgibbon, should not stand idly by and allow this legislation to go through without even making a fight to stop it. As I said before, the matter should be considered an entirely Municipal one. I anticipate that we will get considerable free advertising out of our action in fighting this Bill. I don't think either myself or my colleague, Mr. Lewis, will have to pay for any advertising for the next six months at least, but I say, Sir, if we were not prepared to fight this Bill we would not be fit to represent a working man's district. I daresay that for some time to come we're going to find it dangerous to go into a store or do anything else. It's a good thing that barber shops have been excluded from this Bill, or if we went into a barber shop we would be liable to have our throats cut.

One of the first things I noticed on reading this Bill was that the butchers had been deliberately left out of it, but as I pointed out before, the butcher is one of the hardest kind of jobs; it is one of the hardest trades, with the longest hours in the community, but no one, it seems, ever looked at that. Why should we come in here and effect legislation for only one part of the country. If we are going to put this Bill through at all why not let it apply to the whole country. If a clerk worked after six anywhere over the whole country, let him be paid for it. It is the same principle. The matter, as I said be-

fore, should have been left entirely in the hands of the Municipal Council.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that there is not another city in the world where legislation of this nature is in force. It is certainly not so in New York. In Montreal it is not so, and in London and Paris they are open all the time. Now let us suppose this Bill were to go into effect here and see what would happen. Mr. Speaker, I just heard a very appropriate piece of music being played outside.

Today we seem anxious to separate and keep one another down. There is no spirit of co-operation amongst us. We wan't to put the small men out of business. There is no spirit of the days of 1914-1918 left. I do not want to shout the praises of those who went overseas and fought for justice; but they fought that the little man in life may live. A scrap of paper was the cause of the world war, just as we have a scrap of paper here now to legislate the small business man in the community out of business, and there would be no red blood in my veins if I did not rise up and protest strongly against such a course of action on the part of the Legislature.

Now, Sir, I think I have done the best I can in connection with this Bill, and I intend to do still more, and if this Bill passes its third reading, I hope to be primarily responsible for some organization in this community of some kind, and I am prepared to devote considerable of my time to it the coming summer, to have owners of small stores come together in a co-operative fashion, because if the big stores had their way people would go naked in this community today. Considerable criticism, particularly since I took charge of the Customs, has been made by certain people with reference to the Jews. In fact, some have

been attempting to crucify the Jews. The reason is that the Jews on Water Street, or, on any other street, are the keenest traders in the world. They go into the markets to buy, particularly in the United States—

(Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod enters)

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, that the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Closing Hours of Shops Within the Electoral Districts of St. John's (City) East and West" be now read a third time, Hon. Mr. Lewis moved, and Mr. Fitzgibbon seconded, that the said Bill be read a third time six months hence.

At three of the clock, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a Message from His Excellency the Governor commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber.

Mr. Speaker at the Bar of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:

May it Please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly have voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

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

An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending the 30th day of June, 1931, and the 30th day of June, 1932, and for other Purposes Relating to the Public Service;

Address to the King.

An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V, Chapter 3, entitled "An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to Enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company."

An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in Connection with the Sale of Securities.

An Act to Amend the Act 21 George V, Chapter 14 (Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930).

An Act Relating to the Canning of Rabbits and other Food;

An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips;

An Act to Amend the Law Relating to Life Insurance;

An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs;

An Act to further Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Postal and Telegraph Services";

An Act Relating to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages;

An Act Relating to a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and The Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, Limited;

An Act to Amend "The War Pensions Act, 1922";

An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's;

An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V, Cap. 22, entitled "An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland";

An Act to Amend the Act 21 Geo. V, Chapter 15 (Crown Lands Act, 1930);

An Act to Amend the Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled "An Act to

Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Company";

An Act in Relation to a Contract for Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay;

An Act to Amend the Criminal Law;

An Act to Facilitate the Operation of the Newfoundland Hotel;

An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare;

An Act to Amend Chapter 76 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund";

An Act to give effect to a Protocol on Arbitration Clauses signed on behalf of His Majesty at a meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations held on the Twenty-fourth day of September, 1923, and to a Convention on the Execution of Arbitral Awards signed on behalf of His Majesty at Geneva on the Twenty-sixth day of September, 1927;

An Act for the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Dominion for Certain Public Purposes.

An Act Respecting a Reduction in the Public Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 1931-32;

An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances;

An Act Further to Amend the "Revenue Act, 1925"; .

An Act for the Standardization of Salt Codfish for Export;

An Act Relation to the International Grenfell Association;

An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921;

An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador and the Islands adjacent thereto;

An Act to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Employment of Men engaged in Logging";

An Act to Provide a National Flag for Newfoundland, and Colours to be Worn by Vessels;

An Act Relating to the Department of External Affairs;

An Act to Alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary.

His Excellency was then pleased to make the following Speech to both Branches of the Legislature:

Mr. President and Honorable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Honorable House of Assembly:

It gives me great pleasure to relieve you from your legislative duties. Owing to the convening of the Session at an earlier date than has been usual in past years, it is possible to close now, and thus enable you to give your undivided attention to your ordinary avocations.

I thank you for the care and attention which you have given to your legislative functions.

I shall have pleasure in forwarding to His Majesty the King the humble Address of this Legislature praying for the passing of an Act to give effect to certain declarations and resolutions of the Imperial Conferences of 1926 and 1930.

The Act respecting Health and Public Welfare is one that should result in the closer co-ordination and more economical administration of the various charitable institutions and public health services, with consequent

benefit to those of the public who may need to avail of them.

The Act for the Prevention of Fraud in connection with the sale of securities will do much to safeguard investors, while that respecting Life Insurance brings our law into harmony with modern legislation elsewhere, thereby facilitating the transaction of insurance business.

One of the most important of the Acts passed this Session is that relating to the Standardization of Salt Codfish. Anything that will tend to the improvement of the quality of fish exported will doubtless have a beneficial effect on the markets. It is to be hoped that the loyal co-operation of all interested will, under the provisions of the Act, secure for our staple industry those benefits which this legislation is designed to provide.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Honorable House of Assembly:

I thank you for the provision which you have made for the various Departments of the Public Service. The anticipated shortage of revenue in the next fiscal year will, in large measure be met by the reductions you have made in the Estimates, combined with the further savings to be effected under the separate Act which you have passed for an additional reduction in the Public expenditure.

Mr. President and Honorable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Honorable House of Assembly:

It is gratifying to observe that, while the mills manufacturing newsprint in Canada have reduced their output by fifty percent, the mills operating in Newfoundland show an increase in production.

I hope as you leave these legislative halls to resume the conduct of your business, you may find a lightening of the clouds of depression, and such signs of reviving trade and returning prosperity as will enable you to face the future with confidence and courage. I trust that in the coming months Providence may smile upon us and crown the labors of our people with success.

After which the Honorable President of the Legislative Council by Command of His Excellency said:

Gentlemen: It is His Excellency's Will and Pleasure that this General Assembly be prorogued until Wednesday, the twenty-fourth day of June ensuing, then and here to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY,

- Motion for, 9.
- Draft of, 29.
- Adoption of, 289.
- Presentation of, 391.

ADDRESS TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING,

- (Message from Legislative Council), 214.

ACTS PASSED, List of during the 1931 Session, 561.

ABBOTT, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 124.
- Supply, 326.

AGRICULTURE AND MINES, MINISTER OF.

- On Act for Grading Potatoes and Turnips, 111.
- Crown Lands Act, 221, 226.
- Trinity Bay Coal Areas, 222.
- Supply, 350, 351.
- St. John's Municipal Act, 400.
- Salt Codfish Bill, 472.

BENNETT, MR.

- On Bill for Grading Potatoes and Turnips, 123.
- Petition re Roads Petty Hr., 163.
- Conception Bay Mail and Passenger Service Bill, 208, 232.
- Loan Resolutions, 395.
- St. John's Municipal Bill, 398.
- Resolutions re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 411.
- Shop Closing Bill, 514, 527.

BINDON, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 9.
Salmon Nets, Salmonier River, 43.
Petition for Ferry, S. E. Placentia, 233.
Shop Closing Bill, 502, 539, 542.

BROWN, MR.

- On Petition re Fishing at Spillar's Island, 227.
Bell Island Mail and Passenger Service, 232.
Supply, 364, 365, 367, 368, 379.
Resolution re Reduction Public Expenditure, 413, 416.
Logging Bill, 495, 497.
Shop Closing Bill, 522.

BUDGET SPEECH, 234.

BUTLER-REID GANDER VALLEY CORRESPONDENCE—

- Memorandum Submitted to
Nfld. Government by Mr. Alan S. Butler, 25.
Letter and Correspondence Sent Nfld.
Government re same, per Mr. C. O'N. Conroy, 54.

BYRNE, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 90, 95.
Memorial University Bill, 221.
Supply, 323, 325.
Public Health Bill, 342.
St. John's Municipal Act, 402, 404, 469.
Ways and Means, 439.
Shop Closing Bill, 505, 525, 526, 542.

CAMPBELL, HON. DR.

- On "Bill Relating to the Keeping of Dogs", 163, 165.
Public Health Bill, 342, 344.
St. John's Municipal Act, 469.
Shop Closing Bill, 505, 515, 541.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON. THE.

- On Petition for Road Repairs—Hr. Grace and Bryant's Cove, 227.
Supply, 330.

COAKER, HON. SIR W. F.

- On Supply, 386.
Salt Codfish Bill, 420, 470, 471, 472, 473, 481, 482, 483, 484.
Shop Closing Bill, 516.

DIVISIONS—

- On Vote for Finance Department, 346.
- Vote for Agriculture Department, 361.
- Vote for Reduction in Public Expenditure, 416.

EARLE, MR.

- On Shop Closing Bill, 527.

EMERSON, MR.

- Cn Bill "To Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 38.
- Sale of Securities Act, 40.
- Replying to Questions and Publication of Same, 50.
- Dog Fish Nuisance, 140.
- Address in Reply, 148, 288.
- Petition re Tickle Hr. Crossing, 164.
- His Being Misquoted, 166.
- Conception Bay Mail and Passenger Service Bill, 208.
- Oils and By-Products Resolution, 210.
- Public Health Bill, 212, 219, 294, 296, 297, 298, 339, 341, 344.
- Act Relating to Memorial College, 216, 217.
- Fishery Supplies and Public Expenditure, 228.
- Petition for Ferry S. E. Placentia, 233.
- Permanent Marine Disaster Fund, 286, 360.
- Certain Votes in the Estimates, 291.
- Newfoundland Hotel, 313, 314.
- Supply, 301, 302, 304, 305, 308, 315, 316, 320, 324, 329, 330, 331, 332, 334, 336, 337, 347, 348, 350, 352, 353, 367, 368, 369, 373, 374, 384, 385, 386.
- Act to Amend the Criminal Law, 313.
- Loan Resolutions, 393, 394.
- Arbitration Clauses Bill, 397.
- St. John's Municipal Act, 401, 402, 403, 469.
- Resolutions re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 408, 412, 415.
- Ways and Means, 442, 444, 461.
- Salt Codfish Bill, 474, 479, 481, 484.
- An Address to the King, 488, 489.
- The Address to the King, 500.
- Shop Closing Bill, 502, 505, 519, 520, 521, 525, 530, 534, 535, 542.

FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, HON. MINISTER OF.

- On Replying to Questions and Same Being Incorrectly Published, 49, 50.
- Conception Bay Mail and Passenger Service Bill, 207.
- Ways and Means (Budget Speech), 234.
- Address in Reply, 288.
- Certain Votes in the Estimates, 290, 292.
- Supply, 300, 301, 302, 304, 311, 320, 332, 333, 334, 336, 354, 355, 365, 372, 374, 375, 383, 386, 391.

St. John's Municipal Act, 387, 398, 400, 401, 403, 467.
Loan Resolutions, 392, 394, 395.
Resolutions re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 405, 406, 407, 412,
413, 414, 415.
Ways and Means, 455.
Salt Codfish Bill, 483.
Bill for the Closing of Shops, 501, 504, 520, 521, 523, 524, 525, 527,
528, 529, 534, 535, 536, 539, 540, 541, 542, 544, 555.

FITZGIBBON, MR.

On Supply, 305.

FUDGE, MR.

On Dog Fish Nuisance, 140.
Petition for Road—Morrisville, 163.

GREENE, MR.

On Bill in Relation to a Contract for Mail and
Passenger Service Upon Conception Bay, 202, 204, 207, 208, 282.
Oils and By-Products Resolution, 211.
Petition for Road, Bell Island, East End, 233.
Petition for Well, Bell Island, East End, 294.
St. John's Municipal Bill, 398, 401.
Petition, Lance Cove Road, Repairs, 399.
Petition, Public Wharf, Bell Island, 465.
Shop Closing Bill, 522, 536, 537, 539.

GODDEN, MR.

On Petition re Road, Southern Cove, 218.
Petition re Coal Areas, Trinity Bay, 221.
Ways and Means, 444.
Petition re Heart's Content Road, 465.
Shop Closing Bill, 524.

INTERNAL ECONOMY—

Members Appointed Thereto, 52.

LEWIS, HON. MR.

On Petition re Colliers Road, 112.
Petition re Conception-Brigus Junct. Road, 195.
Conception Bay Mail and Passenger Service Bill, 209, 224, 232.
Petition for Road, Colliers-Marysvale, 222.
Supply, 310.
Shop Closing Bill, 516, 521, 531, 535, 540, 549.
Petition re Kennedy's Road, 545.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, MINISTER OF.

- On Dog Fish, 141.
- Supply, 308, 309, 310, 331, 332, 334, 347, 348, 349.
- Petition re Bell-Wire, Lamaline, 371.
- Salt Codfish Bill, 417, 472, 484.
- Shop Closing Bill, 529.
- Bait Depots, 548.

MOSDELL, HON. DR.

- On Public Health Bill, 212, 294, 295, 298, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 366, 369.
- Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 359.

MOORE, MR.

- On Petition re Bennett's Hill, 52.
- Address in Reply, 166.
- Conception Bay Mail and Passenger Service Bill, 207, 208.
- Supply, 326, 353.
- Logging Bill, 496.

MURPHY, MR.

- On Petition South East Bight re Dog Fish Pest, 139.
- Salt Codfish Bill, 476, 477, 482, 484.
- Bait Depots, 547.

OPPOSITION, HON. LEADER OF.

- On Resolutions of Sympathy, Death of Hon. John Anderson, M.L.C., Hon. S. K. Bell, M.L.C. and Mr. J. J. St. John, Sr., 8, 9.
- Address in Reply, 18, 171, 184, 287.
- Act to Alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary, 36.
- Life Insurance Companies Bill, 39.
- Sale of Securities Act, 40, 123.
- Re Hearst, Gander Valley Project, 42.
- Pouch Cove Breakwater, 45.
- Replying to Questions, 50.
- On Public Utilities Commission Bill, 79, 227.
- Act for Grading Potatoes and Turnips, 111, 123.
- On Dog Fish Nuisance, 139, 141.
- On Oils and By-Products Resolution, 211.
- Public Health Bill, 212, 219, 296, 297, 343, 344, 345.
- Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Bill, 216.
- Petition re Coal Areas Trinity Bay, 222.
- Conception Bay Passenger and Mail Service Bill, 224, 225.
- Bill to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 226.
- Fishery Supplies and Public Expenditure, 230.
- On Certain Votes in the Estimates, 291, 292.

- Death of Lady Bennett, 293.
 Supply, 303, 308, 315, 316, 319, 324, 330, 334, 349, 350, 355, 372, 375,
 376, 378, 385.
 Act to Amend the Criminal Law, 313, 314.
 Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 358.
 St. John's Municipal Act, 389, 404, 467, 468.
 Loan Resolutions, 393, 394.
 Resolutions re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 406, 407, 413.
 Ways and Means, 430, 461.
 Salt Codfish Bill, 471, 475, 542.
 The Address to the King, 489.
 Logging Bill, 496, 497.
 Shop Closing Bill, 505, 521, 523, 525, 526, 529, 534, 535, 537, 540.

PARSONS, CAPT.

- On Petition Roads Spaniard's Bay, 282.
 Salt Codfish Bill, 474.

PETITIONS—

- Puddester, Mr., 24, 112, 218, 221.
 Bindon, Mr., 43.
 Tobin, Mr., 43, 80, 143.
 Moore, Mr., 52.
 Quinton, Mr., 94, 356, 506.
 Lewis, Hon. Mr., 112, 195, 222, 545.
 Murphy, Mr., 139.
 Prime Minister, Rt. Hon., 142, 193, 196, 223, 428.
 Fudge, Mr., 163.
 Bennett, Mr., 163.
 Emerson, Mr., 164, 233.
 Smith, Mr., 164.
 Godden, Mr., 218, 465.
 Public Works, Minister of, 223.
 Brown, Mr., 227.
 Secretary, Hon. Colonial, 227.
 Skeans, Mr., 228.
 Greene, Mr., 233, 294, 399, 465.
 Parsons, Capt., 282.
 Scammell, Mr., 282, 390.
 Strong, Mr., 371, 399.
 Marine and Fisheries, Minister of, 371.
 Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Minister, 371.

POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, HON. MINISTER OF.

- On Bill "Of the Postal and Telegraph Services", 195.
 Resolution for Collection of Tax on Telegraphic Messages, 199, 201.
 Supply, 305, 316, 363, 364, 374.
 Petition from Ireland's Eye, 371.
 Ways and Means, 460.

PRIME MINISTER, RT. HON. THE.

- On Resolution of Sympathy Deaths of Hon. John Anderson, M.L.C.,
Hon. S. K. Bell, M.L.C. and Mr. J. J. St. John, Sr., 7, 8.
Address in Reply, 18, 191.
Butler-Reid-Gander Valley Memorandum, 28.
Resolution of Sympathy re Viking Disaster, 30.
American Telephone and Telegraph Co. Bill, 32.
Act to Alter Title of the Colonial Secretary, 36, 499.
Bill to Amend Summary Jurisdiction Act, 37.
Communication from Prime Minister of Canada, 41.
Re Hearst-Gander Valley Project, 41, 42, 43.
Re Pouch Cove Breakwater, 44.
Message Sydney Board of Trade re Viking Disaster, 48.
German Reparations Account, 50.
Petition re Bennett's Hill, Carbonear, 53.
Public Utilities Commission Bill, 78, 227.
Tabling Opinions or Advise to Governor in Council by His
Legal Advisers, 95.
Viking Disaster Fund Subscriptions, 112, 222.
Petitions from Howley and Humber Arm, 142.
Position of Newfoundland Hotel, 144, 312, 314.
Petition St. John's Gas Light Co., 193.
Petition Clerks of St. John's re Closing Hours, 193.
Petition St. John's Municipal Council, 196.
Tabling Information re Memorial College and Normal School, 196.
Proposed Agreement in Connection with the Treating of New-
foundland Cod, Seal, Whale and other Oils and their By-
Products, 199, 210, 211.
War Pension and Bonus, 214.
Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, Ltd. Bill, 216.
Act Relating to Memorial College, 216, 217, 221.
Petition from Light & Power Co., Ltd., 218.
Public Health Bill, 219.
Customs Smelter Bill, 221.
Petition for Cutting Wood on Three Mile Limit, 222.
Petition Wardens, Penitentiary, 223.
Bill to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 225.
Question of Fishery Supplies, 231.
Interim Report Viking Enquiry, 285.
Act to Amend the Criminal Law, 313.
On Supply, 315, 319, 320, 329, 332, 333, 334, 337, 338, 347, 372.
Bill Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, 358.
Arbitration Clauses Bill, 397.
St. John's Municipal Bill, 398, 400, 405, 468.
Resolution re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 412.
Carbonear Water Co. Petition, 428.
Labrador Marine Shell Resolutions, 429.
Re Sealing Act Bill, 487.
The Address to the King, 488, 489, 501.
Act Relating to External Affairs, 499.

Salt Codfish Bill, 542.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISTER OF.

On Petition Wardens Penitentiary, 223.
 Public Health Bill, 297, 298.
 Supply, 303, 304, 306, 308, 310, 334, 335, 336, 337, 352, 353, 354.
 Resolution re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 414.

PUDDESTER, MR.

On Railway Station at Grate's Cove, 24.
 Sale of Securities Act, 41.
 Hearst-Gander Valley Project, 42, 43.
 Pouch Cove Breakwater, 45.
 Replying to Questions and Publication of Same, 50.
 Bennett's Hill, Carbonear Highway, 53.
 Address in Reply, 61, 81, 287.
 Petition re Road, Red Head Cove, 112.
 Dog Fish Nuisance, 140.
 The Keeping of Dogs, 163, 165.
 Collection of Tax on Telegraphic Messages, 201.
 Conception Bay Mail and Passenger Service, 204, 208, 209, 224.
 Public Health Bill, 212, 219, 297, 339, 340.
 Petition for Flag Station at Western Bay, 218.
 Petition re Coal Areas Trinity Bay, 221.
 Petition re Roads Hr. Grace and Bryant's Cove, 227.
 Interim Report Viking Enquiry, 285.
 Powder Magazine at Battery, 286.
 Certain Votes in the Estimates, 291, 292.
 Supply, 300, 301, 302, 304, 305, 308, 316, 320, 321, 326, 329, 330, 332,
 333, 334, 347, 348, 350, 351, 354, 362, 363, 364, 372, 374, 375, 382,
 386, 391.
 Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 358.
 Loan Resolutions, 392, 394.
 St. John's Municipal Act, 401.
 Resolutions re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 409, 412, 413, 415.
 Ways and Means, 445, 461.
 Salt Codfish Bill, 471, 472, 473, 474, 482.
 Logging Bill, 495, 497.
 Shop Closing Bill, 514, 526, 527, 537, 540, 541.

QUESTION, NOTICE OF—

Alderdice, Mr., 24, 30, 31, 144, 164, 205, 466.
 Puddester, Mr., 24, 30, 31, 53, 80, 113, 124, 144, 164, 205, 214, 218, 224,
 232, 234, 286, 357, 371, 399.
 Emerson, Mr., 24, 30, 31, 53, 80, 144, 164, 205, 214, 218, 224, 234, 286,
 312, 358, 390, 399.
 Winter, Mr., 24, 30, 31, 53, 80, 144, 164, 205, 286.
 Moore, Mr., 24, 31, 113.

- Byrne, Mr., 24, 31, 53, 80, 113, 124, 144, 205, 224, 232, 234, 286, 399.
Quinton, Mr., 24, 30, 31, 113, 124, 144, 164, 214, 218, 232, 286, 399.
Abbott, Mr., 31.
Tobin, Mr., 53, 80, 113, 124, 144, 164, 214, 234, 286, 312, 328, 345, 358,
371, 390.
Bennett, Mr., 113, 124, 144, 205, 234.

QUINTON, MR.

- On Bridge Repairs, Openhall, 94.
Address in Reply, 102, 113.
Supply, 316, 324, 332.
Petition Jamestown re Wharf, 356.
Loan Resolutions, 393, 395.
Resolutions re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 407.
Ways and Means, 437.
Salt Codfish Bill, 478.
Petition, Jamestown re Road, 506.
Shop Closing Bill, 514.

REPORTS TABLED—

- Financial Reports, 25, 94.
Liquor Control Board Report, 46.
Report of Government Directors I. P. & P. Co., 46.
Report of Railway Operations Year Ending June 30th, 1930, 48.
Report Newfoundland Patriotic Fund, 205.
Report Fire Losses 1930, 224.
Interim Report of Commissioners re Viking Enquiry, 283.
Educational Report June 30th, 1930, 356.
Copies of Minute of Council re Transfer of Funds Memorial
University College, 490.
Educational Returns, 507.
Report South West Coast Disaster Committee, 541.

RESOLUTIONS OF SYMPATHY—

- On Death of Hon. John Anderson, M.L.C., 9.
Death of Hon. S. K. Bell, M.L.C., 9.
Viking Disaster, 30.
Death of Lady Bennett, 293.

RESOLUTIONS ON SUPPLY, 345, 361, 372, 400.**SCAMMELL, MR.**

- On Petition re Wharf Eastport, 282.
Petition re Wharf Jamestown, 356.
Supply, 367.
Petition re Lighthouse Haircut Point, 390.
Resolution re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 413.
Logging Bill, 496.

SKANES, MR.

On Petition from Bonne Bay re Mail Service, 228.
Supply, 316, 322, 323, 364.

SMITH, MR.

On Petition re Road Snow's Arm, 164.
Shop Closing Bill, 524, 544.

SOLICITOR GENERAL, HON.

On Life Insurance Companies Bill, 39.
Sale of Securities Act, 39, 40, 41, 122, 123.
Shop Closing Bill, 518.

SPEAKER, HIS HONOR THE.

On Sale of Securities Bill, 122.
Amendment of Rules of the House, 164.
Address in Reply, 287.
Shop Closing Bill, 502, 503, 520, 521, 523.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE—

On Opening, 4.
Closing, 562.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORTS—

On Address in Reply, 23.
Draft Report on Address in Reply, 29.
Summary Jurisdiction Act, 38.
Rules of the House, 95.
Report on Rules of the House, 143.
Report on Committee on Life Insurance Bill, 192.
St. John's Gas Light Co., Bill, 193.
Petition St. John's Clerks re Shop Closing Hours, 193.
Report Petition St. John's Gas Light Co., 196, 228.
Report on Clerks Petition, 196.
Report on Petition St. John's Municipal Council, 213.
On Public Health Bill, 218.
Report on Petition Grenfell Association Bill, 299, 464.
Report on Municipal Bill, 356.
On Petition Carbonear Water Co., 428.
Report on Petition Carbonear Water Co., 428.
Report on Petition of Clerks Closing Hours of St. John's, 466.

SQUIRES, LADY,

On Shop Closing Bill, 521.

STRONG, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 14.
- Bill Relating to the Keeping of Dogs, 165.
- Supply, 325, 377.
- Petition re Breakwater, 370.
- Petition re Postal Telegraph Offices, 399.
- Shop Closing Bill, 504.

TOBIN, MR.

- On Pouch Cove Breakwater, 43.
- Road Repairs at Torbay, 80.
- Petition re Logy Bay Road, 143.
- Public Health Bill, 298.
- Supply, 323, 325, 349, 362, 363.
- Resolution re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 411.
- Ways and Means, 436.
- Shop Closing Bill, 514, 527.

WAYS AND MEANS, 234, 300, 430, 436, 437.

WINTER, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 126.
- Dog Fish, 142.
- Supply, 318, 324, 325, 336, 337, 338, 351, 362.
- Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, 360, 364.
- Resolution re Reduction in Public Expenditure, 411.
- Shop Closing Bill, 514, 516, 527.

Proceedings

OF THE

Legislative Council

DURING THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

Twenty-seventh General Assembly

OF

Newfoundland

1931.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Legislative Council during the Third Session of the Twenty-seventh General Assembly

Begun and holden at St. John's, in the said Dominion, on Wednesday, the Eleventh Day of March, Anno Domini, Nineteen Hundred and Thirty-One, being in the twenty-first 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 11th, 1931.

This being the day appointed by Proclamation for the meeting of the Legislature.

At five minutes to three o'clock p.m. the Council met.

At three o'clock His Excellency the Governor, Sir John Middleton, K.B.E., C.M.G., etc., having arrived at the Council Chamber, and being seated on the Throne, the Hon. the President commanded by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to proceed to the Commons House of Assembly and inform the Speaker and Members thereof that it is His Excellency's will and pleas-

ure that they attend at the Bar of this House; and they being called thereto, His Excellency was pleased to open the present session of the Legislature by reading the Speech from the Throne. The members of the Lower House then returned to their Chamber and His Excellency was pleased to retire.

The Council re-assembling and a copy of His Excellency's Speech having been left for the Hon. the President, it was read by the Clerk.

HONORABLE SIR TASKER COOK

—Mr. President, since the last meeting of the Legislature our Chamber

has sustained a severe loss in the death of the Hon. John Anderson. He impressed his personality upon all with whom he came in contact. His wide experience in commercial affairs was of inestimable value in connection with the deliberations of this Chamber. He took particularly keen interest in financial affairs and his criticisms were invariably of a constructive nature. He will, of course, be best remembered by his connection with what is known as the "Daylight Saving Bill," an enactment which has conferred incalculable benefits upon our people. Living as we do in the northern latitudes the early closing in of our evenings in the summer time formerly deprived us of the benefits of many hours of daylight. Mr. Anderson changed these conditions by providing us with an extra hour of daylight, and his name will go down to future generations connected with that particular piece of legislation of which he was so proud. His sympathies were always with the poor, and his herculean efforts to better their living conditions by the inauguration of a housing scheme are fresh in the minds of all.

Mr. Anderson came to this country at the age of 20, and was not long working with a local firm when his ambition and enterprise induced him to embark upon an independent commercial career. By hard work and ability he built up a flourishing business in this City, but still found time to devote a considerable part of his leisure to public affairs. He was fortunate to have lived long enough to witness the great success achieved by his son, Mr. John Murray Anderson, who is hailed as one of the greatest producers of theatrical entertainments, not alone in the United States, but in the world.

I move that a Resolution of Sympathy be conveyed to his relatives in the following terms:

"RESOLVED that this House de-sires to record the expression of "its deep regret at the death, since "the last session of the Legislative "Council, of the Hon. John Anderson, "member of the Legislative Council, "and some time member o. the "House of Assembly."

HON. MR. MURPHY, in seconding the Resolution, said that he had known the late Hon. John Anderson for a very long period. His Daylight Savings Bill was a great thing for this country, and even those who had opposed it now agreed as to its worth. Its benefit was evidenced by the fact that many other countries now had the same legislation. He had known the late Mr. Anderson well, and had many business dealings with him, and always found him a very fine character indeed. It would be better for Newfoundland if she had more citizens like the late Mr. Anderson.

The motion being put was carried unanimously, and it was ordered accordingly.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK—Mr. President, within a very few days of the closing of the last session of the Legislature another of our members, Hon. Samuel K. Bell, passed away. He had been a member of this Chamber for thirteen years, and his wide knowledge of shipping conditions generally stood him in good stead when considering legislation bearing upon all departments of our maritime life. Mr. Bell was a fine example of a man who, born in one of our outports, by sheer ability, strength of character and determination, worked his way up to a post of high responsibility in this country. Perhaps he was best known

for his splendid work in connection with the construction of the Dry Dock in St. John's in 1885, and the greatest tribute to his ability and the thoroughness with which he executed the work entrusted to his care was revealed when the present concrete dock was constructed in 1925. When the contractors came to dismantle the old dock, the wood work and general timbering was found to be in first-class condition after a period of forty years. His reputation as a shipwright spread beyond the confines of this country, and the splendid work which he did in connection with the S.S. Rotterdam excited the admiration of the owners of that steamer, with the result that they placed her on exhibition at her home port, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Men of Mr. Bell's knowledge and experience are rare in any country, and it is with a sincere sense of his loss that I move that a Resolution of Sympathy be conveyed to his relatives in the following terms:

"RESOLVED that this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death, since the last session of the Legislature, of the Hon. Samuel K. Bell, member of the Legislative Council."

HON. MR. SINNOTT praised the work of the Hon. Mr. Bell and pointed out that his was a practical mind; he had been of the greatest benefit to the Legislative Council because of his grasp of the commercial problems of the country.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—I wish to associate myself with the expression of regret contained in the Resolution. The Hon. Mr. Anderson was for a long period a member of this Council and during his career as a member of this Chamber he brought to bear in the many discussions in which he partici-

pated a richly stored mind, a keen intellect and phenomenal industry. Every worthy cause found in him a staunch advocate. Any movement which tended to uplift the people of the country, to improve their position, would always enlist his energies. His name will, perhaps, be best known to posterity as the father of "Daylight Saving" to this country. His persistent advocacy of the "Daylight Savings Act," the wealth of information he brought to bear, the patience displayed in piloting this measure through the House, and his answers to its critics prove his skill as a parliamentarian and keen debater. We shall miss his youthful enthusiasm and optimistic outlook.

The other Hon. gentleman, Mr. Bell, may be said to be a pioneer in his avocation. By his death we lose another of those unobtrusive men who in a silent but efficient way serve their country's interest. Difficult and complex problems in shipbuilding always found him ready with a solution. He belonged to a type of skilled workmen who are too rapidly passing from our midst. He was a man of irreproachable character and an ideal citizen. In the sphere of industrial activity which the Hon. gentleman pursued, he showed a degree of mechanical skill which would have given him a foremost place in the industrial life of the country. His intelligent grasp of the country's problems showed him to be a man of such ability as is needed in a country such as ours.

Both Honorable gentlemen lived to more than the allotted span of the Psalmist. Both gave their time and talents unstintingly to the country's best interests, and no narrow lines marked their views and efforts.

The motion, being put, was carried unanimously.

HON. HARLOD MACPHERSON—Mr. President, I rise to move 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.

It is fitting that reference has been made to the death of Her late Royal Highness, the Princess Royal, and we are glad to note that His Excellency, on behalf of his Ministers and the people of Newfoundland, duly offered most respectful and heartfelt sympathy to their Majesties.

It is gratifying to note the able manner in which Newfoundland was represented in the proceeding of the Imperial Conference, held in London during the months of October and November. In addition to the press reports, enthusiastic letters from Newfoundlanders in London have been received. One writes: "Your Prime Minister was absolutely splendid during the Imperial Conference, and he has left (and also Lady Squires) a great impression here. He was so active and full of energy, he appeared as if he could accomplish anything, however difficult. It was most encouraging to see our country so well represented. We had a tremendous amount of publicity, very much more than we ever had before, and it is already working to our advantage in business matters."

We are all gratified that the representative of Newfoundland at that Conference was honored in his own person, and on behalf of Newfoundland, by being appointed a member of His Majesty's Privy Council, an honor which has been aptly called the "Victoria Cross of Statesmanship," and we take this opportunity of publicly expressing our congratulations.

Though not mentioned in the Speech, may I be permitted, Mr.

President, to also offer sincere congratulations to the Hon. Sir Tasker Cook, the genial leader of the Government in this House, upon his being created a Knight Bachelor. Sir Tasker has received well-merited recognition of a life of public usefulness and service.

We note that the Inspector General of Police, and head of the Fire Department (Mr. C. H. Hutchings, K.C.) who was a member of the Economic Commission, has rendered valuable services to Newfoundland during the past two years, and who has a record of war work to his credit, was honored in being appointed a Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George; and that the cause of education in Newfoundland was especially recognized by the promotion of the Secretary for Education, Dr. V. P. Burke, from the rank of Member to that of Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire. Both these citizens are worthy of the honors bestowed upon them by their Sovereign, and we tender them too, our hearty congratulations.

It is very gratifying to note that the exports of pulp and paper from Grand Falls and Corner Brook showed an increase of 32,000 tons for the fiscal year 1929-30, as compared with the previous year, with an increased value of one million dollars, and that the exports from Buchans showed an increase of 360,000 tons with an enhanced value of three and a quarter million dollars.

Newfoundland is very fortunate in that during the last few years the total value of our exports exceeded our imports by \$8,000,000. Such a favorable balance of trade is a great asset to Newfoundland and augurs well for her future.

It is true, as stated in the Speech, that the export of our fishery products has dropped from being 90% of our products to below 50%. This is regrettable, but there is compensation in the fact that during a lean year, ~~when our fishery exports are at a~~ minimum, our balance of trade can be maintained, and unemployment ameliorated through our newly developed industries. We rejoice, too, that there has been marked progress in the exportation of salmon, smelts, cod and other fish in cold storage, and in this connection it is encouraging to note that legislative action regarding standardization is seriously considered. While I understand this legislation refers to codfish for export, it embraces also our products generally. Quite a saving could be made annually if a standardization of the potato were made, as at present the same farmer and neighborhood plant several varieties, so that in purchasing a carload one may sometimes find early, medium and late varieties, also reds, whites and blues intermixed, with the result that the early and non-keeping variety rots and infects those near with the rot, with consequent heavy loss. To the consumer, too, this condition is most unsatisfactory. In a Canadian province the farmers select one or two varieties only and sack them, with the result that there is a minimum of loss when same are carried over the winter.

In agriculture the policy of the present Minister of Agriculture in encouraging several years ago one standard breed of cattle, namely, the Ayreshire, which was considered most suited to the country's requirements, has resulted in quite an improvement in cattle and a conformity to that type.

The co-operation of the Empire Marketing Board with the Newfound-

land Government is of outstanding importance to this country, and the Government deserves warm congratulations on its farsightedness in inaugurating this scheme, and in securing the services of such an outstanding Marine Biologist as Dr Harold Thompson, and in having associated with him in this work Mr. George Whiteley, jr., whose family has been prosecuting the fisheries for generations. Mr. Whiteley, the first man to graduate in the Dalhousie University's new course in Marine Biology, is at present associated with Dr. A. G. Huntsman, Director of the Biological Board of the Dominion of Canada. Dr. Huntsman's name is well known in Newfoundland, as he has published booklets dealing with the oceanography of our waters.

The Newfoundland Fisheries Research Commission consists of the Prime Minister, Mr. J. Lewis Paton, M.A., Mr. D. James Davies, C.B.E., J.P., PSc., F.I.C., F.G.S., F.C.S., Sir William Coaker, K.B.E., and the Leader of the Opposition, and is under the chairmanship of the genial, competent and enthusiastic Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It will therefore be seen that the Commission has a very strong personnel, and we trust that this much-needed Fisheries Research Commission will be most helpful in creating a more intelligent and constructive knowledge relative to our fishing industry. Newfoundland is to pay half the cost this research entails, the Empire Marketing Board contributing the other half.

We are glad to read that the re-railing of our cross-country line has now been completed, and that it is not anticipated that any capital expenditure on railway account will be necessary during the coming fiscal year. From recent travels, I have pleasure in stating that our Railway compares

favorably with any railway in British North America, both as regards smoothness of transit and service, and great credit is due the management for its present state of efficiency.

The erection of an up-to-date machine shop and equipment, with the co-operation of the machine shop and the dry dock, should insure better service in handling repairs to disabled ships.

Owing to her connection with the outside world, Newfoundland has been unable to escape the general depression of the past 12 months, though conditions here are not so severe as I have noticed them in Canada and the U.S.A. At a moment when everything was booming and prices of commodities were very high, an over-production in certain commodities caused a general slump. This slump in prices created a fear which drove the dollar into hiding when it should have been at work offsetting the effects of the slump, and in making jobs for the unemployed. It is, however, not like Newfoundlanders to surrender to fear. That courage, faith, grit and confidence that have gained for them the title "better than the best," have never been more needed than right now.

Regarding the possibilities of this year's fishery, I would like to make a few comparisons of last year's prices, and the general commodity costs of today.

When the fisherman fitted out last Spring it was with:

\$9.00 flour now costing \$6.50.

\$30.00 pork, now costing \$20.00.

\$26.00 beef, now costing \$15.00.

\$5.75 peas, now \$4.75 per 100 lbs.

\$9.00 beans, now \$5.50 per 100 lbs.

This means that whereas last year the fisherman spent \$140.00, he can

buy the same now for \$100.00, representing a reduced cost of approximately 30%. Lighter groceries such as dried fruits, biscuits, etc., though considerably lower, have not depreciated to the same extent.

To feed his cattle and poultry:

Corn Meal, costing last winter \$2.70, is now \$1.90.

Oats \$3.60, now \$2.80 a bag.

Bran \$2.25, now \$1.75 bag, etc.

Likewise Drygoods reductions would average at least 20 per cent

On a conservative estimate, therefore, it may be said that 75 cents this year will purchase as much as a dollar last year.

Unfortunately last Fall our fishermen found that with an underaverage catch and an extremely low price they were unable with their diminished income to pay for their supplies purchased at the higher prices.

It is anticipated that the Customs revenue for the current fiscal year will show considerable shortage. Our main revenue is Customs revenue, the greater portion of which is collected upon ad valorem duties. A drop in the price of commodities at the source means a corresponding decrease in revenue. The consumer gets the benefit not merely of the drop in the price of the article but also of the lesser duty payable on that article. I am fully convinced that for the past ten years (and increasing from year to year) through fraudulent practice and falsified invoicing our Customs has been robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. In my opinion these corrupt practices have been heretofore confined to a foreign element of shopkeepers, but failure to enforce penalties, when such practices have been

uncovered and the consequent unfairness of competing against such methods, has caused these demoralizing practices to spread and corrupt heretofore honest traders, and it is my belief that unless confiscation, forfeiture of right to re-open business and prison sentences are enforced when discovery of such practice is made, it will become quite impossible in time to cope with this matter. The loss of the revenue is twofold in that a person who will defraud the revenue in one way will also fail to disclose his income when taxable in another. Furthermore the honest trader finds himself unable to compete.

It is regrettable that another loan bill has to be introduced, we trust, however, that any moneys so raised will be strictly applied to public necessities only.

With regard to the census, I understand at first the Government thought the census would not be taken this year, because of the necessity for economy, but in view of the fact that this is a year of the world census, and more particularly having regard to local conditions, under which our educational votes, and a considerable portion of public works and marine votes are allocated on a per capita basis, it was afterwards agreed that the census should be undertaken. That this is wise may be instanced in the development of the town of Buchans, in the Grand Falls district, which means an increased population in this constituency, as the present per capita grants on the district are based upon the census taken in 1921. This district now receives less than it should and justice can only be done by ascertaining the correct figures through the medium of the census. This applies also to the Humber District where Corner Brook, Deer Lake and Howley have been developments of the past 10 years.

At the last session of the Legislature, it was announced in the Speech from the Throne, that a claim had been made upon the Government for the payment of interest on the guarantees provided for by the Hotel Facilities Acts of 1925 and 1926. The Hotel Company has since gone into liquidation and the receiver has been appointed. The Government consequently became liable for the amount of its guarantee. This condition was anticipated last year and provision to meet that liability to the amount of a half million dollars was made in last year's loan. The Government succeeded in preventing the total collapse of the enterprise which otherwise would have involved a practical total loss to the Colony. It is true that the country will probably acquire the property for the amount named, but while an asset to the town, it is very unlikely to pay even a nominal interest on the amount it will cost us.

The proposed legislation includes a Public Health Bill which consolidates the existing law and remodels the Public Health system of the country.

Legislation regarding life insurance is to be introduced which Act will align the Newfoundland Insurance law with that of Canada, providing Newfoundland policy holders with all the advantages and privileges, which Canadian policy holders now enjoy. It is estimated that there is 50 million dollars worth of life insurance carried in Newfoundland.

The Government is to be congratulated on its decision to have legislation re brokers introduced, as had such legislation been made and enforced during the past decade, Newfoundlanders would be much better off to-day as much worthless paper misnamed securities have been readily sold in our Dominion during the recent boom years.

We are informed that the Banks of England, Canada, U. S. A. and Newfoundland hold greater savings deposits than at any time in the history of the world. This reserve is latent prosperity when confidence returns and that money is put to work.

In closing I would recommend the practice of courage, calmness, steadiness, Newfoundland common sense, and the co-operation of all classes in creating that atmosphere of confidence and faith, which will hasten the day of the restoration of prosperity.

I move Mr President that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this session of the Legislature.

HON. JOHN DAVEY—Mr. President, I beg to second the motion 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.

In the first place, I wish to extend hearty congratulations to the Hon. Harold Macpherson on the honour which has been conferred upon him by His Gracious Majesty the King in creating him a member of this, the Legislative Council of Newfoundland, and feel sure that on behalf of all those who have occupied seats here for many years I can extend to the Hon. Mr. Macpherson a hearty welcome. The able and practical manner in which he has made his maiden speech in our Parliament indicates that his addition to this Chamber is one of outstanding value and importance.

This session of the Legislature is one of more than usual importance, in that we are this year formally and

officially stepping out on a platform of Dominion status. The Mother Country has truly in constitutional matters been the guiding parent for the constitution of the entire English-speaking world. Newfoundland began as a Crown Colony, with its affairs administered exclusively from the Colonial Office at Downing Street. After years of work as a Crown Colony, Newfoundland had reached a stage of development which enabled her to step forward as a self-governing Colony with Responsible Government, and now, after a century, Newfoundland takes the further step of full and complete responsibility on the same constitutional basis as the Great Dominions of the British Empire, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, Australia and the Irish Free State. It gives me particular pleasure, therefore, to be identified with this, the formal opening of this Parliament, as seconder to an address to the representative in this country of His Majesty the King.

The Speech from the Throne indicates progressive development of the affairs of the country. Those of us who are members of this Chamber, identified as we all are with the large commercial interests of the country, especially appreciate the business ability displayed on the part of those who hold seats in the House of Assembly as representatives of the people.

Life insurance, to which reference is made, is a matter of very great importance to this country. Life insurance policies form the basis of a considerable amount of the savings of the people, and the security upon which a very substantial amount of commercial business is undertaken. Practically all insurance companies doing business in Newfoundland are Canadian companies. For many years past the Dominion of Canada has been strug-

gling to secure a unified life insurance law. That has been achieved so far as it relates to all the English-speaking provinces of the Dominion of Canada. Quebec alone, with its French civil law, as distinct from British law, remains outside the scope of unified legislation. Newfoundland steps in the march of life insurance progress in the bill which is foreshadowed in the speech.

The importance of drastic legislation in the matter of brokerage and bond houses is highly rated and appeals particularly to members of this Chamber. The fact that not only the Opposition as a group and the Board of Trade as an organization, but hundreds of people not connected with either, claim that this legislation is their idea, shows that the Government will have very strong backing in connection with this matter.

The financial affairs of Newfoundland are also matters which especially interest members of this Chamber, because here are gathered together many of those who carry the heaviest financial burdens in the handling of the country's credit. Our tariff is based mainly on an ad valorem duty. That means that as the price of goods in the world market drops, the Newfoundland tariff drops almost proportionately. The drop in the price of commodities generally, foodstuffs, dry goods, hardware, and almost everything else, has had its effect upon the revenue of the Colony. Let me give an illustration of how that works out. Take a class of goods on which there is an ad valorem duty of forty per cent. If the article in the foreign market costs \$2.00, the duty on that item would be eighty cents, which would mean \$2.80, to which would be added certain freight, insurance and handling charges, overhead expenses, and bank interest and exchange charges

in many cases, and a profit to the people who are carrying on the business, the result being the retail price as the article goes to the consumer. If that article in the foreign market drops from \$2.00 to \$1.00, the duty paid on it is forty cents, the freight, handling and overhead charges may be the same, but the insurance charges would be cut in two, the amount added for profit would be cut in two or practically so, with the result that the cost of the article to the consumer would not only be reduced by the lessened cost abroad, but reduced by half of the duty charges, and probably by half of the insurance and profit charges. This means that in a country such as ours, where our revenue has an ad valorem basis, the revenue falls in proportion to the fall in the price of the article; where the price of the article is cut in two in the foreign market, the revenue to Newfoundland is cut in two. We consequently must expect a very much smaller Customs revenue this year than last year. Just what the percentage in revenue will be because of the reduced cost of imported goods, I do not know. That is a matter which will be brought before us in the Budget Speech of the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, but it is a matter which on this, the opening day of the Legislature, we should consider and anticipate.

The reorganization of the Poor Asylum and the Infirmary in connection with that Institution, the reorganization of the Lunatic Asylum, so that it may be not only the place for the detention of people who are mentally diseased, but a place where mental diseases may be treated, and in many instances cured, the activities of the Government in the matter of Public Health, General Hospital and Sanitorium reorganization, are all matters which commend themselves to us as the activities of a Government

active and business-like in its methods and devoting its energies to public development and public improvement.

I think the Government has to be congratulated on the early opening of the House. Last year the House did not open until the 28th of May. The lateness of the session was due to the fact that there were three by-elections pending and the Government decided these should be held before the House was actually called in session. This year there are no by-elections, the business for the House has been got ready at an early date, and, in conjunction with my fellow members of the Council, I feel that this season of the year, which from a commercial standpoint we consider the dull season is the most appropriate time for the opening of the session, because now we have a much greater opportunity of giving attention to public affairs with a minimum of interference with our own commercial activities.

I feel that I should not sit down without giving an expression of the appreciation which every Newfoundlanders feels at the action of His Majesty the King in having honoured our Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard A. Squires, P.C., K.C.M.G., K.C., by making him a member of His Majesty's Privy Council. This recognition by His Gracious Majesty of Sir Richard A. Squires is one of which we all feel proud. It is much more than a high tribute to him personally; it is an honour in which every Newfoundlanders shares.

The Hon. the President appointed the following committee to draft the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne: Hon. J. J. Murphy, Hon. John Davey, Hon. H. Macpherson, Hon. J. P. Ayre, and Hon. E. Sinnott.

Hon. the President read a communication from His Excellency the Governor granting leave of absence to the Hons. O'Dea, Ryan and Macpherson.

Hon. the Leader of the Government tabled the Report of the Examinations conducted by the Council of Higher Education, (Newfoundland), 1930, the Financial statement of the Council of Higher Education for the year ended December 1st, 1930 and the Annual Report of the St. John's General Hospital for the year ending June 30th, 1930.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK—Mr. President, I would call the attention of the Council to the fact that in the Speech from the Throne reference is made to a memorandum submitted by Mr. Allan S. Butler, debenture holder in connection with the Reid-Gander property. The Speech indicates that this memorandum would be submitted for the information of the Legislature. I beg to table copy of the memorandum referred to. The policy followed by the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Squires, in all matters of major public importance is to place the facts before the Legislature and the people, so that there may be the most accurate knowledge and complete discussion possible. He has consequently authorized this memorandum to be printed for the convenience of members, and I would ask the Clerk to have printed copies distributed.

HON. SIR T. COOK gave notice that he would on tomorrow move that an humble Address be presented to His Majesty the King praying that he may be graciously pleased to cause a Measure to be laid before Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to give effect to certain Declarations and Resolutions set forth in the reports of the Imperial Conference holden at Westminster in the years 1926 and 1930.

HON. SIR T. COOK moved that the House adjourn until Wednesday, March 18th, at 3.30 p.m., and on the motion for adjournment took occasion to extend hearty congratulations to the Hon. Mr. Macpherson upon the honor conferred upon him by His Majesty in appointing him a member of the Council. The Hon. Mr. Macpherson needed no introduction to the Chamber. He came from a very old Newfoundland family and his forbears had been connected with the public and commercial life of the Colony for nearly one hundred years. Mr. Macpherson brought to the Council a wealth of information of public matters; and that would be a very valuable asset.

The Council then adjourned until Wednesday, March 18th, at 3.30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, March 18th, 1931.

Council met at 3.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne. The report was received, passed unanimously, and it was ordered to be presented to His Excellency by a deputation of the Whole House at a time suitable to His Excellency.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK—Mr. President, since we last met there has occurred a sealing tragedy which at first was thought to be one of the most serious that has ever happened in this country. The explosion and following fire which destroyed the steamer "Viking" with its one hundred and forty men on board might have been a tragedy costing the lives of every one of them. Had there been a

storm, or even had there been intense cold, we might never have heard of any of them. We now feel sure that over a hundred and twenty are safe, some badly injured, but none so injured as to render life in jeopardy. At this moment there are six steamers at the scene of the disaster. For the past twelve hours four big sealing steamers with their total crew of about six hundred men have been covering the scene of the disaster pan by pan. The action of the Prime Minister, Sir Richard Squires, and his able lieutenant, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Lake, in the speedy and efficient manner in which this disaster has been handled, is receiving the commendation of friend and foe alike. "Even the ranks of Tuscany can scarce forbear to cheer," the able way in which the matter has been dealt with. Under these circumstances we can hardly deal with Legislative business.

Our thoughts and efforts are directed rather to the disaster and what we can collectively and individually do to give assistance to the Government in its rescue and relief programme. Present operations are delayed because of the ice blockade of four miles around Horse Island, with which even the sturdiest sealing steamer cannot successfully contend. This morning the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sent an urgent wireless telegraph message to these sealing steamers to group for massed attack of steam power and man power to force their way sufficiently near the Island for the landing of doctors, nurses and medical supplies. It is possible that by tomorrow night the relief steamer "Foundation Franklin" and possibly also the relief steamer "Sagona" will be in port. I do not think it would be desirable for us merely to adjourn until tomorrow or Friday, as there will be days fully occupied in the

handling of this disaster situation, but that we should take adjournment until Monday next. I consequently move that this Chamber at its rising do adjourn until Monday, March 30th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I desire to formally extend my sympathy to those families who have suffered loss in the recent catastrophe, the circumstances of which brought awe and regret to the heart of every resident of the country. Around the sealing voyage has always hung the atmosphere of romance, and not without reason, for those activities of man with which we associate romantic sentiments have always incident the element of risk and danger. Men braving the barriers of wind and wave and tide to drag from the store of nature its treasures that those at home may live in frugal comfort beget our interest and earn our encouragement. But when danger comes and loss occurs, it strikes with a dreadfulness that draws from us a spontaneous burst of sympathy. That sympathy springs from the heart of every person in Newfoundland today with a spontaneity which speaks in eloquent terms of its genuineness, and I feel that it animates the mind and heart of every member present here this evening.

The Council then adjourned until Monday, March 30th, at 3 o'clock p.m.

MONDAY, March 30th, 1931.

Council met at 3.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Sir T. Cook the Resolutions with respect to the Address to the King were deferred.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT informed the Council that messages had been received from the House of Assembly stating that it had passed the Bills entitled respectively:

An Act to Amend the Act 20, George V., Chapter 3 entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company' and "An Act to Amend the Act 31, George V., Chapter 14 (Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930)" in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

The said Bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT informed the Council that he had received a Communication from His Excellency the Governor informing him that the following had been appointed as a Commission of Internal Economy:

The President of the Legislative Council.

Hon. Sir Tasker Cook, Kt.

Hon. J. V. O'Dea.

Hon. the Speaker.

Hon. H. M. Mosdell.

Hon. F. Gordon Bradley, K.C., and

Hon. P. J. Lewis.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK tabled the following:

Report of Newfoundland Railway for year ending June 30, 1930.

Report of the Postal and Telegraph Department for the year ending June 30, 1930.

Report of the Registrar General of Births, Marriages and Deaths for the year ending December 31st, 1930.

Report of the Board of Liquor Control for the year ending January 31st, 1931.

On motion of Hon. Sir T. Cook the Council then adjourned until Tuesday, April 7th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

TUESDAY, April 7th, 1931.

Council met at 3.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. SIR T. COOK, in moving the Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20, George V., Chapter 3, entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company'", said: In moving the second reading of this Bill I do so with the confident feeling that it cannot be classed with a lot of other Bills in which have come before us in the previous session asking for extension of time for the performance of contracts. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company has not been marking time, and it is not through any fault of their own that the operations on which they have been engaged have been temporarily delayed. On the contrary they have done the utmost that could be expected under the circumstances. You will recall that when the original Bill came before us for consideration two years ago it embodied an agreement between the Newfoundland Government and the Company whereby the Company undertook to land a cable in Newfoundland and thence to the British Isles. At that time no unusual or extraordinary obstacles to the Company's plans were anticipated, and the Company were to forfeit the franchise if telephonic communication

between Newfoundland and the American Continent were not established before the 20th June, 1932. The Company immediately set to work. From the beginning they were faced with difficulties in acquiring the necessary rights-of-way between Bangor, Maine and Sydney, Nova Scotia. It is gratifying to learn that these difficulties have been overcome and considerably over two hundred miles of the land line have been constructed. Cable ships were especially chartered and have accurately surveyed the entire route of the cable from Newfoundland to Europe. The cost of this survey work, line construction, and the acquiring of the necessary land and landing rights in Ireland have cost the Company to date about two and a quarter million dollars. The chief feature, however, which has retarded the Company's operations is the matter of the cable itself. The Company itself owns and controls certain patents, and in connection with these a lot of time was lost in arranging satisfactory patent licenses to cable manufacturers qualified to bid for the construction contract. Many conferences were held during 1930 in connection with the contracts, and when everything was in readiness it was found that it would be absolutely impossible to complete the construction of the cable so that it could be laid during 1932, the year in which the franchise expires under the original Act. I think it will be admitted that the Company have made herculean efforts to comply with the requirements of the statute. In order to be in a position to proceed with the construction of the cable it was necessary for them to have enormous supplies of balata, which is an important ingredient in the manufacture of paragutta which has been found to be the most satisfactory insulation for long distance cables, and as a result they had to contract for the purchase

of a large percentage of the world's supply. This entailed an outlay of a million and a half dollars in addition to the huge amount already invested for the purposes I have already mentioned.

The Hon. the Prime Minister has already pointed out in the House of Assembly that he is quite satisfied that the Company has grappled with the problems which faced them under the Act in a very thorough manner, and part of their difficulties is due to the fact that there are only about three months of the year during which it is practicable to lay a cable in the vicinity of Newfoundland. Already they have completed the survey work at Port aux Basques, are securing options on sites at that place, as well as at Grand Bank and New Perlican. Necessary surveys of the cable route across the Burin Peninsula and the Isthmus of Avalon have also been undertaken and completed. It will be apparent to everyone that a Company of the high standing, unique record and tremendous financial strength of the American Telegraph and Telephone Company is not likely to begin something which it cannot finish. Plans and preparations for this trans-Atlantic Cable have been in the course of preparation for years. They have already expended millions of dollars on the project and but for the delay in connection with the cable itself they would undoubtedly be able to complete the contract within the allotted time.

It might be of interest to quote the following digest of the position of the project as at 24th February, 1931, which the Prime Minister, who conducted the original negotiations with the Company, and has been in close touch with their representatives in London, New York, and St. John's,

furnished to the House of Assembly in moving the second reading of this Bill.

Bangor, Maine—Canadian Border (82 Miles).—Survey work has been completed and right of way purchased. No clearing or construction work has been started. The central office equipment for Bangor was to be installed by the New England Telephone Company. I understand that requisitions for the equipment were placed a few weeks ago.

St. Croix River Crossing—International Border.—Application for permit has been made, but permits have not yet been secured.

International Boundary, St. John, N. B. (72.8 Miles).—The pole line work is completed. Wire has been strung on 67 miles of pole line. The remaining wire work in this section will be completed within the next week.

Toll Entrance Cable Work, St. John, N.B. (32700 Feet).—Nearly all of the conduit work has been finished and the cable and loading has been ordered and partially delivered. The New Brunswick Telephone Company will have an interest in this cable and conduit.

St. John, N. B.—New Brunswick—Nova Scotia State Line (121 Miles).—Survey work has been practically completed; 97% of the right of way has been optioned and 48% of the right of way purchased. 39% of the right of way has been cleared and poles have been set for 22 miles. No wire has been strung in this section.

Nova Scotia—New Brunswick State Line—Amherst, N. S. (3½ Miles).—Line work has been completed and the wire is strung.

Amherst Toll Entrance Cable and Conduit (2500 Feet). — Engineering work has been completed. Conduit work started December 1st, 1930.

Amherst — New Glasgow (86½ Miles). — Pole line and wire work completed. Wire temporarily cut into both offices.

New Glasgow Toll Entrance Cable And Conduit (Approximately 6,000 Feet). — Engineering work has been completed. This Maritime Company is to have a reservation in a part of this cable and conduit.

New Glasgow to Strait of Canso (64.4 Miles). — Survey has been completed; 91% of the right of way optioned; 90% of right of way purchased; 85% of clearing finished; 27 miles of pole line constructed; 20 miles of wire strung.

Strait of Canso. — Engineering work has been completed and right of way secured.

Strait of Canso—Sydney Mines (85 Miles). — Approximately 70% of the right of way has been staked. About 70% of the right of way has been optioned. None of the options have been taken up. No clearing or pole line work has been done.

Sydney Mines, N. S. — A lot has been purchased and architects plans have been completed for the proposed building. Bids have not yet been secured from contractors for the erection of this building. Permit has been obtained from the Dominion Government for the Sydney Mines-Port aux Basques cable landing.

Port aux Basques, Nfld. — Preliminary survey work has been completed. The work is under way to secure options on building sites.

Grand Bank, Nfld. — Real estate for a building site has been optioned, total cost to be approximately \$4,500.

New Perlican, Nfld. — Application has been filed with the Newfoundland Government for about 20 acres of Crown land and an option has been secured on some private property in the centre of this tract to cost approximately \$1,000.

Burin Peninsula and Avalon Isthmus. — Preliminary surveys have been completed of proposed overland¹ cable routes across the Burin Peninsula and the Avalon Isthmus.

Termonearragh, Ireland. — Land has been purchased for a building site. The Bell Telephone Laboratories are conducting experiments on this site at present and have laid some test cables.

Central Office Equipment. — Orders have been placed on the Northern Electric Company for central office equipment installations for St. John, N. B., Amherst, N. S., New Glasgow, N.S., and Sydney Mines, N. S. Some engineering work has been completed but no manufacturing has as yet been started.

I have just read you a statement covering the progress of the work to date, and in view of unexpected delays the Company has asked for an extension of eighteen months. When this Bill came before us for consideration some days ago it was checked by the Department of Justice, and a printer's error was discovered. Where this year 1931 is inserted in the print it should be 1932, and where next year 1932 is inserted it should be 1933. In other words, the printers got it this year and the year after instead of next year and the year after. When the Bill is in Committee I shall consequently move that the Bill be corrected accordingly.

I now move that this Bill be read a second time.

HON. MR. MURPHY said he saw no objection to giving the extension asked; he would, however, have wished that a lower rate could have been arranged which would have been an advantage, not only to his company, but to the public generally.

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

HON. SIR T. COOK then moved the Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 21 George V., Chapter 14 (Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930)" in the following words:

Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of this Bill, entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 21, George V., Chapter 14 (Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930)".

Section (1) of this Bill refers to Section (155,) sub-section (1) (c) of the Act as passed last year. Under Section 155 of last year's Act the Rule Committee appointed under the Act had power to make, rescind, alter and add to rules in relation to the costs and charges payable under distress warrants issued by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, but Fees and Costs to be taken in proceedings before such a Court were set forth in the Sixth Schedule to the Act.

Objections have been raised by Magistrates and others in regard to the scale of costs under the Sixth Schedule of the Act of 1930, and the matter has been under consideration by the Law Society. It has been thought inadvisable to hurriedly draw up a hard-and-fast rule of costs, but the Rule Committee (which consists of the three Judges of the Supreme

Court, the Registrar of the Supreme Court, the Solicitor General, the Deputy Minister of Justice, and the Judge of the Central District Court) will after full consideration be able to draw up a scale that will be fair to plaintiff and defendant alike. It has, therefore, been thought wise to give the Rule Committee power in regard to the costs and fees payable in all proceedings in Court of Summary Jurisdiction, including the power to alter or amend the Schedule of costs set forth in last year's Act.

In regard to Sections 2 and 3 of the Bill, they are to correct certain errors in the drafting or printing of the Act of 1930. In the Act as passed last year there was a slight error in drafting sub-section (d) referring to libel and slander, and this sub-section (d) makes the necessary correction. In reference to sub-section 2 and 3, these were passed by the House last year, but omitted when the Acts were printed, and it is felt that the easiest way to correct this is to re-enact these sections.

Section 4 of the Bill also makes a correction of a clerical error which was made last year when the wrong heading was put to the Sixth Schedule of the Act.

This Bill deals merely with detailed matters which have been under consideration by the Department of Justice, and I would move that it be now read a second time.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be deferred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT read messages from the House of Assembly stating that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively:

"An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in Connection with the Sale of Securities."

"An Act Relating to the Canning of Rabbits and others Food."

"An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips" in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion these Bills were read a first time, passed, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion the House then adjourned until Wednesday, April 8th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

WEDNESDAY, April 8th, 1931.

Council met at 3.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the American Telephone and Telegraph Company Bill. Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair. Committee, rose, and reported having passed the Bill with some amendment. The report was received, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

Council went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill to amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act. Hon. Mr. Shea in the Chair. Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment and it was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

HON. SIR T. COOK moved Second Reading of the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Frauds in connection with the Sale of Securities," speaking as follows:

Mr. President this Bill was prepared by the Committee on the Consolidation

of Statutes, and represents the policy of the Government for the protection of local investors from bond swindlers. The matter was referred to the Committee on the Consolidation of the Statutes, a group of gentlemen consisting of the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard A. Squires, Mr. B. E. S. Dunfield, K.C., Hon. F. G. Bradley, Hon. P. J. Lewis, C. J. Fox, Esq., K.C., Mr. R. A. Parsons and Mr. R. Gushue. The result was the drafting of this Bill. Some months ago the Prime Minister sent copies of it to brokers, insurance companies banks and others who would be primarily interested in a Bill of this sort. In the House of Assembly it was referred to a Select Committee consisting of all the lawyers of the House in active practice. It received a unanimous favorable report from the Committee, and was likewise unanimously supported in the House of Assembly.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time, passed, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

In moving the Second Reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Canning of Rabbits and other Food," Hon. Sir T. Cook spoke as follows:

Mr. President, for many years the Department of Marine and Fisheries has had control of the canning of salmon. We all know the system whereby packers have to get a license, must have a number of their tins to identify the pack, and that generally one can depend upon the salmon pack. The same thing has applied in the case of lobsters. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries as such has no power to make rules and regulations outside of the fishing industry. It is felt by the entire public that rabbits, birds and shellfish, vegetables, wild fruit, and

such like, should be likewise standardized. This does not mean any considerable extra expense, because it does not mean the appointment of an army of inspectors for this particular purpose, as the men now permanently employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries will do the work.

In the ordinary course of events one might expect this matter to be handled by the Department of Agriculture and Mines, to which Department it naturally belongs, but the Department of Agriculture and Mines has no inspectors; it would mean the creation of a new Departmental system, and it would mean additional expense. In these circumstances, it is felt that it should be handled by the Minister who for years has been dealing with the control of the packing industry in connection with fishery products. This Bill, like all the other Bills which, up to the present, have come before us, has been the subject of careful examination from the point of view of legality and draftsmanship by the Committee on the Consolidation of Statutes, represents Government policy, and has received the unanimous endorsement of the Lower Chamber.

The Bill was then read a second time, passed, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. SIR T. COOK moved that the Bill "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips" be read a second time, speaking as follows:

Mr. President, the object of this Bill is to help the farmers in connection with the sale of potatoes locally. Our markets are being over-run by Canadian products. It is quite true that potatoes can be produced very much more cheaply in Canada than

in Newfoundland. It is equally true, however, that there is a high duty, which, added to freight, insurance and handling charges in shipment to Newfoundland, gives the local potato a very high preference. The difficulty in the past has been that Newfoundland potatoes could get no regular market, because nobody knew just what they were getting. The Canadian potatoes come to Newfoundland graded; they are a standard product. When a man buys ten sacks or a hundred sacks of Canadian potatoes at a certain price, he knows exactly what he is getting; he knows the weight he is getting, and he knows the quality of the potato. He can judge the size of it, the uniformity of it, and he knows that if it is white potatoes he is getting, they are all white; if red, they are all red.

There have been a number of cases in which large orders have been lost to the Newfoundland farmer because the large outport buyers, people who buy for bankers, people who buy for schooners going to the fishery, do not know what they are getting when they place their order with the local farmer. Here and there there is a farmer that supplies a standard grade of potatoes. These farmers always have a market for these potatoes.

The idea of this Bill is to give every farmer the same opportunity of getting a market for his potatoes as those who have already on their own standardized their product. The standards provided here are a little lower than the standards of Canada, but the grading is along the same lines. This should be very helpful in enabling the farmers to develop local trade, and so capture for the Newfoundland potato the market which is now being supplied by the Canadian grown article.

The same thing applies in a less

degree to turnips. The Bill in the form in which it is presented here has had unanimous endorsement of the House of Assembly.

The Bill was read a second time, passed, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. MR. STEER tabled the Report of the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund for the period ending 31st March, 1931.

HON. SIR T. COOK called attention the fact while the total amount dealt with was \$223,705.13, the number of grants paid 1689 and the number of families or individuals assisted 1185, yet the total cost of administration, including books, stationery, printing, cost of investigations, postage, telegrams, etc., amounted to only \$2,912.83, or only one and one-third per cent of the sum dealt with; it was a wonderful showing and the Committee deserved the thanks of the general public.

On motion the Council then adjourned until Monday, April 13th, at 3.30 p.m.

MONDAY, April 13th, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3.30 p.m.

The Address to His Majesty the King was on motion deferred.

The Bill to Amend the American Telephone and Telegraph Company was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same with some Amendment.

The Bill to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930, was read a

third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without Amendment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in Connection with the Sale of Securities." Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair. Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without Amendment. The report was received, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

The House then on motion resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Canning of Rabbits and other Foods." Hon. Mr. Sinnott in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported that it had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion the Council went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips." Hon. Mr. Davey in the Chair. The Committee rose, and reported having made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT informed the Council that he had received a message from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed Bills entitled respectively:

"An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs."

"An Act Relating to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraph Messages."

"An Act to Amend the Law Relating to Life Insurance."

These Bills were thereupon on motion read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT read a message from the House of Assembly asking for the appointment of a Committee of the Whole Council to confer at 4 o'clock tomorrow in the House of Assembly Chamber with the House of Assembly concerning the Motion that "An Humble Address be presented to His Majesty the King praying that he may be Graciously pleased to cause a Measure to be laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to give effect to certain Declarations and Resolutions set forth in the reports of the Imperial Conference holden at Westminster in the years 1926 and 1930."

HON. S. MILLEY asked the Leader of the Government whether this motion was moved in the House of Assembly or in the Legislative Council.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK said that the motion had been moved in both Houses and had been on the Order Paper of the Legislative Council since its opening. He said he had absolutely no information about the motion other than that contained in the Speech from the Throne. He moved that the Council accede to the request of the House of Assembly.

HON. MR. BARTLETT seconded the motion.

HON. MR. DAVEY enquired if a vote would be taken at the Conference.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT said it was merely a Conference to discuss the motion, and that the Conference would not bind the Council in any respect.

HON. MR. MILLEY asked the President if the Council could submit a report separately from the House.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT replied that this was merely a request from the House of Assembly that a Committee of the Whole Council meet a Committee of the Whole House to discuss the motion; the Council would not bind itself in any manner, and if a report were submitted as a result of the Conference it could take the form of a majority and minority report, either for or against the motion, as the Committee might think best.

The motion to accede to the request of the House of Assembly was carried unanimously.

On the motion for adjournment Hon. Sir Tasker Cook took the opportunity to welcome the Hon. Captain Kean back from the icefields; he congratulated the Hon. Captain on his success; the Commodore was now the high liner and his health and appearance showed that he had had an enjoyable, though not an over prosperous Spring.

HON. CAPTAIN KEAN stated he had intended to rise and offer his apologies for being so late in attendance, but it seemed that he was just in time for work. He thanked the Leader of the Government for his flattering remarks and said that although the trip was enjoyable, if the provisions had lasted, they would have stayed out longer. It was an enjoyable Spring as far as weather and ice conditions were concerned, but in other respects it was not very encouraging.

He wished to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Macpherson on his promotion to the Council. He had known the Hon. gentleman from childhood and on many occasions had taken dinner with his father and mother. Without attempting any flattering remarks he knew of no man that had a

more splendid character than Mr. Macpherson. The Hon. gentleman had a long business experience, and no doubt the Council would find him in a position to give very valuable assistance on questions that came up for consideration.

The Council then adjourned until Friday, the 17th April, at 3.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, April 17th, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3.30 p.m.

On motion the Address to His Majesty the King was deferred.

The Sale of Securities Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Council then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Canning of Rabbits and Other Foods"; Hon. Mr. Sinnott in the Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed with some amendment. The report was received and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act for the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips"; Hon. Mr. Davey in the Chair. Committee rose and reported Bill having passed with some amendment. The report was received and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

HON. SIR T. COOK, in moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs," spoke as follows:

Mr. President in moving the second reading of this Bill "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs," I need merely explain that this is an effort on the part of the Consolidation Commission acting conjointly with the Select Committee of the House, for the consolidation and modernizing of our law with respect to the Keeping of Dogs.

Under the old law the people of any particular locality might by petition proscribe the keeping of dogs. That Proclamation ran for a certain length of time. If the people had changed their minds in the meanwhile, they had to file a counterpetition within a certain length of time after the expiry of the Proclamation. Nobody took the trouble to know when the period would expire, action would not be taken within the statutory limit, and consequently the area would continue proscribed. Under this Act the proclamation runs for a definite period, and any time after that a change may be made.

Then the old law was enforced in scarcely any part of the Island of Newfoundland outside of St. John's; licenses would not be taken out, and license fees were not paid. There were certain areas where dogs were prohibited, but woodsmen had to have dog teams; doctors and clergymen could get around only by dog team. That is provided for. Provision is also made that telegraph and line repairers may travel by dog team, even though the area through which they are travelling is a proscribed area. There has always been trouble in people going with hunting dogs to places where dogs were not allowed to be kept; the people were always incensed about outsiders coming in with dogs, while they were not allowed to keep them. That is adjusted under the present law. Then there was al-

ways friction in areas where dogs were not allowed to be kept, because pet dogs were not allowed; unless a dog were a collie it could not be kept. Now a collie can be kept, a Newfoundland dog can be kept, and certain pet dogs. The object of the dog laws is to protect sheep. A Newfoundland dog, reasonably thoroughbred will not attack sheep, and the little pocket dogs which children want to play with instead of toys, and women want instead of children, have never been known to attack a sheep; there is nothing the world afraid of them except cats and rats and mice, and very often the cats are not afraid. These dogs may be kept.

On the whole, this Act appears to me to be a very sensible working out of the dog problem. Here in St John's we do not realize what the dog problem amounts to, and have a tendency to joke at the time and trouble taken in connection with dog laws. It must be remembered, however, that there are many sections of the country in which dogs are beasts of burden. It is the dog that takes the mailman and the clergyman and the doctor to their destination ;it is the dog team that helps out the telegraph and telephone line repairers; it is the dog that hauls the man's wood. A dog in the North is just as important an article of furniture as a pony in Harbor Main.

The legal end of the Bill has been looked after by the Committee on the Consolidation of the Statutes and the lawyers. It has also been looked after by the members of the Districts of Newfoundland described as the "Dog Districts," as distinct from those Districts known as the "Proclamation Areas," and between the lot of them a sensible Bill has been worked out which the distinguished gentlemen who

constitute the House of Assembly in this country have seriously considered and passed unanimously.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time ,and ordered to be referred to a committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. SIR T. COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act Relating to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages," explaining it as follows:

Mr. President, at the present time a person pays a certain amount of money to send a telegraph message, whether local or foreign. This is the price for the sending of the message. In addition to this a stamp has to be put on the message, or the person to whom it is delivered has to be paid the price of the stamp. Let me illustrate. In the case of local messages, the cost of the message is twenty cents, stamp five cents. A man pays his twenty cents to the telegraph operator, and puts a five cent stamp on the message or pays the telegraph operator five cents, the telegraph operator putting on the five cent stamp.

There is no difficulty whatever for the auditors of the Postal Telegraph Department to check the twenty cents for the message . It is impossible however, to check the putting on of the five cent stamp. That stamp is on the original message. The original message remains in the office to which it has been delivered, and the Postal auditors have no means of knowing whether the stamp is on or not unless the travelling auditor calls at the office and checks up the telegraph message.

The object of this Bill is to make the tax payable in cash instead of in stamps and have the tax accounted

for as cash to the head office in St John's. This is absolutely no disadvantage to the sender of the message. It has an absolute advantage in that he has not to bother at all with postage stamps so far as telegraph messages are concerned. It is no disadvantage to the telegraph operator, but rather an advantage in that the telegraph operator has not to keep a supply of postage stamps on hand and affix them to the messages. It has an advantage to the revenue, because of the saving of the actual cost of the postage stamp; that is, the cost of the manufacture of the stamp. The correspondence incidental to the forwarding these stamps to the various offices is also saved. The operator has less trouble, as there is no stamp account to be kept, and no checking up of stamps. The outstanding advantage however, is the possibility of an efficient auditor's check at the head office. Under the present system the twenty cents are accounted for in the ordinary course, and are checked up in the auditor's examination of the accounts of the office. There is, as I have said, no possibility in a large number of cases to check up the original messages and see if a stamp is affixed. Under this new system there is a complete audit which includes the tax. To sum up, I would say that this Bill is a positive advantage, with no possible disadvantage to any person and certainly no additional cost as far as the telegraph message is concerned.

The Bill passed second reading, and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

In moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act to Amend the Law Relating to Life Insurance," Hon. Sir T. Cook spoke as follows:

Mr. President, in, moving the second reading of the Life Insurance Bill it is only necessary for me to say that it is really a measure designed to give greater protection to policy holders. During recent years the neighboring Dominion of Canada devoted careful study to legislation governing Life Insurance Companies, and the result was the adoption by all the Provinces except the Province of Quebec, whose legislation is based on the French law, of a Life Insurance Act identical with the one which is now under consideration. It is only right and proper that we should follow the same procedure as our Canadian neighbors in connection with the matter because practically every insurance company doing business in this country is of Canadian origin. As a general rule, when a man insures his life he very rarely reads over the terms of his policy and is consequently ignorant of most of the provisions which it contains. Under the law hitherto existing in Newfoundland, if a man were to make his policy payable, say, to his father, and his father predeceased him, it was oftentimes difficult to make any readjustment in the policy with regard to a new beneficiary or beneficiaries, because the insurer had practically no personal control over the disposition of the proceeds of his policy, and in some cases the money might be disposed of in a manner entirely contrary to the plan he had in view when he took it out. Under the proposed Act the man who takes out an Insurance Policy is in a much better position and can exercise more extensive powers of control over the disposition of the proceeds of his policy at maturity. I think it will be agreed that this is a decided improvement over existing conditions, and affords a much greater measure of protection for the man who takes out life insurance. While the proposed Bill differs con-

siderably in arrangement and detail from the Act which it is designed to supersede, no change of principle is involved. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of this Bill.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the Council that he had received messages from the House of Assembly acquainting the Legislative Council that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively:

"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

"An Act Relating to a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, Ltd."

"An Act to Amend the Act 20 Geo. V., Cap. 22, entitled 'An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.'"

"An Act to Amend the Act 21 Geo. V., Cap. 15 (Crown Lands Act, 1930)."

These Bills were on motion severally read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the President read letters from the relatives of the Hon. S. K. Bell and the Hon. John Anderson in relation to the resolutions of condolence passed unanimously by the Council.

On motion the Council adjourned until Friday, April 24th, at 3.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, April 24th, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3.30.

The Bill "An Ac Relatin_S tct the Canning of Rabbits and other Food"

was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same with some amendment.

The Bill "An Act Relating to the Potatoes and Turnips" was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same with some amendment.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs." Hon. Sir Marmaduke Winter in the Chair.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON said that the wording of Clause 17 was so open that people could keep any kind of dog. He moved that the latter part of Clause 17 be amended to refer to "any Newfoundland dog or collie registered or eligible to be registered as such in the Newfoundland live stock registry in the Department of Agriculture and Mines." All dogs more or less worry sheep, but the Newfoundland dog will not do so to the same extent as any other, the dog whose conformation the Newfoundland dog most closely resembles was kept by the Pyrenean shepherds, not so much to herd their sheep, as to protect the flock from the depredations of wolves which frequented those mountains. Hence, through generations of association with sheep he is less a menace if given ordinary intelligent guidance than any other breed. The Newfoundland dog of today shows standards have been evolved through selective breeding from the common Newfoundland dog as we see it in the outports today. It has retained the intelligence, love of water, and the affectionate nature of these dogs, but has gained immensely in physique and appearance. Newfoundland would be expect-

ed to abound in Newfoundland dogs, and that there is a big demand for genuine Newfoundland dogs from Newfoundland would be confirmed by applying to the Tourist Bureau; those in charge there could have placed hundreds at least \$50.00 each had they been able to find them. The Hon. gentleman himself has had as many and fifty unfilled orders at a time, and always a waiting list. That Newfoundland had not advanced the quality of her dogs might be evidenced by an extract from a book relating to Newfoundland, written by Mr. M. F. Sweeter in 1881, as follows:—

"The finest breed of Newfoundland dogs were formerly found about the Twillingate Isles, and were generally distinguished by their deep black colour, with a white cross on the breast. They were smaller than the so-called Newfoundland dogs of America and Britain were almost amphibious, and lived on fish, salted, fresh or decayed. These animals were distinguished for rare intelligence and unbounded affection (especially for children) and were exempt from hydrophobia. A Newfoundland dog of pure blood is worth from \$75.00 to \$100.00."

Since then, aside from some sections on the West Coast, where in 1899 the Hon. gentleman had purchased his first pair, the standard of the dog is poor and in 1901 it was difficult to obtain one worthy of presentation to the Duke of Cornwall to take home from the children of Newfoundland to the children of the Royal Household.

The purpose of this Act, he understood, was to permit a dog lover or a would-be dog user to have one. Was this not a great opportunity, now that this privilege of keeping dogs is a concession, to demand that worthwhile ones be kept? If permission be for thorough-bred dogs only, it will

encourage breeders to supply that demand, and a person who has a good dog will generally look after it and train it from puppyhood not to chase sheep. Our Department of Agriculture and Mines registers pure bred dogs free of charge. The standards demanded were those set down by Britain, Canada and the United States, and the registration entitles them to free entry into those countries. At present there were registered Newfoundland dogs and bitches in Twillingate, registered dogs in Grand Falls, Buchans, Aguathuna, and there are at least two breeders of registered Newfoundlands in St. John's. He would be happy to place bitches with any bona fide breeder. Personally, he was not looking for an outlet for his dogs. He had been raising them for over twenty years; was on the executive of the Newfoundland Club of America and for three consecutive years had been president of the North American Newfoundland Club. Further, he had been selected to act, and last year acted, as sole judge of the Newfoundland breed at the Westminster show, the largest dog show in America and a similar show to that of Crofts in England. These associations made him realize what a boon to Newfoundland would be the standardization of her dogs, and what a good return to Newfoundland could be made through her dogs should she be prepared to supply the American market. The reason for suggesting the modification of the collie dog from its propensities for hunting sheep (like the setter for hunting birds) is with training a good servant, but without training liable to be worse than the average dog in its destruction of sheep. These, he concluded, were his reasons for moving the amendment.

HON. MR. STEER in seconding the amendment, said a chance was

now offered for the raising of the standard of our dogs. The breed had practically died out, for it was impossible to supply the demand for them, and it was no more trouble to raise a pure-breed dog than a mongrel.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with an amendment. The report was received, and, with the unanimous consent of the Council, was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same with an amendment.

The Council then resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Relating to the Mode of Collection of the Tax on Telegraphic Messages." Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. The report was received, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Council then went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend the Law Relating to Life Insurance." Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report was received, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922," spoke as follows:

Mr. President, the War Pensions bonus which is paid to soldiers did not originally come within the scope of the Pension Bill, but was based upon a subsequent arrangement made in conformity with the Canadian system. This bonus is not a permanent War Pension allowance of gratuity but is a bonus which is carried on from year to year. This Bill is the same as the

Bill which has been enacted each year for some time past.

The Prime Minister, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Squires, in introducing this Bill in the House of Assembly, is reported to have said that, in spite of the adverse financial conditions of the Colony, in spite of the fact that Departmental salaries and Civil Service salaries generally would have to be reduced, and in spite of the fact that there would have to be a general reduction on supplies, subsidies and practically all public expenditures, excepting those relating particularly to Old Age Pensions, assistance to the poor both financially and from the standpoint of public health, he felt that the military and naval pension bonus should be continued for the coming year. In view of the fact that this was the attitude taken by the Prime Minister in connection with this matter and that the Resolutions in the form in which they were introduced by him passed unanimously in the House of Assembly, I feel that we also should give our unanimous concurrence to the Bill.

I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On the motions for second reading respectively of the Bills "An Act Relating to a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Co., Ltd." and "An Act to Amend the Act 20 George V., Cap. 22 entitled 'An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland,'" Hon. Mr. McNamara enquired whether these were private Bills. Hon. the President held that they were. Hon. Mr. McNamara asked if the fees had

been paid. Hon. the President replied that the fees had not been paid, and that therefore the Bills could not be proceeded with until such was done.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 21 George V., Cap. 15 (Crown Lands Act, 1930)" explaining it as follows:

Mr. President: the Minister of Agriculture and Mines or the Governor in Council has power to give certain leases of land for the building of shacks or other buildings where people are carrying on a woodworking establishment. Some lawyers in reading this Act thought that the term "Woodworking" would not cover such a case as logging; would not cover such a case as driving logs on a river, and there might be some doubt whether the Minister or the Governor in Council would have the right to give leases for the erection of shacks or other buildings in connection with such enterprises. So that there would be no possible misunderstanding on this point, the Act is now amended, so as to read "woodworking or other industrial establishment." That is provided for in Section 1.

Section 2 corrects a printer's error. In the original Bill the word "license" was used. It was thought to be clearer to strike out "license" and use the term "permit holder." The term "license" was consequently struck out of the Act wherever it occurred. It occurred fifty or a hundred times. The printers left it in in two cases when it should have been struck out, and Section is to change that printer's error.

Section 3 deals with mineral licenses or leases. Mineral licenses and leases have been carried on under the old Act from the standpoint of the con-

tinuance of matters which started before the old Act was repealed. Some lawyers say that this throws a doubt upon the continuance of many leases, saying that the old Act was repealed. This section makes that clear.

I move the Second Reading.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received messages from the House of Assembly acquainting him that that body had passed the following Bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Council:

"An Act in Relation to a Contract for Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay."

"An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's."

"An Act to Amend the Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Company.'"

On motion these Bills were severally read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed the Council's amendment to the American Telephone and Telegraph Company Bill without amendment.

On the motion for adjournment Hon. Mr. McNamara took occasion to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Macpherson on his appointment to the Legislative Council. He felt that an independent man with such wide business ex-

perience as Mr. Macpherson possessed could not fail to be a valuable asset to the Chamber. Mr. McNamara stated he wished to make a few rambling remarks which his absence had prevented him from making earlier. In referring to the Speech from the Throne he said it was all verbiage and platitudes; there was no hope whatever to be found in it. With regard to the new loan, he said he had prophesied its coming last year; and with the price of goods going down and the ad valorem duties, the revenue was bound to suffer; there would be another loan in 1932. The matter was a serious one. On all sides were unbridled waste and extravagance. He considered it would have been better business if the contract for the 50,000 tons of coal, recently made with the U. S. A., had been made with the Nova Scotia Steel Company operating at Bell Island, even if a higher rate had been charged. Today at Bell Island men were working at half time, and this could have been used as a lever to give employment. Then, he understood, the Government had purchased the Marshall Building—for what? The Customs House at present being used was large enough to collect our revenue for generations. No thought was being taken for the morrow. Again, enough machinery was imported without duty to build a Suez Canal. And to remedy matters a ten per cent reduction was to be made on the salaries of underpaid officials—Civil Servants. It was true the Civil Service was overmanned, but the officials were underpaid. If a fifty per cent reduction had been made on the sessional pay of members of the House of Assembly, it would be more to the point. Or if the Government had pluck enough, duty might be put on things which at the present time come into the country duty free. The whole system, he thought, had been abused. Where the

money was coming from to pay the interest on all these loans he could not see.

The Council then adjourned until Monday, April 27th, at 3.30 p.m.

MONDAY, April 27th, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3.30.

The Bill in relation to the Tax on Telegraph Messages was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Life Insurance Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to the effect that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill to Amend the War Pensions Act. Hon. Mr. Murphy in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report was received, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Council then went into Committee on the Bill to Amend the Crown Lands Act. Hon. Capt. Kean in the Chair. Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report was received, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Second Reading of the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company Bill was on motion deferred.

The Second Reading of the Customs Smelter Bill was on motion deferred.

The Second Reading of the St. John's Gas Light Company was also on motion deferred.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the Second Reading of the Memorial University Bill, speaking as follows:

Mr. President, the Memorial College was started in the years 1921-22. A debate arose in the House of Assembly over the question whether this site should be used for College purposes. It was then decided that that whole area of land should be reserved. The College was built on it. During the past winter members for St. John's East and St. John's West jointly agreed that some of their District funds might be spent for the purpose of improving these grounds.

This Bill is for the purpose of setting aside that area bounded on the north by Merrymeeting Road, on the East by the Police Barracks and Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation grounds, on the south by various pieces of ground that have been leased out to various religious bodies for their purposes, educational, semi-military or otherwise, and on the west by Parade Street, that lot of land to be grounds for this College. The Executive Government or the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has no right whatever to sell, lease or deal with any portion of it except for educational purposes. The sole power to deal with that area of land for purposes other than educational now vests in the Legislature, and it does not appear to me that the Legislature will ever appropriate it for any other purpose. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

The Bill passed Second Reading and was ordered to be referred to a Com-

mittee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The Second Reading of the Conception Bay Mail and Passenger Service Bill was on motion deferred.

The Council then adjourned until Friday, the 1st day of May, 1931, at 3.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, May 1st, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3.30 p.m.

The Bills entitled respectively "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922" and "An Act to Amend the Act 21 George V., Chapter 15 (Crown Lands Act 1930)" were severally read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act Relating to a Contract between His Excellency the Governor in Council and the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, Limited," explaining as follows:

Mr. President, in the year 1926, when Mr. Monroe was Prime Minister, an agreement was entered into with Mr. Powell in connection with the subject matter of this Bill. The name of Mr. Powell's company was the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Company, Limited. Mr. Powell was not able to make sufficient progress with his development idea as to comply with the terms of the agreement. In the year 1928 Mr. Monroe gave him an extension. Condition during recent years have been such as it was impossible for progress to be made. Last year

the agreement expired. This present agreement with this Company is a re-enactment of the agreement made by Mr. Monroe in 1926, and confirmed and extended in 1928. If the terms of the Acts of 1926 and 1928 had not expired, a Bill for extension would now be all that was necessary. As, however, these Acts have actually expired the whole thing has to be re-enacted in the form in which it is now. This agreement is, in the main, a copy of the old agreement. There is this difference, that the old agreement was for commencement within two years and completion within five years; this agreement is for commencement within three and completion within five years.

Since the original Act of 1926, what is known as the "Standard duty clause" has been evolved, and that Standard Duty Clause is inserted in this Bill. This clause is included in all similar contracts. The reason why the Department of Justice prefers a Standard Duty Clause rather than a different wording in each contract is that it simplifies the matter of the interpretation of the clause in its application to individual items. Thus, when a decision is arrived at in any one particular matter, that decision applies to all contracts containing the same clause; there has not to be a special consideration of the wording of each individual agreement.

I am informed that the Bills of 1926 and 1928, and also this Bill passed the House of Assembly unanimously, and I now submit it for the careful consideration and debate of this Chamber.

HON. MR. JOB said that he had just seen this Bill for the first time. He would like to know the real differences between this measure and what was passed before. He noticed that this Bill would interfere with certain local industries, such as the seal fish-

ery. It allowed all materials in connection with its operation to come in duty free. The Hon. the Leader of the Government had said it had been passed unanimously by the House of Assembly. Could the Leader of the Government tell me if the Legislative Council had passed it before?

HON. SIR TASKER COOK replied that the Legislative Council had passed the Bill during the Monroe Administration.

HON. MR. JOB said he would like to have the Bill deferred until he could get full information.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK suggested that the Bill pass its second reading, and he would get the information for the Hon. gentleman during the committee stage.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK, in moving the second reading of the Customs Smelter Act, spoke as follows:

Mr President, by Act of Parliament of the year 1929 an Agreement was authorized between Newfoundland Mines and Smelters, Ltd., and the Government, whereby certain concessions were granted in consideration of certain undertakings being gone ahead with. This Customs Smelter is to be situate on the Peninsula of Avalon, the object being to provide a smelting place for ores from various small mines in Newfoundland. About \$125,000 has been spent by the smelters people and their financial associates in investigating mining properties and further active work is being undertaken this year. Financial conditions during the past two years have not been such as to make large

industrial undertakings of this character easily financed, and as a result an extension of time is asked. All the words in Section 1 mean that we business men say in ordinary English "A years and a half's extension." Section 3 states the thing clearly, in that it is an extension from the first day of January, 1935, to the 1st day of May, 1936. Section 4 merely corrects a mistake which was made in the printing of the Bill. When it was copied by the Engrossing Clerk the word "of" was left out, and Section 4 puts it in again.

I beg to move the second reading. The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The Second Reading of the St. John's Gas Light Company Bill was on motion deferred.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's." Hon. Mr. Job in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report was received, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

In moving the Second Reading of the Bell Island Mail and Passenger Service Bill, the Hon. Sir Tasker Cook explained its object in the following words:

Mr. President, this is a contract for a new and improved service for Conception Bay and Bell Island. Bell Island is an ancient and honourable centre of commercial activity in Newfoundland. It has represented millions of dollars to Newfoundland in wages and revenue. Shortly after the present Government came into office an ar-

rangement was made whereby they paid the substantial royalty on exports. but, more important than the royalty provision, an arrangement was made whereby an increase in wages was secured by the Government for Bell Island miners. Certainly, at the present moment the mines are suffering from the world depression.

There is a very limited market for iron ore, and as a result the mines are operating at about half time. In view of the fact that there are thousands of very valuable mines throughout the world entirely closed down because of this wave of commercial depression, we are fortunate if these mines are actually alive and in operation. It is not to be expected that they will again be in the vigorous full blast of a year ago until world conditions adjust themselves, so that further demand for iron ore is created. Meanwhile, however, the operations are being carried on at half capacity. It is earnestly hoped that during the present calendar year smelting conditions abroad may improve, and as soon as they do improve one of the very first mines to get the benefit of the improvement will be Bell Island.

This additional transportation service is very necessary. The Bell Island operations fully justify it, and I am sure the contract, which has been very carefully thought out, will meet the approval of this Council. It has received the unanimous support of the House of Assembly. I move its Second Reading.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the Council that he had received a message from the House of Assembly

to the effect that they had passed a Bill "An Act to Amend the Criminal Law" in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

The Bill was on motion read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK, on moving the adjournment of the Council, expressed the wish that a message be sent to Sir John R. Bennett, extending to him the sympathy of the Whole House upon the irreparable loss he had so recently sustained in the death of his wife. In so doing he felt he was voicing the sentiments of every member of the Chamber.

HON. MR. McNAMARA, in seconding the motion, said that he felt the members were fully in accord with the Hon. Leader of the Government in wishing to convey to Sir John R. Bennett their heartfelt sympathy. Lady Bennett had interested herself in many public works, and by her passing the community suffers a great loss.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK also expressed to the Hon. Mr. Job the sincere sympathy of the entire House upon the very great loss which he, too, had been called upon to bear. The Hon. gentleman had been out of the country for some time, and an opportunity had not been given before to extend officially the deep sympathy of the members.

HON. MR. McNAMARA deemed it a sad privilege to second the sentiments which the Hon. Leader of the Government had so clearly expressed.

HON. THE PRESIDENT also wished to associate himself with the Resolution; and to express to the Hon. Mr. Job his sincerest sympathy upon the loss which he had sustained.

HON. MR. JOB thanked the Hon. members for their sympathy which they had so kindly expressed, and said that such sympathy was a great help to him.

The Council then adjourned until Wednesday, May 6th, at 3.30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, May 6, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3.30 p.m.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill Relating to a Contract with the Terra Nova Oils Manufacturing Co., Ltd.; Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. JOB considered that the Bill as it now stood might possibly interfere with some of the established industries; for as far as he could see, there were no restrictions on the company's operations. He thought it would be fair to have the exact operations defined. If the Terra Nova Oil Company was to be free from taxation, other companies which were subject to these taxations would suffer. He did not wish to delay the Bill unnecessarily, but would like to move an amendment to Section 6 when that Section came up for discussion. Section 2(b) dealing with free entries, he thought admitted a principle which had been denied other companies, viz: that containers imported for exporting commodities should be free of duty. The request that such concessions be granted other companies had been flouted on various occasions. It seemed extraordinary that they should be found in this Bill. Containers, barrels, etc., were expensive here, but could be imported cheaply. Heretofore, it had been impossible to get these in duty free, although eventually

they were to be re-exported. He had no objection to the concessions if they were granted to all. But to deny them to established companies and grant them to this company, unless their operations were clearly defined, would mean the putting of these other companies under a serious disadvantage and might possibly cause them to disappear altogether.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK thought if these concessions were granted to one they should be granted to all.

HON. MR. MURPHY did not think there was anything in the Bill to cause any objections to be raised. The period was only for twenty years, and he would not like to see the Bill killed. The promoter had gone to Norway to raise the necessary capital, and if he were successful the industry would be started within a year.

HON. MR. JOB replied that he did not wish to throw the Bill out, but he asked that it be amended.

HON. MR. AYRE considered it unusual that in Section 2(a) "lighting fixtures and bulbs" were not to be included when "All material for lighting installation" was mentioned.

This Section, on motion stood over for further consideration.

HON. MR. JOB moved the following amendment to be inserted as Section 6 of the Bill:

"Whereas the Company may by reason of its freedom from taxation be in a position to compete to the disadvantage of industries already established in Newfoundland, which are subject to taxation, it is hereby declared and agreed that it is not the intention that the concessions granted shall place the Company in any such advantage-

"ous position, and it is further that the Company's operations will be restricted to the business of hardening and/or hydrogenating oils."

and that Sections 6 and 7 of the Bill be numbered 7 and 8.

He then stated that Hon. Mr. Murphy thought he was anxious to stop the industry. He thought it would be a very good thing for the country to have such an industry, but he thought it was their duty also to protect other industries and that provision should be made to that effect.

HON. CAPT. KEAN seconded the motion, and while he was just as anxious as any man in this Colony to see new industries, he stated that in regard to this Act he would take the same position as he had taken on the Buchans Mine Bill. The two concerns conducting the sealing industry today have been doing business in this country, he thought, for over one hundred years, and for a new company to come in and get new concessions he did not think would be right.

The Committee rose, reported having made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

The Council resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Customs Smelter Bill; Hon. Sir M. G. Winter in the Chair. Committee rose, and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. The Report was received and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion the second reading of the St. John's Gas Light Company Bill was deferred.

The Memorial University College Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of

Assembly with a message acquainting that body that the Council had passed the Bill without amendment.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill in Relation to Mail and Passenger Service on Conception Bay; Hon. Mr. Ayre in the Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. The report was received, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act to Amend the Criminal Law," explaining it as follows:

Mr. President, when as a result of a motor-car accident a person is killed outright, or dies within a year after the accident, the driver or other person responsible is liable to be arrested and charged with murder or manslaughter. The charge is always murder if it is a deliberate intent to kill, and manslaughter if the fatality occurred as the result of an accident in which it was clear that there was no intent to do bodily harm. Murder is an offence for which the maximum penalty is death. Manslaughter is one for which the maximum penalty is life imprisonment. Juries naturally hesitate to convict a man on a charge of manslaughter, even with a recommendation of mercy, because of the enormity of the punishment. Consequently verdicts of "not guilty" are frequently rendered or juries disagree because of the alarming association which manslaughter has in connection with criminal proceedings. When a person is proceeded against on a charge of murder, Trial Juries have the power to reduce it to manslaughter, but when a person is prosecuted on a manslaughter charge a jury has no power to reduce the offence. The object of this amendment is to make it

possible for a jury in the case of death resulting from motor accidents to reduce the charge from the exceedingly grave one of manslaughter to the lesser charge of criminal negligence, under Section 71 of the Highway Traffic Act, 1925. That section reads as follows:

"Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two 'years' imprisonment who, having charge of any carriage or motor vehicle, automobile, or other vehicle, by wanton or furious driving, or racing or other misconduct or by wilful neglect, does or causes to be done, any bodily harm to any person."

It is the unanimous opinion of both the Bench and the Bar that this amendment is one which will be very helpful in the administration of justice in connection with motor accidents, and will tend to secure a more efficient administration of the law and a greater certainty of punishment in cases where negligence is proven. The Bill was introduced in the House of Assembly by the Hon. the Attorney General on the recommendation of the Department of Justice and the Judges of the Supreme Court. In the House of Assembly it received the support of both the members of the legal profession who have seats on the Opposition side. The Bill in passing through its various stages in the House of Assembly received the unanimous support of the members. I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

THE HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received messages from the House of Assembly

to the effect that they had passed the following Bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

"An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare."

"An Act to Facilitate the Operation of the Newfoundland Hotel."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 87 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund.'

These Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

THE HON. THE PRESIDENT announced that the Address in Reply would be presented to His Excellency on tomorrow, Thursday, at 3.45 p.m.

The Council then adjourned until 3.30 p.m. on tomorrow.

THURSDAY, May 7, 1931.

The Council met at 3.30 pursuant to adjournment and proceeded to Government House to present the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne.

Returning to the Council Chamber, the Hon. the President informed the Council that a deputation of the Whole Council having waited on His Excellency had received the following reply:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present Session was opened.

(Sgd.) J. MIDDLETON,
Governor.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Terra Nova Oil Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

Committee rose and reported having made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

The Customs Smelters Bill was on motion read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK, in moving the second reading of the St. John's Gas Light Bill, spoke as follows:

Mr. President, the old St. John's Gas Light Company is still in existence so far as the name of the Company is concerned, but so far as its property is concerned it has entirely changed ownership. It is now owned and operated by foreign capital, and a foreign expert gas manager has been sent here by the Company for reorganization purposes. Already they have done a considerable amount of work and given labor in St. John's. They have already greatly improved the quality of their gas supply, and are putting in an up-to-date organization. I understand that they expect in the near future to get a new plant and put gas into active competition with electricity in certain commercial, industrial and household services.

The Company, when originally started in the days of long ago, had dual liability on its shareholders. The Company has paid off all its liabilities. An amount of thirty or so thousand dollars which the Government of Newfoundland advanced for coal to keep them going during the War, has been paid off, and the Company now asks, as a matter of form, that that liability be relieved. They

Government House,
May 7, 1931.

are going into the American market with their stocks and bonds and shares or whatever it is they are offering, to raise capital, and these foreigners do not understand the old practice in St. John's of having double liability on shares. It is an internal matter for themselves, and does not concern anybody other than a person who is a shareholder. The only matter of importance is a clause providing for an extension of the time of their charter. That is necessary to enable them to secure the satisfactory flotation of bond and other issues and secure capital. There is a clause dealing with Customs matters. They are allowed to get in pipes for trunk line purposes for such relaying or pipe re-organization and additional services as would enable such services to be properly effected; the time limit being two years. The original application was for five years. That was cut down to two.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole Council on tomorrow.

The Bill "An Act in Relation to a Contract for Mail and Passenger Service upon Conception Bay" was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend the Criminal Law." Hon. Mr. Sinnott in the Chair.

Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act to Facilitate the Operation of the Newfoundland Hotel," explaining it as follows:

Mr. President, The Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., which is the Company which owns and operates the Newfoundland Hotel, went into liquidation some time ago. The Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. F. Lloyd, P.C., K.C.M.G., K.C., Ltd., was appointed liquidator. By order of Mr Justice Kent, issued on 21st March, 1931, it was ordered that the Hotel be sold. Advertisements calling for tenders have been inserted in local and foreign papers. The liquidator has called attention to the fact that there will be doubt in the minds of any prospective tenderers as to whether the purchaser would get the benefit of the legislative advantages given the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., the feeling being that whatever chance there was of securing a satisfactory tender if the purchaser stepped in the place of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., and enjoyed these advantages and concessions, there would be very little hope of securing a satisfactory tender if the prospective purchasers did not succeed to whatever privileges that Company enjoyed. The difficulty of running the Newfoundland Hotel at a profit, even with all the advantages conferred on the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., are fully apparent, and it is not necessary for me to emphasise them. In these circumstances the liquidator, acting in conjunction with the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice drafted this Bill. It has received careful consideration at the hands of the House of Assembly, and has been put into a shape which I feel will be satisfactory to the members of this Chamber. This Bill does not grant any concessions beyond those already vested in the Hotel Company. Indeed in some particulars these concessions are lessened. In the proposed Bill there are more stringent time limits as to freedom from taxation, both Governmental and Muni-

cipal. The result is that the purchaser would receive somewhat less concessions than those which the operating company had, but nevertheless the concessions granted are of a character similar to those granted the old Company and should make the proposition reasonably attractive to prospective purchasers. The legal members of both sides of the House of Assembly concurred in this Bill in the form in which it is now before you.

The Bill passed second reading, and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole Council on tomorrow.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK, in moving the Second Reading of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Amendment Bill, spoke as follows:

Mr. President, the object of this Bill is to make it absolutely clear that subscriptions received for the Viking Disaster Fund by the Prime Minister personally, or the newspapers or others who have taken up collections, may be legally transferred to the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund. It also provides that in the event of the South Coast Disaster Fund Committee deciding to transfer the whole or any part of any credit balance which they may have after they wind up their responsibilities in connection with that particular disaster, they may do so legally as is the case with the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund. Under the Act as it stands at present there is some doubt as to whether a "Sealer" comes within the wording of the Act. That question has never been raised. Sealers have come under the category of "seamen," but the lawyers felt that it was better to make it absolutely sure, so that the scope of the legal activities of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund may clearly cover cases

of sealing disasters, as in fact it always has been made to cover them.

On the motion for the second reading of Public Health Bill, **HON SIR TASKER COOK** said:

Mr. President, the bulkiness of the present Bill has caused some misgiving and has created some misapprehensions in the minds of those who have given it casual consideration.. The explanation of the large number of sections comprised within the scope of the measure is that it is for the greater part a consolidation of existing laws within one Act. Nineteen Acts at present on the Statute Book are affected by this enactment. Sixteen of these Acts are repealed and are here re-enacted. Three others are repealed in part and the sections so repealed are replaced for the most part by sections of similar import in the present measure.

The Bill provides for the consolidation of similar services as well as of laws of similar import. Public Charities and Public Health services in this country, whether of a general or of an institutional character have been tremendously enlarged during the period of the last generation. They are today costing the Treasury an average of one million dollars per year to conduct. No adequate system of supervision of this big annual expenditure has been devised and adopted. The efforts made for the alleviation of destitution and sickness are outstanding but are not systematically directed nor are they conducted on sufficient co-operative basis.

The report of the Commission of Inquiry into matters of Public Charities and Public Health strongly emphasised this drawback and the necessity for legislation to remedy it. They stated, in part: "Both the testi-

mony given by witnesses summoned before us and our observations of results attained under the existing system, convinced us that the divided authority so evident in connection with the administration of institutional and general services conducted at the public expense results in waste and inefficiency that seriously reduce the benefits accruing to the general public from relatively large annual expenditures. Similarly, the fact that a number of excellent statutory enactments concerning public welfare are not assigned specifically to the administration of any department, results in failure to apply available legal remedies to the prevention or cure of various evils.

"This remark applies particularly to the laws respecting desertion and illegitimacy and the maintenance of inmates of hospitals and other public institutions by relatives in whole or in part.

"We have found, too, that a number of public service undertakings are conducted at large expense to the Colony without statutory enactments laying down the conditions under which such disbursements of public funds must be made. As a result a chaotic condition of expenditure of such funds has been created. Persons are helped without regard for particular circumstances and, frequently, without just cause or reason at all. The general effect has been demoralizing rather than beneficial. These evils are of the system or lack of system that prevails. Obviously, the necessity is for legal enactments to systematise expenditures and to abolish present abuses and prevent their recurrence in the future.

"We urge that existing legislation in connection with such matters be immediately revised and re-enacted so

that local statutes may be brought into line with the laws of other countries and that their general scope and particular provisions may be amplified to cover services and conditions that exist and to enable increased services in connection with conditions hitherto untouched, or but casually dealt with or that may be created from time to time.

"It is urgently necessary that our legislation in connection with public health and public welfare matters be without further delay broadened in scope and be strengthened in detail and be brought into line with the best statutory enactments of other countries in this regard."

Such are the broad general considerations and the specific advice on which the provisions of the Bill have been founded.

During the period of eighteen months that has elapsed since the Bill was drafted, it has been subjected to the most careful consideration and to very particular scrutiny in all respects. It is, therefore, anything but hasty or ill-considered legislation. It has been given the consideration of two select committees in another place. It has passed through the hands of the Consolidation Committee. It has been submitted for approval of great general interests affected by its provisions and its provisions have been amended and re-amended, adjusted and re-adjusted, with intent to ensure its smooth, harmonious and general application throughout the Dominion and in respect to all classes of our population. Not only are all such interests agreeable to this Bill and intent on its enactment as law, but the medical profession are unanimous in its favour and last year sent a delegation to another place to advocate the giving of legislative effect to its

provisions. The Bill, therefore, is now generally acceptable to all concerned thereby.

Another misapprehension regarding the Bill is as to the cost involved in administering the services for which it provides. As a matter of fact these services are being conducted today without the necessary statutory authority, in some connections. It is true that we have no such institution as a reformatory, although the Bill provides for administration of such an institution. It is true also that we are not conducting child welfare undertakings on the elaborate and necessary scale provided for by this bill. It is, however, true that the need of amplified services in the connections mentioned has long been felt and voiced. The creation of such adequate services at this time is not contemplated, because funds are not available and it cannot reasonably be contended that they can be provided under existing conditions. These and other provisions must be regarded as enabling in effect, rather than immediately effective. As and when finances can be found to meet the cost of additional public charities and public welfare services, legislation will be available under this Act to give authority for their establishment, and that establishment will have to be authorised by the administration of the day, not by the Bureau in charge of the service now being discussed.

In the case of the inspection of logging camps, the staff of the Department of Agriculture and Mines will be utilized for investigating and reporting on the sanitary condition of such camps. In child welfare matters, the present organisation will continue to function. Nonia will continue to conduct its nursing activities with its position enhanced, rather than reduced. These matters have all been

carefully and repeatedly discussed with the interests affected, who not only endorse the Bill, but are anxious for its early enactment as calculated to improve the position and the effectiveness of the various important public services they conduct.

Now as to the title of the Bill. The term Public Welfare is used advisedly instead of Public Charities. The transfer of the accounting for Old Age Pensions to the Office of the Commissioner of Charities is one reason for the change. Honorable gentlemen will quite understand the unfairness and inadvisability of labelling this small assistance to wornout fishermen as "Charity." Other services of economic value to the country will have to be conducted by the Bureau services which it would be equally unfair to tag with the label "Pauper relief."

The recommendation in the report of the Commission of Inquiry already referred to was for the creation of a Bureau including in its personnel a single member of the Executive Council or at most two. The organisation now proposed by the Government is a Bureau to include every member of the Executive Council, thus having its policy dictated by the government as a whole and its affairs constantly under the immediate attention of the Governor-in-Council. I am of the opinion, Sir, that the importance of the public policies to be formulated, of the services to be rendered and of public expenditures that may from time to time be involved on the part of members of Council and this desire to exalt the Bureau and its affairs to a position of the utmost dignity and prominence that can be given them by this or any other administration.

The main function of the Bureau of Health and Public Welfare will, of course, be the formulation of general

policy for application to the services under its control.

Its responsible ministerial head will continue to be the Colonial Secretary.

Its responsible executive heads, each charged with working out in practice the details of the policy formulated by the Bureau, will be the Secretary of Health and the Commissioner of Public Welfare.

Decentralised control of our Public Health and Public Welfare institutions is, in the opinion of the Commission, responsible for the relatively high cost of some of these institutions to the people of Newfoundland, as well as for the fact that results are not usually obtained commensurate with the equipment or accommodation provided or available. Control of such institutions will, therefore, be centralised under the Bureau of Health and Public Welfare. The advantages are certain to be manifold; and may be summarised as follows:

(1) The new management will be special and specific, treating institutional administration as the chief aim of its existence rather than one amongst a multiplicity of duties of this sort to be discharged.

(2) It will abolish the present system of divided and overlapping authority, with consequent confusion and inevitable waste.

(3) It will ensure closest possible contact between all the institutions and all departments of all institutions and one central body charged with the duty and the power to formulate working policies and insist that every detail of institutional administration coincide therewith.

(4) It will constitute a guiding central authority and control for superintendents of all institutions, assist-

ing such officials to manage their own institutional affairs, on the one hand and obviating isolated one-man control, on the other hand.

(5) It will ensure utilisation of buildings, staff and equipment to the utmost possible degree as determined by consideration of practicability and necessity rather than by others of much less present moment, as so frequently occurs under decentralised control.

(6) It will ensure much beneficial reciprocity as between institutions and the due classification and treatment of patients at the institutions best calculated to ensure sufficient and economical hospitalisation of any particular condition. Co-operation is badly needed along these lines today. It is the only means whereby public hospital institutions can be made to interlock in their activities. It cannot be ensured voluntarily. It must be enforced by a central governing body.

(7) It can frequently arrange for central equipment for a number of institutions rather than a very expensive duplication of such equipment in a number of separate institutions.

(8) It can regulate efficiently and as economically as possible the admission of patients, the payment of their expenses and other matters vitally important to their treatment.

(9) It can decide as to the relative importance of requisitions of supplies and equipment for the various institutions, approving purchases only as shown to be indispensable to the efficiency of staff and of institutions, ignoring all other considerations, and approving expenditures in the order of their importance to the public service as a whole, not on the basis of any of the many secondary considerations that may arise.

(10) General supplies could be purchased much more economically than at present. Retail prices are now paid, whereas, at most, the prices, if not wholesale, should not be higher than the jobber's charge.

I think, Mr President, I have said sufficient for the present to justify on general principles, the adoption of the broad general principles embodied in this Bill. I have pointed to the administrative necessity for such an enactment. I have shown how the organisation of the Bureau will exalt the services to be administered by it to a position of due prominence and meticulous attention. I have shown the necessity for the reorganisation of services and the co-ordination of efforts on the part of all concerned therein that is provided for in the Bill.

The advantages of the legal consolidation involved are apparent. The Government is fully persuaded that this legislation will make for greater efficiency and economy in administration, for consistent and advantageous public health and public welfare policies and for the more advantageous use of the facilities, institutional and otherwise, already possessed by us. When the measure is in Committee I will be pleased to indicate the general effects of the various parts comprised in the Bill and to endeavor to satisfy honorable members on various points as they may be raised. Meanwhile, Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

HON. THE PRESIDENT announced that messages had been received from the House of Assembly acquainting the

Council that that body had passed without amendment the amendments of the Council to the Bills Relating to the Keeping of Dogs, the Canning of Rabbits and Other Food, and to the Grading of Potatoes and Turnips.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the Suspension of Rules for the remainder of the Session.

The Council then adjourned until Friday, May 8th, at 3 p.m.

FRIDAY, May 8, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3 p.m.

The Notice of Motion for the suspension of Rules was deferred.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Terra Nova Oils Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. JOB asked leave to withdraw his original amendment and substitute the following:

"It is declared that, as the Company may by reason of its freedom from taxation be in a position to compete to the disadvantage of industries already established in Newfoundland, it is not the intention that the concessions granted shall place the Company in any such advantageous position."

HON. CAPT. KEAN supported the amendment.

Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed with some amendment. The report was received, and, on motion of the Hon. the Leader of the Government, read a third time,

passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same with an amendment.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the St. John's Gas Light Company Bill. Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. The report was received, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Bill "An Act to Amend the Criminal Law" was, on motion, read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Council went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Facilitate the Operation of the Newfoundland Hotel." Hon. Mr. Job in the Chair.

Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Council went into Committee on the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill. Hon. Mr. Macpherson in the Chair. Committee reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Council resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Public Health Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair. Committee reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK asked leave to recommit the Bill "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act." He understood that in the Act ther-

was no limitation set forth as regards fines or imprisonments in some cases and the Department of Justice wished to have the matter rectified.

HON. THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received messages from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed a Loan Bill and a Bill relating to a Protocol on Arbitration Clauses, in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council. On motion these Bills were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned until Monday, May 11th, at 3.30 p.m.

MONDAY, May 11, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3.30 p.m.

Notice of motion for Suspension of Rules deferred.

The following Bills were severally read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment:

"An Act to Amend the Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Company.'"

"An Act to Facilitate the Operation of the Newfoundland Hotel."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 76 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund.'"

"An Act Respecting Health and Public Welfare."

On motion for the Second reading of the Loan Bill, HON. MR. McNAMARA spoke as follows:

Mr. President, this loan before us is a money measure, and unfortunately we have no control over it, but there is nothing to prevent us expressing our opinion on it, and I really think this Act should not go through the Council without protest or comment of some kind from its members.

The amount called for is \$8,000,000, made up as follows:

\$2,000,000 for repayment of a temporary War Loan.

\$1,000,000 for a temporary loan from the Bank of Montreal.

\$2,000,000 for deficit on General Public Account for 1930-31.

\$150,000 for 1927-28 unliquidated Railway deficit.

\$600,000 for deficit on 1930-31, including expenses in stranding S.S. "CARIBOU" and Railway a/c.

\$1,250,000 for General purposes of Dominion, including cost of raising Loan.

\$1,000,000 for Municipal Council for Civic improvements.

It is understood that the Government intend allocating \$10,000 for each District, or \$370,000 for the 37 Districts, to help aid the Fisheries.

In addition to this amount the regular yearly allocation of \$150,000 to the 37 Districts is to be applied.

Then it is estimated it will cost \$160,000 to raise the Loan.

These three items represent an outlay of \$680,000 out of the \$1,250,000, leaving a balance of \$570,000 for general purposes of the country.

This, therefore, leaves the large sum of \$570,000 to be spent on purposes not specified. What this \$570,000 will be spent for will of course remain a mystery until the Council meets again, but we can be pretty well sure it will not be expended by our present rulers with due regard to economy.

The principal cause of all these big Loans can be attributed to criminal waste and extravagance in administering the affairs of the country, and with the present rate of expenditure continuing, there can be no hope for the eventual recovery of this Dominion

The Government in its pretended desire to do something to reduce Public Expenditure have decided upon cutting the Civil Service 10% while their own sessional pay of \$1,000 each for two months sitting remains unaltered. This 10% reduction, as already pointed out, is unfair and unjust and the cut should be on a sliding scale, and low salaries should be reduced much less proportionately than high salaries.

I think the unwarranted cut of 10% on the Teachers' salaries is a tragedy and a disaster. It is well known that the teaching profession is very poorly paid, and cannot stand this reduction.

The result of this cut on the teachers will be far-reaching, and in the long run the pupils will be the sufferers, as you cannot expect teachers to take an interest in their scholars if they are not paid for their services.

The Premier, on being interviewed by the Teachers' Association, told that body that if they could suggest means of increasing the Revenue of the country, it would be possible to avoid a reduction of the Education Grant.

The Teachers answered by suggesting that all bonuses, sinecures, per-

quisites and unreasonable payments for overtime be abolished.

They also suggested disbanding the Agricultural Commission, the greatest joke of the age, and all Commissions that did not justify their existence and stop the subsidies on steamers which did not give an adequate return.

Of course all these suggestions will be disregarded.

I have another suggestion to make to raise Revenue without appreciably hurting anybody, and that is to put a 10% tax on the five or six million dollars worth of goods that are admitted duty free, exclusive of flour, which can still remain on the free list.

I made this suggestion before, but of course it has fallen on deaf ears, although it would give the Minister of Finance another five or six hundred thousand dollars per annum to help him out in his yearly deficit.

The trouble about our financial affairs today is this, that our rulers do not appear to be able to grasp the significance or value of money, and the public funds of the Colony are scattered here, there and everywhere, regardless of returns or consequences.

Is it any wonder, therefore, to find that we are collecting roughly \$11,000,000 in Revenue yearly and spend it all, or in other words, we are practically spending \$1,000,000 a month to run our little country, and are still dissatisfied that we are not spending more.

There can be only one end to the present carnival of extravagance and that is insolvency, which cannot be very much longer delayed, with its degradation and humiliation.

Our present debt with the new loan added will bring us over the \$90,000,000 mark and with next year's inevitable loan to follow we will have approached the stupendous debt of \$100,000,000, a sum we can never hope to pay the interest on or reduce unless succeeding governments practice economy, live within their income and spend less money than they collect.

HON. CAPT. KEAN.—Mr. President, the first year I had a seat in this House the Loan Bill was five million dollars. One hon. gentleman got up and said in effect "where are we and whither tending?" and then asked the reporters not to take down his words. He made, in my opinion, a very eloquent speech. Two or three others followed and all congratulated him for the stand he had taken with the exception of myself, and I informed him that in my opinion nothing of that nature spoken in secret but would be proclaimed from the rooftops. Since then that hon. gentleman fills a very important position in another branch of this legislature and is in part responsible for this Loan Bill of today, which has increased in magnitude to the tune of two million dollars. In saying this I do not for one moment mean that he is in any way responsible for the increase, but I do say if he had any way of preventing it then he has certainly failed to accomplish it.

It may be circumstances over which none of us has any control that has brought it about. It may be world conditions have brought it about. I am inclined to think it is. However, it is not my intention to lay the blame on any one particular party, but just so far as I think governments are responsible. I think all the governments we have had in the last thirty years are equally guilty, and where they have all failed in my opinion is

by permitting so much goods to come in under the table of exemptions. I do not mean by that those goods that have come in free by statute to encourage foreign capital to come in here to help us develop our resources, as I think the 4th clause in His Excellency's speech this session shows us this is fully justifiable and with your permission I would like to read it

"During the fiscal year which ended last June the export of pulp and paper showed an increase of 32,000 tons, and an increase value of over \$1,000,000. For the same period, with the increased production at Buchans, there showed an increase export of 360,000 tons of minerals with an increased value of three and a quarter million dollars. For the last four years the total value of the exports exceeded that of the imports in the fiscal year 1926-27, the excess of exports over imports was more than \$5,000,000; in the following fiscal year the excess was over \$6,000,000; in the next year it was over \$7,500,000, and in the year ending June, 1930, it was over \$8,000,000."

Hon. gentlemen will remember the first year I was in this House there was a great deal of talk about the fisheries being the mainstay of the country. In one of my remarks on that point I said if the fisheries were the mainstay of the country, then I hoped the Lord would have mercy on the country. The answer to my remark you will find in the fifth clause which contains the following: "These figures show the progress that is being made in the development of the colony's resources. Twenty years ago the fishery products constituted 90% of our exports. While in the last fiscal year the value of the fishery products did not amount to 50% of the value of our exports. While the loss to our people, through the shortage

in the catch and the very low price received for our codfish in the markets, has been considerable, it is not felt in the same degree as would have been the case twenty years ago and I sincerely hope our other latent resources will be very shortly developed and give employment and labor to our people.

The Finance Minister in 1927 made the following remark which, with your permission, I would like to read. He said, as a matter of fact, the value of free imports into this country is approximately forty per cent of all imports during the year 1925-1926. The official figures are: dutiable goods \$16,735,073.00; free goods \$10,815,232.00. Dutiable goods only exceeds free entries by less than \$6,000,000. The following is a list of the principal items: Flour, 361,232 barrels, \$2,922,496.00; salt beef, 43,157 barrels, \$816,030.00; pork, 20,849 barrels, \$630,160.00; export coal, 101,876 tons, \$538,643.00; kero oil 1,100,000 gallons, \$132,745.00; gasoline, 1,249,239 gallons, \$275,675.00; fruit from Spain, \$31,171.00; tomatoes and onions, \$25,539, worth in all \$5,571,460.00. To permit all these goods in duty free is, in my opinion, a very injudicious step, as the following figures will show. It was spoken of as a means to help the fishermen. But the census of 1921 shows our inhabitants were 263,000 people, 65,000 of whom were fishermen. To favor this 65,000, 197,000 were exempted from taxation which meant a loss to the revenue of over a half million dollars annually which would mean in thirty years fifteen million dollars. I think the quicker our politicians talk of Newfoundland as a whole and not divide it into classes the better for all concerned. Learn to talk of them as a body, and then remember although the body is one it hath many members and all members have not the same office and

the hand cannot say to the foot I have no need of thee, and the eye cannot say to the ear, I have no need of you. Although others may differ with me upon that point, the fact remains they have steered the opposite course and where has it landed us?

In fifty years our public debt has increased from less than two million to 93 million dollars and many fishermen are wondering today where they will get supplies for the fishery, and other classe are equally strapped for something to do to keep poverty from their door. All eyes are turned and all ears are opened to the criticism of the Government, perhaps justly so but to bring about any substantial reform it must go deeper than that. Every man and woman in the country should ask himself and herself the question: If the state of the country is due to world conditions, what part have we as a community played in bringing that about and what part can we play in bringing about reform?

Is it not a fact apart from government altogether, communities wield an influence for good or ill; and right here I ask you to turn up the report of the Liquor Control Board and look at Schedule A and you will see there was spent last year for liquor \$1,128.- 675.13.

Now I want to say, Mr. President, I am not a temperance crank and not of the type that believes that if a man drinks a glass of liquor that he is doomed to perdition. In fact I am not speaking from the moral aspect of the situation, altho I am free to admit there is a moral side. But I am speaking entirely from the standpoint of economics. It is true we have been told that rum is the greatest collector of revenue we have, but the worst point about that is the more revenue we get the greater the waste, and the more harm is done to us as a people,

because rum is the enemy of law and order and the cost of regulating and maintaining the peace must surely run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. Dispense with rum and you could dispense with half of our police force. Dispense with rum and you could reduce your staff at the penitentiary 50 per cent. With another fact staring you in the face, that for 80 per cent who go there, directly and indirectly rum is the cause. The above is the lowest value that can be placed upon the harm that is done by this curse. Estimate, if you can, on the damage done to the homes of the victims of strong drink. The underfed and the half-clothed young men and young women that these wretched homes sent out to do battle with life, without an education, doomed to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, and then tell me do you think that we should exult over the fact that their curse has increased our revenue a few dollars and cents. But, Sir, there is one redeeming feature in this report. The very last item is five dollars conscience money. The Lord knows it's time and I sincerely hope that all those who have contributed their share towards that million dollars will have their consciences troubling them until they see the enormity of this curse to the country as I see it. If so, then they will see that in this Loan Bill of seven million dollars, one million is to replace the amount that has been spent the past year in intoxicating drink—which has a world-wide reputation for carrying in its track a curse to humanity greater than war, pestilence or famine put together.

This question rests with the community; it is your work to carry it on.

It is your work to reform. In speaking as I have I feel I have only done my duty.

I close with this injunction: Why spend ye your money for that which is not bread, and give your labor for that which satisfieth not.

In moving the second reading of the Bill in Relation to a Protocol on Arbitration Clauses, HON. SIR TASKER COOK explained the Bill in the following words:

Mr. President, this Bill entitled "An Act to Give Effect to a Protocol on Arbitration Clauses signed on behalf of His Majesty at a Meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations

the Twenty-fourth day of September, 1923, and to a Convention on the Execution of Arbitral Awards signed on behalf of His Majesty at Geneva on the Twenty-sixth day of September, 1927," is a formal matter as clearly appears from the Bill itself. The recitals read as follows:

"WHEREAS at a Meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations held on the twenty-fourth of September, A.D. nineteen and twenty-three the Protocol on arbitration clauses set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act was signed on behalf of His Majesty.

"AND WHEREAS on the twenty-sixth day of September, A.D. nineteen hundred and twenty-seven the Convention on the execution of Arbitral Awards set forth in Schedule "B" to this Act was signed at Geneva on behalf of His Majesty, AND WHEREAS it is expedient to give effect to the said Protocol and Convention in the Dominion of Newfoundland as hereinafter provided."

They in themselves give a clear explanation of the circumstances. This Bill should have been passed years ago, and is now made to apply to any awards made after July 28, 1924. It

was deferred by previous Ministers of Justice because nobody was prepared to act in connection with the matter without a study of the situation. This our present Prime Minister, had the opportunity of doing when in London with the result that this Bill was the subject of careful preparation by the Department of Justice, and any points of wording in doubt were referred to the law advisers of the Crown in London to make absolutely sure that the Bill was properly drafted.

It merely means that if a Newfoundland and a Frenchman have an arbitration here in St. John's, the Newfoundland can enforce that arbitration against the Frenchman in France without all the cumbersome machinery of taking legal proceedings against him in France on the presentation of the arbitrators. Likewise if a Newfoundland and a Frenchman have an arbitration in Paris, the award can be enforced against the Newfoundland here.

Under the old system the award would have no validity outside of the country in which it was given except to the extent that legal proceedings could be instituted on that award in the foreign country. That would mean that the whole matter would have to be gone over again at enormous expense and inconvenience.

This Bill is technical in character, and may be referred to as a lawyer's bill straightening out international procedure.

In my memory, which stands for a good many years' practical experience of commercial business in St. John's I do not know of any case which the Bill would affect, and unless the policy of arbitration instead of litigation develops very much more than it has done during recent years, it may be a week of centuries before we hear of

this Bill in actual operation. It is important, however, that Newfoundland should run in harmony with Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and all the other leading countries, because there is always possibility that at any moment a case may arise, and an awkward and unpleasant situation would be created if we were the only part of the British Empire which had not by our own legislation carried out the arbitration arrangements provided by the League of Nations, and in accordance with International Conventions signed in relation thereto.

This Bill is no more and no less than a measure of that nature which the Imperial Government has asked us to put into effect in this country.

I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK, with the unanimous consent of the Whole Council moved that the Council resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on an amendment of the Summary Jurisdiction Act.

HON. THE PRESIDENT explained the importance of the amendment under consideration. A case had come to notice in which the offender, altho guilty, could not be sentenced by the Magistrate because no penalty had been set forth in the Act. This amendment was to remedy that state of affairs. The assent of the Council being given, the Bill was re-committed. Hon Capt. Kean in the Chair.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. With the unanimous consent of the Council, the Bill was then read a third time, and it was ordered that a mes-

sage be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that the Council had passed the same.

The Council then adjourned until 3.30 p.m. tomorrow, Saturday, May 12.

TUESDAY, May 12th, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3.30 p.m.

Notice of motion for Suspension of Rules was deferred.

On motion, the Council resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Loan Bill. Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

HON. S MILLEY.—Mr. President, it is not my purpose to oppose this Bill, but I wish to use this occasion to make a few remarks on present conditions and upon future prospects. Nearly thirty years ago I was appointed to this House in company with Hons. John Harvey, J. D. Ryan, and John Anderson. These colleagues have since passed away, as have also all the members who occupied seats in this Council at that time, with the exception of Sir Edgar Bowring who has long ceased to be a member. Some seven or eight others who have received appointment to this body during these thirty years have also passed on. I am, therefore, the sole survivor of those who went in and out of this House thirty years ago. Thirty years is a period concerning which one can perhaps review conditions as they have occurred to him from time to time. The old ship of state, Newfoundland, has sailed thru some heavy seas during the time I have had the honor of sitting in this House, and, thanks to a kindly Providence, and to wise seamanship on the part of those who held the helm, she has so far been able to steer clear of the rocks.

To my mind—and I say this from no spirit of partisanship, for not once have I registered a partisan vote in this Council—Newfoundland is facing heavier seas today than she has yet faced, and wise indeed must be the men at the helm if the rocks are to be avoided and disaster averted. From a legislative standpoint, two men hold the helm today, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Squires in the Lower House, and Hon. Sir Tasker Cook in this one. Are they going to be equal to the task? They can if they so will it; or are they going to let us continue to drift until their most strenuous efforts will be useless?

As a business man I have for several years now, had access to the opinions of leading financiers on both sides of the water, and I have yet to find one who takes a really optimistic view of things as he looks into the immediate future. With world conditions so full of foreboding, surely we in this little isle "should sit up and take notice," and not be engaged in bartering our birthright for a mess of pottage.

I welcome to this House the Hon. Harold Macpherson, representing as he does one of our largest business concerns, and I want to commend him for the timely remarks made on opening day in his maiden address. I did not have the pleasure of hearing him but I was pleased to read the report of his speech in the press. But what has resulted? The Board of Trade with commendable promptitude, took the matter up, a special committee sat on it, and made important suggestions. These were forwarded to the proper authorities, but nothing has so far been done. In other words, Mr. Macpherson has been told (by inference at any rate) that he is only wasting his time by making complaints of this

nature. Of course, I may be wrong about this, and it may be something is being done. I can say, however, that the trade has not felt the uplift yet for dishonorable practices are still going on to the detriment of those who are doing their business in an honorable manner.

I think that every business man in this Chamber will agree with me when I say that wise counsels must prevail if we hope to survive the serious condition of affairs now upon us, and I make an appeal to all who have any power in this land to be "up and doing" if they really have any regard for this island home of ours. It is high time that the game of politics ceased and that the more serious game of statesmanship, sincere and real, be played.

Retrenchment is essential everywhere in our financial outlays, but I must say that I am sorry that it has not started at the top instead of where it has. A strong hand at the wheel and a "stiff upper lip" are what we need now on the part of those whom the people have given authority. I might close by saying that I am not a pessimist yet, but I fear for our future unless a little more statesmanship is displayed, and that such statesmanship is possible, I have no doubt.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report was received, and, with the consent of the Council the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a Message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion the Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill to Give Effect to a Protocol on Arbitration Clauses. Hon. Mr.

McNamara in the Chair. Committee rose, and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. The Report was received, and, with the consent of the Council the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Lower House with a Message to the effect that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read messages from the House of Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed the following Bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

"An Act Respecting a Reduction in the Public Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 1931-32."

"An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

"An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925."

"The Public Service Act."

These Bills were on motion severally read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received messages from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed without amendment the amendments to the Terra Nova Oils Bill and the Summary Jurisdiction Bill.

On motion the Council adjourned until Wednesday, May 13th, at 3.30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, May 13th, 1931.

The Council met at 3.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved that the Rules of the House with re-

spect to all matters now or to come before it, be suspended. The motion was carried unanimously.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act Respecting a Reduction in the Public Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 1931-32," explaining it as follows:

Mr. President, This is the Bill which provides for a reduction of 10% in the Estimates for the coming fiscal year. There is no need for me to refer to this at any length because the Bill itself is self-explanatory. I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House. Hon. Mr. O'Dea in the Chair. The Committee reported the Bill having passed without amendment; the report was received, the Bill read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a Message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Retiring Allowance Bill, as follows:

Mr. President, this Bill contains a list of Civil Servants who have been retired during the past year as set forth in the Estimates. It is necessary in the case of pensions to have a special Bill enacted providing for the payment of the pensions. The mere fact that the amounts have been passed in the Estimates does not suffice. This is the same practice that has been followed every year and is necessary to have the pensions legally paid. I move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole Council. Hon. Mr. Job in the Chair. The Chairman of the Com-

mittee reported the Bill having passed without amendment, and on motion it was read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a Message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On the motion for second reading of the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925," HON. SIR TASKER COOK stated:

Mr. President, the Amendments to the Revenue Act this year are not of a nature to which anybody can object. Taxes are neither put on nor taken off. Necessary adjustments have been made. The Nail Factory seems to have been lucky in getting an extra quarter cent a pound protection, as that concern has been operating under great difficulty during the past year or so. A slight adjustment has also been made in the duty on candy. That is a matter which, I feel, that at our age we will not be personally interested. Batteries for fishermen have in the past been rated at 40% duty. Other batteries have been placed at 50%. This difference has provided an opportunity for anybody who wanted to beat the Customs to do so. It has not been possible to keep track of batteries once they have been imported and ascertain whether they ran the spark plug of a fisherman's engine or a high class motor car. Small tins for honey will now be allowed in at 15% instead of the rate of 45 per cent hitherto charged. This will encourage people to keep bees in hives instead of in their bonnets. These are the only changes contemplated in the Revenue Act, and as in the majority of cases they provide a slight additional protection for local industries, I have no doubt they will meet with the approval of honorable gentlemen. I move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time and on motion referred to a Com-

mittee of the Whole Council, which Committee reported the Bill having been read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a Message to the effect that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Public Service Bill as follows:

Mr. President, this is the usual Bill for the granting to His Majesty of certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the thirtieth day of June, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-one, and the thirtieth day of June, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-two, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service. I move its second reading.

HON. MR. JOB.—Mr. President, I always feel when the annual money Bills are presented for our approval that although we have not the privilege of making amendments, we are nevertheless neglecting our duties if we do not comment to some extent upon the proposed expenditures.

A few days ago we listened to an admirable and forcible address by the Hon. member on my left, and to another by the Hon. member on my right, dealing to some extent with these matters, and only yesterday the Hon. Mr. Milley made an eloquent patriotic appeal which I am sure touched us deeply.

One of the Hon. members mentioned went so far as to intimate that in his opinion the old colony was on the verge of bankruptcy, and with every wish to avoid undue pessimism, it must be admitted that the immediate future is dark indeed, and that it will need a strong hand to force the heavy

reductions in expenditure which are essential in view of our decreasing revenues and increasing expenditures. A drastic reduction of expenditures is a vital necessity, and it behooves us to consider to what, if any, extent the figures now presented for our consideration meet the situation.

A government in a democratic country is driven by force of public opinion to cater to the wishes of the electorate, and present day electorates are, I fear, very difficult to convince that even in times such as those through which we are passing, drastic retrenchment is a vital necessity. I fear it is only too true, also, that political leaders will not face the facts, and endeavor to educate the electorate to the dangers, but are inclined themselves to drift with the tide rather than to boldly stem it.

You and I, Mr. President, and everyone in this Chamber, know in our heart of hearts, that we are being asked to approve of hundreds of thousands of dollars of expenditure which, under present conditions, should be cut out entirely.

As practical men we know that these payments to commissioners are all wrong, and that no value is obtained from them from the point of view of the colony, but rather that they are payments made to keep a political party together.

I have very little doubt about being correct when I state that many hundreds of thousands of dollars are wasted in the purchasing of goods, as in nearly every department of the Government an excessive cost of at least 25% is eventually paid as compared with purchase costs under a sane purchasing system, and the reason again is a desire to keep a political party following together.

It is not pleasant to make remarks of this sort, but we are wanting in our duty if we avoid such comments.

I fear that public opinion in this old land must be roused before any government can be induced to take a sane stand on this question of expenditures.

A few weeks ago a public meeting was called by some of our most respected, independent, and public-spirited citizens, to protest against these extravagances. This meeting expressed in no uncertain way the alarm of the electorate at the serious position facing us, and one would imagine that such expressions of public opinion would be welcomed by any patriotic body of people. It is this kind of public spirit that is now wanted all over this fine old colony. It is regrettable that a certain "newspaper," which I am informed circulates largely through our island homes, took occasion to draw a red herring across the trail and to endeavor to belittle the undoubtedly sincere intentions of the convenor of this meeting and of those present.

I believe that I am expressing the views of all in this Chamber when I close these remarks by expressing the hope that such public-spirited meetings will spread over the face of this land, and bring to our rulers, whoever they may be, the conviction that the time has really arrived when the electorate will no longer tolerate the waste and extravagance that is so rapidly driving us into complete loss of our independence as a self-governing colony.

HON. MR. AYRE endorsed the remarks made by the honorable member, saying that one could not but feel very considerably the exceedingly serious condition of the country's finances. He

expressed himself as not being wedded to any party; what he said was free from political feeling. Money was being squandered and wasted from year to year and unless something was done things would go from bad to worse until eventually we might find ourselves in the disgraceful position of New South Wales. In his opinion, a recent remark of an hon. gentleman, viz., that we wanted statesmen, not politicians, struck at the crux of the whole matter. Gladstone was cited as an outstanding example of a statesman. In his position as Prime Minister of England, he recognized that he was accountable to the people for the money spent; it was not to be spent for his own benefit. On one occasion while he was living at 10 Downing Street, a gravel walk was being sodded and Gladstone enquired where the money was coming from to pay for it. On being told from the Exchequer, he replied: "I am not going to have money spent on improvements for my benefit." The work was stopped and the walks remains today unsodden—a monument to Gladstone. Statesmanship does not consist in spending money; but rather in wisely caring for it in the best interests of the country. In referring to the meeting mentioned by the honorable member, he said he was not present at that meeting but as far as he could see from what he had read it was non-political and afforded the Government a splendid opportunity to take hold and use it, if possessed of any unselfishness. He trusted that something more would follow in the direction of that meeting. He protested against the enormous leakage which was draining the country and ruining it so that it was almost impossible for a hard-working man to live in it. A few days ago these men had been referred to as "hewers of wood and drawers of water." In passing, Mr. Ayre paid a

glowing tribute to these wielders of the axe and the toilers of the sea; their industry, skill and use of time, were commendable and praiseworthy. Men were put in their right places at these occupations and rendered faithful service in the positions they filled. We had, in his opinion, too much executive machinery; enough to run a country of several millions, instead of one with only a population of 250,000. One way of retrenchment suggested was to cut off some of this superfluous machinery which was only affording men an opportunity of receiving salaries for which they had not to work very industriously.

The Council went into a committee of the whole on the Public Service Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was then read a third time, and ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body to that effect.

The following Bills were read a first time:

"An Act relating to Salt Cod Fish."

"An Act to Amend the Municipal Act."

"The International Grenfell Association Act."

The Council then adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m.

THURSDAY, May 14th, 1931.

Council met at 11 a.m. pursuant to adjournment.

The Address to His Majesty the King was read a first time.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK, in moving its second reading, spoke as follows: Mr. President, when on the

23rd of April, 1918, Sir Charles Alexander Harris, then Governor of Newfoundland, opened the Seventh Session of the Twenty-third General Assembly, he made the following statement:

"On this, the first occasion of meeting you in session, I believe that you would wish me just to refer to the recent complete recognition of the status of Newfoundland as one of His Majesty's self-governing Dominions."

Many years have passed since that initial announcement, and it is not until now, after many Imperial conferences, that definite steps for the legal and constitutional consummation of this pronouncement are being taken. This step is the result of the decision of the representatives of Newfoundland and all the other Dominions of the British Empire, namely, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Irish Free State, and consists in the submission to both branches of the Legislature of Newfoundland of a Resolution to the effect that an humble Address be presented to His Majesty the King in wording as it is before us today.

In moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish," HON. SIR TASKER COOK spoke as follows:

Mr. President, for many years an effort has been made to stabilise the codfish export business. It appears that we have got to a point where the House of Assembly, both Government and Opposition, and the chief exporters are in agreement on the matter of policy, namely, Standardization of salt codfish for export. This Bill was drafted by the Board of Trade and introduced into the House of Assembly by the Prime Minister personally. Sir Richard Squires explained, in intro-

ducing it that it was not a party measure. He pointed out that it was the enunciation of a policy of standardization of salt codfish for export, and he understood that not only had leading members of the Government already declared themselves in favor of that policy, but that leading members of the Opposition had made similar declarations. The Prime Minister expressed the hope that the Bill would receive the unanimous approval of the House. It did, with one exception only, namely, the question as to the qualification of people to be exporters of salt cod fish. All agreed that persons carrying on a fish business in the regular way and possessing business premises should be regarded as exporters. Then there were a number of small men and brokers who were engaged in the purchase and sale of codfish and were exporters thereof. The original idea of the Board of Trade was that no person who could not export five thousand quintals annually should be allowed to export. This was reduced in the Bill to twenty-five hundred. A number of members of the Government and Opposition felt that it should be further reduced to one thousand quintals. The majority of the members of the House, however, felt that the figure should be fixed at twenty-five hundred quintals and it was so arranged as a result of a majority vote in that Chamber. That was the only point on which there was not absolute unanimity in the House. I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill passed second reading, and, on motion, was referred to a Committee of the Whole Council. Hon. Mr. Davey in the Chair.

HON. MR. McNAMARA said that, in his opinion, this was a very important Bill, and demanded weighty consideration. The present age was one of

standardization and purity, and we would lose our markets if we did not adopt standardization in our fisheries. We had already lost the Greek and Italian markets. This Bill appeared to be a good one, and demanded the full attention of the Council. The exporters appeared to be united, as all their names were attached to the Bill. While he was speaking on salt fish, he would also deal with fresh fish. Anyone visiting our coves any morning would readily see that the fish displayed for sale was not attractively displayed. The fish was often laid out in an old wheelbarrow, often fifty years old, or on oars stretched across the cove. It was bad enough now, but it would be positively disgusting when the flies came. He knew that last year some tourists took a snapshot of the fishermen selling fish under conditions such as these, which would probably be broadcasted all over the world. The Government or the Municipality should erect a few stalls with running water in the coves, which they could let out to the fishermen, and so do away with our present ignorant and disgusting method of selling our fresh fish products.

Referring to the clause contained in the Bill relating to fish being exported to the United States and Canada without being graded, he said it might be all right to send it to Canada, because they practically grade the fish there in the same way. They have no such facilities in the United States, and there was a risk of its going out in bad condition, and he did not think we could afford to take that chance. He moved that the clause be deleted.

HON. MR. JOB thought that the Bill had been pretty well thrashed out by the exporters themselves. He did not think it was quite correct, as had been stated, that the Bill was drafted by the Board of Trade. To all intents and

purposes he was in accord with the views of the exporters. It did seem ridiculous to exclude shipment to the United States, and the same thing applied to Canada. While the whole idea was good, the Bill was an impractical one. Even if these two amendments were made, he did not believe it practicable to standardize all our fish. The main point about the Bill was that it rested with sixty percent of the trade. Nothing could be done with the Bill unless sixty per cent of the trade were in favor of it, and for that reason he would not oppose the Bill. He did not see any objection to the amendment. It was perfectly true that it was possible some people might purchase for shipment to Italy or Spain or Greece certain fish, and that would go out in casks uninspected.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON felt that there was one point about the American market, namely, that we were in proximity to the United States and Canada, and they could send agents and buyers down to pick up lots of fish that was not standardized; that would go out of Newfoundland ungraded, and it would be a case of "let the buyer beware."

HON. CAPT. KEAN thought that Canada should be included as well as the United States.

HON. MR. AYRE was inclined to let the Bill go through as it was. It had been thrashed out by the Committee, and it was a step in the right direction. If alterations were advisable they could be made later.

HON. MR. McNAMARA did not wish to be persistent. He thought Canada might be left in for this year.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK said he could appreciate the honorable gentleman's point of view, but at the same time we had 2,300 miles of coast

line where fish is caught and to grade along that line would take an army of inspectors. When the Bill had been discussed in the Executive he had got the fishery regulations from Iceland and Norway and laid them before the Executive, and to carry out regulations of that sort here would need a good many inspectors. He would suggest to the Government that the clause be deleted.

HON. MR. McNAMARA said his whole object in requiring the deleting of the clause was to improve the quality of our fish, and this section opened a loophole to let our own fish be shipped ungraded. The fish might easily go to Italy or Greece from New York. Things were so bad before that our fish was exported as "slop" fish, which killed it for years. Again, the honorable gentleman stated he noticed the term "cullage." Cullage was fish which should not be allowed to be exported. He was strong on the point of deleting this clause. The Bill was an honest attempt to improve our present conditions, and we should not leave any loophole whatever. He did not wish to be persistent, but would like the Council to be unanimous in having "United States" deleted from this section.

On the motion being put, the amendment was carried.

On the consideration of Section 13 of the Bill, **HON. CAPT. KEAN** stated that before the Section was passed he move like to move an amendment, namely, that the Section be deleted. He had in his hand a message from six exporters in Grand Bank to the Fish Committee, as follows:

"Grand Bank,
May 13th, 1931.

To the Secretary Fish Committee,
Board of Trade,
St. John's.

"We believe Bill relating to Standardization salt fish now before House to be necessary, but we believe Mr. Lake's local option clause makes it worthless and we are in favor of Bill according to copy received few days ago.

S. HARRIS EXPORT CO., Ltd.
WILLIAM FORSEY,
S. PIERCEY
S. TIBBO & SONS,
J. B. FOOTE & SONS, Ltd.,
J. B. PATTEN SONS, Ltd.

These six exporters stood by the original Bill. These exporters were the largest section of the fish merchants of the West Coast. Before dealing further with the point, the honorable speaker said he was going to make a few general remarks. This was not a perfect measure, and in his opinion, it was not a more perfect measure because the Committee of the Board of Trade could not get their way. There will always be differences until the exporters are of one mind, and when they are of one mind, that will be the beginning of the end. It was natural for fish merchants to differ—lawyers differ, doctors differ. In most cases laws are passed by majorities. The Board of Trade at present had a strength and a might which it never had before, and it could do more good than ever before. The trouble with the Board of Trade was that its own members knocked it, but the hon. gentleman wished to pay his compliments to the members of the Board of Trade who undertook this measure last January. As time went on, it seemed to him, that the Board would be the means of doing a great deal more good. A revival took place in the Board of Trade a few years ago, and since then Messrs. Horwood, Williams and Pratt, who had been presidents of the Board, all three live, industrious young business men, have

carried on the good work. He did not know whether the Bill came from Sir William Coaker or not. The Committee of the Board of Trade had worked hard and had an energetic young man who was making his mark in his profession, Mr. Gushue, as their legal adviser. Another thing he did not like was the clause on the third page which, first of all provided that no man should go into the exporting business unless he was prepared to ship five thousand quintals of fish. That had been changed to two thousand five hundred, but had everyone forgotten all the men in the world who had commenced in a very small way and had risen to do good business? A fish exporter had come to him and said, "Captain Kean, you have to look after this when it comes to the House," and the exporter stated his own case, that he was shipping fish for four years before he had got up to five thousand quintals, and had risen as high as forty thousand in one year. The question to be considered now was the desire of these men of Grand Bank to have that clause 13 deleted. The Bill provided for the standardization of our fish products. Was that not the same principle that provided the Pure Food law by which we are all governed. There was a day when we imported into this country No. 1 flour, No. 2 flour and No. 3 flour, and there was a little stopper in the head of every barrel so that we could get out the flour, and see what kind it was.

Since we have had the Pure Food laws was it not a fact that we could buy one thousand barrels and every barrel would be alike. That should be the case with this Bill, but to enact a clause such as Section 13 would be to defeat the very purpose of the Bill, because where one part of the country had to standardise the fish, another part may not. That would leave us in as bad a condition as hav-

ing no Bill of this sort at all. He moved that Clause 13 be struck out, and that the other clauses be numbered accordingly.

HON. MR. McNAMARA agreed with the last speaker. Clause 13 was an objectionable clause, especially when the objection was backed up with sentiments such as those in the telegram which had been read.

HON. SIR T. COOK wished to point out to hon. members that if they deleted this Clause, they put the Bill out of existence. What suited the north did not suit the south and vice versa, and this section gave every part of the Island a chance to do as it liked. If the Bill was objectionable to any part of the country, that part need not come under its scope. This was a chance to make a beginning—it may be a good beginning. We could not have too drastic legislation; everyone knew the result of that type of law. He thought it wise to try out the Bill as it was.

HON. CAPT. KEAN said it was quite true that what suited the north did not suit the south, but here were six principal exporters of the west coast saying that this did not suit them, and he thought the Legislature should comply with their request.

HON. SIR T. COOK stated that, in any cases, the representatives of West Coast in the House were in favor of this section, and if this were cut out the whole Bill would be lost.

HON. MR. JOB felt that this clause was a compromise. It was an absurd clause, and if the Bill were passed, it meant passing an absurd clause, but if it were deleted and the Bill lost we might be losing something of benefit.

HON. CAPT. KEAN replied that if the House of Assembly did not accept

the amendment, the result would be a deadlock, and there would be no Bill passed this session.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK suggested that, as the Bill allowed different sections of the country to do as they wished, it would be better not to amend the Bill.

HON MR. McNAMARA said he would like to see the Section struck out. One honorable gentleman said the Bill was ridiculous as it was, and it would be indeed ridiculous with this section in it.

HON. MR. MURPHY thought this important Bill should not be brought in at the last moment, because an amendment would mean a few more days for the Government to keep the House open, we must lose the Bill.

HON. CAPT. KEAN felt it was far better to kill the Bill and know its death than let it die slowly outside.

On the amendment being put, it was carried. The Committee rose and ported the Bill having passed with some amendments. It was then read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to the effect that the Council had passed the same with some amendments.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Grenfell Association Bill as follows:

Mr. President, this is a private Bill. The International Grenfell Association asked for a grant of land on the Labrador. By an Act of Parliament passed some years ago the land could not be granted other than by the Legislature, consequently this Bill has been introduced. The Bill as originally submitted by the Association gave them the shore down to high water mark, and also the banks of the

stream that flowed through the property. This was changed in the House o' Assembly and a reservation of two hundred feet from high water mark made in favor of the public. Reservation of one hundred feet on each side of the stream and on the shore of a pond included in the property were also arranged for. The recitals of the Bill explain just what it is all about. Those recitals read as follows:

"Whereas by the Act 18 George V, "Chapter 11, it is provided that "from and after the passing thereof "no grant of land on Labrador ex- "ceeding fifty acres shall be given "save by an Act of Legislature of "this Dominion; and Whereas the "International Grenfell Association, "an association incorporated under "the laws of Newfoundland and hav- "ing its registered head offices in "the King George V Seamen's In- "stitute Building at St. John's, has "petitioned for a grant of land "situate at Cartwright and St. Mary's "River, Labrador, and hereinafter "more particularly described, for "the purpose of erecting thereon "a boarding school and hospital; "And Whereas the Association in- "tends to expend at Cartwright and "vicinity the sum of \$100,000 in the "construction of the said buildings "and in the clearing of land and the "establishment of a supply of water; "And Whereas it appears expedient "to accede to the prayer of the said "petition, etc."

I move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole Council. The Committee reported the Bill passed without amendment, and it was read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Municipal Bill, as follows:

Mr. President, the Bill as we have it before us here has had the unanimous approval of the House of Assembly. It was debated at length in that Chamber. All the sections and amendments of a controversial character were dropped. The Bill was a private Bill and went through its regular stages. In its original form it was submitted to a select committee, was considered at great length and modified to the form in which it now appears. I beg to move its second reading.

The Bill passed second reading, and was referred to a Committee of the Whole Council. Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. DAVEY wished information on the sections that were to be cut out of the Municipal Bill.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK explained that this would give the Council a little more power, and do things that other Councils could not do, but it did not give any extra authority, such as raising of taxes. It did give authority to do more effective work.

HON. MR. DAVEY objected to Section 28. Under that Section a Council could send an official who could demand a man's private papers.

HON. THE PRESIDENT pointed out that owners of property lease land at a certain rental, and then tell the Council that they are receiving a lower rental; that occurred very frequently when he was Mayor. Again, this Section was a protection to the owner, because the appraiser might value the land too highly.

HON. MR. DAVEY said he did not press his objection.

The Bill passed Committee stage without amendment, was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Hon. the President informed the Council that he had received a message from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed the Bills

"An Act to provide a National Flag for Newfoundland and Colors to be worn by Vessels";

"An Act to Alter the Title of the Colonial Secretary";

"An Act Relating to the Department of External Affairs";

"An Act to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging.' and

"An Act Respecting the Exportation of Marine Shells from Labrador and Islands Adjacent thereto,"

in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion these Bills were severally read a first time.

Council then took recess until 3.30 p.m.

The Council resumed at 3.30 p.m. after recess.

The Bill "An Act to Provide a National Flag for Newfoundland and Colours to be Worn by Vessels," was read a second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole Council. Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was then read a third time, and

ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that this Council had passed the same without amendment.

A Bill to alter the title of the Colonial Secretary passed second reading, and was referred to a Committee of the Whole Council. Hon. Mr. Bartlett in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was then read a third time, and a message was ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly to that effect.

In moving the second reading of the Bill Relating to a Department of external affairs, HON. SIR TASKER COOK explained that that did not create any new office, but that some official would take over everything appertaining to Imperial and foreign affairs. At the present time if we needed any information along these lines we had to secure it from Downing Street, and that was very unsatisfactory.

The Bill passed second reading and Committee stage, (Hon. Mr. O'Dea in the Chair) and was read a third time. It was ordered that the House of Assembly be informed to that effect.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the second reading of the Logging Bill, stating that it was very necessary legislation, had been thoroughly examined into by all parties connected with logging, and had their approval.

HON. MR. JOB considered it a dangerous piece of legislation to have the wages of employees specified, and asked if the employers were consonant with the Act.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK replied that several conferences had been held between contractors and men, and no protests had been made.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole Council. Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amendment. It was then read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly acquainting that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK moved the Second Reading of the Bill "An Act Respecting the Exportation of Marine Shells from Labrador and Islands Adjacent thereto."

HON. MR. McNAMARA said that when this Bill was before the House two or three years ago he had been opposed to it, but this particular Bill was an entirely different one, as it gives a monopoly for three years only. He understood that before there was another company negotiating, but that company has done nothing. As the matter stood, the Bill may be the means of some labour being given, and in any case the royalty amounted to \$5,000.

HON. MR. JOB said he supported the Bill, but it should have the same provisions to restrict operation as similar Bills. Freedom from taxation should not allow it to compete with other industries.

The Bill passed Committee stage without amendment, and was read a third time. It was ordered that a Message be sent to the House of Assembly to that effect.

HON. CAPTIAN KEAN said that in the morning he had moved as an amendment to the Salt Cod Fish Bill that Section 13 be struck out. That Section itself was an amendment moved by the Minister of Marine and

Fisheries in the House of Assembly, and he had understood that it had been carried by a small majority, but in that he had been wrong. There was grave doubt that if that amendment went, the Bill would be lost. Therefore, if it was possible to re-consider the matter and re-commit the Bill.

HON. MR. McNAMARA stated he could not conscientiously vote against a Bill in the morning and vote for it in the afternoon. The Section was just as objectionable then as it was earlier in the day. He would not withdraw his motion. He could not conceive how the Hon. member could change his mind in order to please a few politicians. If the members changed their minds now, they would make themselves ridiculous before the world.

The motion for re-committment of the Bill was carried, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole Council.

HON. MR. MILLEY read the message of protest from Burin and asked if no notice was to be taken of it; was the Bill to go through without a chance of seeing that these people get some kind of justice?

HON. SIR TASKER COOK replied that Section 13 had nothing whatever to do with the people who had sent the cable. The Section need not be enforced in any district if the people were opposed to it; but if the clause were eliminated there would be no Standardization Bill; and another year would go by without anything being done in the matter. He knew what the west coast had suffered in the past. This was an experimental Bill and he advised giving it a trial rather than remaining another year without making an effort to do something in the matter.

HON. MR. BARTLETT thought it better to vote for the Bill with Section 13 included rather than lose the Bill altogether. Some Standardization was required for matters had been lax in the past. It could be tried out for a year and if it did not work an improvement could be made in it next year.

HON. CAPTAIN KEAN explained that he was not in the habit of changing his mind every hour, but he had spoken in the morning under a misunderstanding; and he wished to take back what he had said. He understood that the motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was only carried by a majority of one and when the message came from Grand Bank he was informed that if this Council turned it down it would be given another decision in the Lower House; which is not the case. After due consideration, and having received the best information he found it was quite legal to do what he had done.

HON. MR. McNAMARA could not see why the decision of the morning was reversed. He referred to the regulations of the West Coast put through previously in this Council as being worse than the Bank Crash, and objected to coercion in the matter.

HON. SIR TASKER COOK said it was not the wish of anyone to coerce others; the districts were free to accept or reject the measure, but it seemed a pity to put obstacles in the way when standardization was being looked for.

HON. MR. BARTLETT thought that probably the west coast did not know about this Section 13. They had the option to do as they wished regarding it. Standardization was a necessity and if this measure were wrong it could be altered next year. He did not

consider it wise at this time to cut down the props from under it and have nothing.

HON. MR. JOB said he was in favor of cancelling the clause in the morning; and still considered it wrong. The clause was optional but if withdrawn the Bill was done. There cannot be standardization in one part of the country and not in another.

HON. MR. AYRE, while recognizing the weakness of Clause 13, considered that it was better to have the Bill than nothing at all; for it was at least an attempt to bring about the Standardization which was badly needed. If the amendment were passed the Bill would probably be lost, and as half a loaf was better than no bread, he felt that a first effort at Standardization should be made, and that from time to time the Act would be bettered.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON thought that all were of the opinion that attempts for Standardization were for the better. All knew the disaster of a few years ago when too stringent regulations were enforced.

HON. SIR M. G. WINTER stated he had voted against the Clause in the morning. If the Bill was likely to be lost in case that Clause were deleted, he was prepared to stand by it. It was better to have the Bill as it was than to have no Bill at all.

Clause 13 passed Committee without amendment.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed with an amendment. It was then read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a Message acquainting that Body that the Council had passed the same with an amendment.

The Council then adjourned until 11 a.m. Friday, May 15th.

FRIDAY, May 15th, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 11.30 p.m.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the Council that the Lower House had passed the Council's amendments to the Shell Bill, and the Salt Cod Fish Bill.

The Postal Telegraph Service Bill passed first and second reading and was referred to a Committee of the Whole Council. Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair. Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without an amendment. It was then read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to the effect that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Council then adjourned until 2.30 p.m. in order that the Shops Bill, should it pass the Lower House, might be considered before prorogation at 3 p.m.

The Council met after recess at 2.30 p.m.

The minutes were read and the Council took recess.

At 3 p.m. His Excellency Sir John Middleton, K.B.E., C.M.G., being seated on the Throne, commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, through the Honorable the President of the Legislative Council, to summon the members of the House of Assembly to the Bar of the Council, and they being there assembled, His Excellency was pleased to assent to the Bills passed during the session. His Excellency then made his Address from the Throne. After which the Honorable the President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor, declared the General Assembly prorogued.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY—

- Motion for, 6.
- Presentation of Select Committee Report, 13.
- Presentation of Address in Reply, 37.

AYRE, HON. MR.

- On Terra Nova Oils Mfg. Co., Ltd. Bill, 35.
- Public Service Bill, 54.
- On Salt Codfish Bill, 57, 64.

BARTLETT, HON. MR.

- On The Address to His Majesty the King, 22.
- Salt Codfish Bill, 63.

BILLS PASSED DURING 1931 SESSION—

- See Index House of Assembly.

COOK, HON. SIR TASKER

- On Resolution of Sympathy Hon. J. Anderson, M.L.C., 4.
- Resolution of Sympathy Hon. S. K. Bell, M.L.C., 4.
- Butler, Gander Valley Memorandum, 12.
- Congratulating Hon. Harold Macpherson, 13.
- "Viking" Disaster, 13.
- American Telephone and Telegraph Co. Bill, 15.
- Summary Jurisdiction Act 1930, 18.
- Sale of Securities Bill, 19.
- Canning of Rabbits and Other Food Bill, 19.
- Grading of Potatoes and Turnips Bill, 20.
- Report of Nfld. Patriotic Association, 21.
- The Address to His Majesty the King, 22, 55.
- Keeping of Dogs Bill, 23.
- Tax on Telegraphic Messages Bill, 24.
- Life Insurance Bill, 25.
- War Pensions Act, 28.
- Crown Lands Act, 29.

- Memorial University Bill, 31.
Terra Nova Oils Mnfg. Co., Ltd. Bill, 31, 35.
Customs Smelter Act, 32.
Bell Island Mail and Passenger Service Bill, 33.
Message of Sympathy to Sir John Bennett, K.B.E. and family, 34.
Message of Sympathy to Hon. Mr. Job, M.L.C., 34.
"Act to Amend the Criminal Law", 36.
St. John's Gas Light Co. Bill, 37.
Nfld. Hotel Facilities Bill, 38.
Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 39.
Public Health Bill, 39.
Act Respecting Arbitration Clauses, 49.
Act Respecting Reduction in Public Expenditure, 52.
Retiring Allowances Bill, 52.
The Revenue Act of 1925, 53.
The Public Service Bill, 53.
Salt Codfish Bill, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63.
Grenfell Association Bill, 60.
Municipal Bill, 61.
The Logging Bill, 62.
Marine Shell, Labrador, Bill, 62.

DAVEY, HON. MR.

- On Address in Reply, 10.
The Address to His Majesty the King, 22.
Municipal Bill, 61.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE—

- Personnel of, 14.

JOB, HON. MR.

- On Terra Nova Oils Mnfg. Co., Ltd. Bill, 32, 34, 35, 42.
Public Service Bill, 53.
Salt Codfish Bill, 57, 59, 64.
The Logging Bill, 62.
Marine Shell, Labrador, Bill, 62.

KEAN, HON. CAPT.

- On Thanking Members for Welcome Home, 22.
Terra Nova Oils Mnfg. Co., Ltd. Bill, 35, 42.
Loan Bill, 46.
Salt Codfish Bill, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63.
Labrador Marine, Shell, Bill, 62.

McNAMARA, HON. MR.

- On Welcoming Hon. Mr. Macpherson, 29.

Message of Sympathy to Hon. Mr. Job, M.L.C.
and to Sir John Bennett, K.B.E., 34.
Loan Bill, 45.
Salt Codfish Bill, 56, 58, 59, 60, 63.

MACPHERSON, HON. MR.

On Address in Reply, 6.
The Keeping of Dogs Bill, 26.
Salt Codfish Bill, 57, 64.

MILLEY, HON. MR.

On The Address to His Majesty, 22.
Loan Bill, 50.
Salt Codfish Bill, 63.

MURPHY, HON. MR.

On Resolution of Symathy of Hon. J. Anderson, 4.
American Telephone and Telegraph Bill, 18.
Terra Nova Oils Mnfg. Co., Ltd. Bill, 35.
Salt Codfish Bill, 60.

PRESIDENT, HON. THE

On Resolutions of Sympathy, Honourables John
Anderson, M.L.C. and Hon. S. K. Bell, M.L.C., 5.
The "Viking" Disaster, 14.
The Address to His Majesty, 22.
Message of Sympathy to Hon. Mr. Job, M.L.C., 34.
Summary Jurisdiction Act, 50.
Municipal Bill, 61.

PROROGUED, THE HOUSE, 64.

RESOLUTIONS OF SYMPATHY—

On Death Hon. John Anderson, M.L.C., 4.
Death Hon. S. K. Bell, M.L.C., 5.

REPORTS TABLED, 14, 21.

SINNOTT, HON. MR.

On Resolution of Sympathy Hon. S. K. Bell, M.L.C., 5.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE—

(For both Opening and Closing Day—see Index House of Assembly.)

STEER, HON. MR.

On Keeping of Dogs Bill, 27.

WINTER, HON. SIR M. G.

On Salt Codfish Bill, 64.