

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

DURING THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1915

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

1915

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NEWFOUNDLAND

1915

Printed and Published by the Government Printer, St. John's, Nfld., 1915.

PROCEEDINGS
of the
House of Assembly of Newfoundland

SESSION 1915

WEDNESDAY, April 7, 1915.

His Excellency having fixed the hour at which he proposed to open the present session of the Legislature at three of the clock in the afternoon of this Wednesday the 7th day of April, instant, the Members of the House of Assembly met in the Room at a quarter to three o'clock in the afternoon when Mr. Speaker took the chair.

At three of the clock a message from His Excellency the Governor was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, commanding the immediate attendance of Mr. Speaker and the House in the Council Chamber. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber, and, having returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that when in attendance on 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 purposes of greater accuracy, he had obtained, and which he then read to the House.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

The great War in which our Empire is engaged, and which, in order to provide for the Colony's participation therein, compelled your being convoked in Extraordinary Session last September, still continues. The progress of the struggle has been such thus far as to give Britons cause for pride in the achievements of the Naval and Military forces of the Empire, and in the splendid spirit of union, and co-operation manifested towards the Mother Country by the Dominions beyond the Seas. Equally have these events been such as to establish beyond doubt that Victory will in time crown the arms of Britain and her Allies, and secure to the world not alone a lasting peace, but also a protection against the unscrupulous ambition of militarist cliques in countries which have defied the civilizing spirit of the present age.

Under the terms of the measure enacted by you at the Special Session, the enlistment of a force for military service abroad was proceeded with. It

is a source of gratification to me, as it must be to you, that the response to the call for volunteers proved so large that the original number proposed was speedily doubled, and now bids fair shortly to be trebled. Signal honour has been paid to the First Newfoundland Regiment by the Imperial authorities, and all accounts agree that the men who have gone forward are doing credit to themselves and their country; while it is almost needless to express the confident belief that when their period of training is completed, and they undertake active service, they will acquit themselves in a manner that will leave nothing to be desired.

Concurrently with the creation of this force, the enlargement of the Newfoundland Naval Reserve, which my Ministers engaged to increase from Six Hundred to One Thousand men, was carried on, and it is equally satisfactory to know that the number was duly enrolled, and additions to this body are still being made. In this branch of our fighting force the Colony has already paid a substantial toll in human life, through the loss of three of His Majesty's ships containing complements of our men, but the relatives of those who have given their lives in the defence of the Empire will have the satisfaction of knowing that the sympathy of their fellow-countrymen goes out to them in the fullest measure, and may well be proud that in the greatest crisis in the history of the British race, sons of the Oldest Colony were found nobly doing their duty and sacrificing life itself beside their brothers of the parent land, and kindred Dominions.

You will be invited to consider a measure to provide financial assistance towards the maintenance of those who suffer partial or total disablement while on active service, or

to the dependents of those who lose their lives while so engaged. To this measure I am sure you will give your most generous and sympathetic consideration.

It is gratifying to observe that private philanthropy has already been enlisted with highly beneficial results on behalf of those whose ordinary sources of income are impaired or cut off by the absence of their breadwinners at the Front, and in this respect the generous contributions towards the Patriotic Fund attest anew the liberality of the people of Newfoundland, while the efforts of the Women's Patriotic Association on behalf of the sick and wounded in the War, and for the provision of comforts for our own forces, deserve equally favourable notice. Their zeal and self-sacrificing efforts will, I am satisfied, rank among the very best achieved by the women of any portion of the Empire.

The Colony, in common with the other portions of the Empire, has suffered in its Trade and Commerce, as the result of the War, but it is reassuring to remember that the fears entertained at the outbreak of hostilities, as to the possible dislocation of our business enterprises and the marketing of our staple products, have been dispelled and that, during the past half year, the prices realized for our codfish have been amongst the very best on record.

The unfavorable outlook of the Seal Fishery this year is to be regretted, but there is this cause for comparative satisfaction, that the escape of so many young seals will contribute to the conservation of this industry, so that while those engaged in the venture will lose the returns which it brings to them ordinarily, the potential wealth which the seal fishery re-

presents will be much enhanced in later years.

In view of the demand for foodstuffs to which the War has given rise, the greatly diminished prosecution of the deep sea fisheries in large areas, within the War zone and the withdrawal of great numbers of fishermen from their ordinary occupation, the prospect before our people for a profitable prosecution of the Cod and other fisheries of the Colony was never better, and there would seem to be therefore especially good ground for the belief that all those who will engage in fishing operations the present season will reap a liberal reward for the fruit of their labour.

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

The Revenue for the past fiscal year showed a deficit, the result of the depression which had been manifesting itself for some time previously in Newfoundland, as well as in other parts of the world. This condition of affairs was rendered more acute by the outbreak of the War, and for the current fiscal year an even greater shortage is apprehended. Towards reducing this adverse balance my Ministers propose to utilize the Cash Reserve provided for such emergencies, and proposals will be submitted to you for dealing with the amount which will remain to be liquidated.

Estimates for the Public Service will be laid before you at an early date. In view of existing conditions they have been prepared to meet only indispensable requirements. I invite consideration of them.

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

In July last His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught paid his promised

visit to the Colony. He called at Bay of Islands, Southern Labrador, Grand Falls and St. John's, and everywhere met with a most enthusiastic reception. In this City he took part in several important functions, and his visit will long be remembered, and will, I trust, be but the forerunner of others which may follow in the not distant future from other members of the Royal family.

As you are aware, a Royal Commission, appointed by His Majesty for the purpose of enquiring into and reporting upon the natural Resources of the Self-governing Dominions, has been pursuing its investigations for the past three years, and during last season visited Newfoundland in pursuance of this task. The Commissioners held sittings in St. John's and took evidence in regard to our resources and industries, and also visited Bell Island, and the centres of the Paper Industry in the Exploits Valley. The Report of the Commission has recently been issued, and I trust will prove not alone of interest but of profit to the Colony.

In response to a request by my Ministers that the Fishery Board of Scotland would place at their disposal the services of one of its experts to enquire into and report upon the fishery possibilities of the Colony, one of its inspectors was despatched here in the early months of 1914, and spent some weeks amongst us closely observing our fishery methods and the habits of the various fishes that resort our shores. His report, a copy of which will be laid before you, will probably appeal strongly to those interested in the fishing industry, and may, I trust, form a basis for practical action at your hands.

As announced to you a year ago, Professor Wyndham R. Dunstan, the head of the Imperial Institute in Lon-

don, was invited to undertake such an examination of the Colony's mineral wealth as was possible during such time as he could spend in the Colony, and he devoted several weeks to this mission last year, visiting different parts of the Island and studying the mineral formations. The intervention of the War has delayed his report thereon, but I am hopeful that it will be received in time to allow of its being submitted to you before the present session closes, and I feel confident it will prove of no small value in assisting all to arrive at an estimate of Newfoundland's possibilities as a mineral producing country.

A year ago a Joint Committee of both branches of the Legislature undertook an investigation of Fishery problems of pressing importance, but, being unable to complete the work before the session closed, the gentlemen composing it were appointed a Commission under the Great Seal to continue these labours and report at the present session. That report will be laid before you in due course, and you will be asked to give effect by enactments to the recommendations contained therein.

Under the authority of the Act passed at the Special Session, a Commission was appointed to enquire into and report upon the circumstances attending the death of members of the crew of the steamer Newfoundland, and the loss of the steamer Southern Cross and her whole crew; the manner of prosecuting the Sealfishery, and the provisions made for conserving the health, comfort and safety of the persons engaged therein, so as to ascertain the causes which have contributed to the above disasters, and which may possibly contribute to the causing of others in the future, and to suggest such remedial measures as may be desirable to render similar dis-

asters unlikely hereafter. That Commission, after an exhaustive enquiry, has made a very full report, which will be submitted to you, together with a measure designed to ensure greater safety to our people engaged in this occupation.

Negotiations are in progress between my Ministers and a Corporation which proposes to establish in this Island and on Labrador an industry of exceptional magnitude involving the expenditure of many millions of dollars in the developing of our water powers and the utilizing of some of our valuable natural resources in the manufacture of a variety of commodities. The enterprise promises to be one affording new avenues of employment for great numbers of our people, and serving as an auxiliary for our staple industry. To this and other measures dealing with undertakings of lesser scope your early attention will be invited.

In leaving you now to your deliberations in a session which marks a unique period in the history of the Colony and the Empire fraught with momentous possibilities for our future, it is with special solicitude that I invoke Divine guidance for your labours.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. DOWNEY.—In undertaking to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor has opened the present Session of this Legislature, I would take the occasion to say that not only does this Legislature and the people of this country, but that the great majority of public opinion throughout the world, deplores as sincerely as we do the calamitous war that is now progressing and a reference to which constitutes the first paragraph in the Speech from the Throne.

Those who have read carefully the State papers, dealing with the war and the causes that have led up to it, that have been submitted to the public by Great Britain and her Allies, can come to no other conclusion than that the present war was unrighteously and wantonly precipitated by Germany, her motive being the selfish one of self-aggrandizement at the expense of the weaker powers and, if possible, of the humiliation of our own Empire. I am no doubt exhibiting a considerable degree of temerity in daring to differ with so many others in ascribing to Germany one special motive for precipitating the war at the moment that she did. It is true, no doubt, that Germany's object is self-aggrandizement, and for the struggle that should come before this could be attained she has been preparing for decades, but my reading of Germany's motives convinces me that Germany delayed as long as she dare delay with any hope of eventually winning the war that should be fought and won to ensure the realization of her hopes. Germany's status as a military and naval power was greater than that of any single Continental power, and, possibly, fully as great as any two of them combined. Her expansion from a military and naval aspect was also almost immeasurably greater than that of any other Continental power, and had she but those antagonists to reckon with she could have calmly afforded to wait the measure of development that would have ensured victory to her. But fortunately for Europe and for humanity there was one country whose rate of development vastly exceeded even that of Germany; this is our own Empire.

Germany prophetically foresaw that the day was fast approaching when no antagonist could reckon upon dealing single-handed with Great Britain as a foe; that the rapid development of Britain's daughter nations, Canada,

Australia, South Africa and New Zealand, leaving out our colossal ally, the Indian Empire and its tributary states, would in the course of another decade or two have so commercially and in point of population dominated the world as to mean the annihilation of all Germany's hopes. If the war, that she hoped was to secure her a predominant position in Europe, was not immediately fought, so that the great potential strength that would have come to Britain a few years hence might be anticipated and discounted.

Germany's preparations were undoubtedly methodical, far-reaching and heroic, and I think it may be safely said without any disparagement of our brilliant Allies, that but for our entrance into the war to prevent the realization of the unholy aims of Germany, very possibly her ends would have been achieved.

At the present time I don't think there can be any person competent of forming an impartial and just opinion of the conduct and trend of the hostilities now being carried on, who can come to any other conclusion than that this war must terminate, and will most likely terminate, within the period of the present year with absolute and unqualified victory for ourselves and our Allies, and it will be our duty when this is attained, in the interest not alone of Europe but of the universe and of humanity, to effect peace upon such conditions as will ensure the peace and tranquility of Europe for a century hence.

The Speech from the Throne speaks in most favourable terms of the highly gratifying result from our effort to extend aid to the Mother Country in the present struggle. I am justified in congratulating the country, which justified this Legislature in the extra session held a few months back, upon the spirit of loyalty which dictated the policy that enabled us to contrib-

ute a quota of men for both land and sea services of the Empire, fully as great proportionately as that of any of the great Overseas Dominions, and this generous response upon our part to the call of the Motherland will have the result of placing us upon an equality with the great Overseas Dominions in the membership of the British Empire.

I would take this opportunity further to congratulate the fathers and mothers and families of those who have volunteered as seamen and soldiers on the spirit of self-sacrifice they have exhibited, and on the meritorious work that we are assured, upon the best authority, they have performed since entering upon active service, and with the progress of the war and its victorious conclusion I have no doubt whatever that they will establish a record that will reflect credit upon themselves and upon this country, and no effort that we can make to protect those who have so volunteered in the defence of home and country, from any ill-effects that may follow from the dread possibilities to which they are exposed, will be grudged.

I would also extend my sincere sympathy to the families of those who have thus far lost their lives in the service and devotion to their country that they have exhibited, and I am convinced that a practical expression of this sympathy will emanate in due course from this House. The readiness with which our young men have and are responding to the call of Country is beyond all praise. The continued needs of the Empire seem but to increase the spirit of loyalty that has been manifested from the first, and I have no doubt that so long as country calls, the people of this country will be ready to respond.

The Speech from the Throne further intimates that a measure will be in-

troduced providing assistance for those who may suffer disablement by accident or illness during the prosecution of the war, and I feel sure that I am absolutely safe in predicting that this measure when introduced into this Parliament will meet with an unanimous, patriotic and generous support.

Not alone have we as a people contributed our sons to the cause of the Empire, but we have also made heroic efforts in contributing towards the comfort of all those engaged in the present struggle. To the ladies of this country it would be, I think, impossible to afford the measure of praise that their great efforts entitle them to. It is further gratifying to know that these efforts were given without any regard to subsequent recognition, and that all that has been done by the Patriotic and other Associations working towards this end, have been done in the spirit of loyalty to the Empire that reckons not the cost of doing, but desires only to do its utmost.

We have been further informed in the Speech from the Throne that in common with other portions of the Empire the country suffered in its trade and commerce during the early stages of the war, but that it is reassuring to remember that the fears entertained at the outbreak of hostilities, as to the possible dislocation of our business enterprises, were entirely unwarranted, and we are thankful to Providence that through the fighting qualities of our seamen and the marvelous preparedness and efficiency of our Fleet, that the intentions of the enemy to dislocate our commerce and so effect the ruin of our trade have been thwarted, and that to-day we are in the proud position of being able to do business as usual, whilst the enemy's trade and shipping have been driven from the seas.

The next paragraph in the Speech refers to the very unfavourable out-

look in connection with the prosecution of the present sealfishery. This is undoubtedly a matter of regret, but it may be but a blessing in disguise, as very many amongst us are imbued with the belief that the conservation of the sealfishery calls for the giving thereto of a period of rest—in other words, of the imposing of a close time of one or more seasons duration. If this belief be warranted, their desires will have been partially met by the results of the present season's fishery, as it can now, I fear, be safely assumed that a very large proportion of this year's young seals will escape, and in a year or two will serve to recruit the ranks of the breeding members of the seal herds, and that we will be reimbursed by the increased catches of the future for our loss in the present year. I may say, parenthetically, that I am amongst the number of those who believe that the preservation of our sealfishery calls for the enforcement of a close time. My view of the matter is that for practically 25 or 30 years we have been killing off the entire herd of young seals each year, and that practically none escaped to replace those which, in the natural course of things, reached the limit of the procreative stage. There are to-day tens, possibly hundreds, of thousands of old seals who have gone beyond that stage, and it is very questionable indeed if any considerable number of young have escaped for years past to recruit their ranks, so that to me it appears quite possible that any year we may suddenly find the young seals so depleted in number as to make the prosecution of the voyage unprofitable. I earnestly hope that this theory of mine will not pass into realization, but should it unfortunately be the case I certainly will not be surprised at the result.

The paragraph in His Excellency's Speech dealing with the probable exceptionally keen demand for food-

stuffs is one that appeals to us in a two-fold character. First, as owing to the large areas in Europe now being occupied by hostile armies, and owing to the very large numbers of men that are withdrawn from industrial life for military purposes, it follows that the acreage under wheat will be very materially reduced, and that where a normal crop may be obtained there will be great difficulty, owing to the scarcity of labor, in harvesting it, so that it may safely be assumed that the price of wheat must become abnormally high, and as it seems a foregone conclusion that there can be no cessation of hostilities at least before late August or early September, when it would be too late to plant, the high prices must inevitably continue until well into the next year, and as we of this country consume per capita more flour than, perhaps, the people of any other country, it behooves us to take any step possible that will enable us to reduce the present very large consumption of flour.

The most ready and practicable means that suggests itself for the accomplishment of this object here is by our people planting more largely than usual of potatoes in the coming spring. There can be no doubt that from 50 to 150 thousand barrels more can be raised than are being raised at present and as food value of potatoes compared to flour is reckoned as being $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, an additional 30,000 or 100,000 barrels to the crop would materially lessen our flour bill, but if the high cost of wheat affect us adversely, as it will to a certain extent, we can reasonably expect compensation in the equally high prices that our fish may be expected to command in the coming year.

Owing to the destruction of a number of fishing vessels and owing to the large number requisitioned by the

Imperial Government for war purposes, and owing as well to the Dollar Bank being within the zone of operations of German submarines, fishery operations there are entirely suspended; the French fisheries, too, were practically abandoned, so that there should be a greater dearth of fish in Europe in the coming year than has been experienced since the days of the Peninsular War when, we are told on good authority, our fish reached the highest price ever attained in the history of this country, and which abnormally high prices, it is quite possible, may repeat themselves in the coming year. It does not do, however, to depend upon these to recoup us for the additional expenditures that we may be called upon to make in the providing of other requisite foodstuffs, but it is gratifying to know that if the high prices must prevail, that for us, at least, there is a silver lining to the cloud, and that we may reasonably hope to be largely reimbursed through our fish for what we will be called upon to pay for other commodities.

It is regrettable to be informed, as we are in the Speech, that there is a deficit in the present year's revenue. There seems to be something prophetic in the time-honoured adage that "coming events cast their shadows before them", and it would appear to have been verified in the case of the present war for the financial markets of the world felt in advance its depressing influence and a shortened consumption, and consequently lessened revenues, were in evidence almost the world over during 1913. We ourselves had a deficit in that year and in the present year it is now evident that a deficit will be again in evidence. Of course the large expenditure for war purposes that the Colony has been obliged to make is responsible in a large measure for the deficit in the present year, and from this ex-

penditure there was no escape. We had to dip our hands deeply in our pockets and contribute our quota of aid towards the sacred duty of keeping the Flag that has waved for a thousand years still waving and triumphant, and to transmit unimpaired and unscathed to our successors the noble and sacred heritage that we inherited from our forefathers. I am, therefore confident that the necessary steps to protect the country's financial interests that will be submitted to this House will meet with universal approval.

It is pleasing to know that every possible economy has been exercised by the Government in framing the Estimates for the coming year so as to reduce to the lowest figure our national expenditure.

The paragraph in His Excellency's Speech that recalls the visit of His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught, in the last summer conveys an assurance that this visit was enjoyed by the Duke and his party and we were equally pleased at the opportunity presented to us of exhibiting our loyalty and respect to the Royal family, and it is earnestly to be hoped, as the Governor expresses it, that the visit of the past year may be but the forerunner of many such pleasant reunions of Royalty and people and from which much can be expected in the way of assuring a continued permanency to the happy governmental system under which we exist.

We are also reminded in the Governor's Speech of the visit here a few months since of the Dominions Royal Commission that has been holding sittings in the chief Overseas Dominions in the past three years and from whose labours very many valuable reports upon the possible further consolidation of the Empire, and on the unification and development of its interests have reached the Imperial Gov-

erment and, through them, been submitted to the Dominions interested. Within the past few days an interim report dealing with Newfoundland has been received but sufficient time has not yet been given for a critical analysis of this report, still I do not think that there can be a doubt that much good can be expected to follow from the work of this Commission so far as it affects this country.

The next paragraph in the Speech is one of very considerable importance for us. It refers to the action of the Government in having induced the Scottish Fisheries Board to send one of their expert officials to this country to enquire into and report upon the possibilities of further development of our varied fisheries and when this Report is tabled, as it will be in the course of a few days, it will furnish much material for serious thought on our part towards devising methods for the realization of many of the valuable suggestions that the report offers. To me it appears eminently practicable that a most marked improvement may be effected in our Herring fishery. We are all more or less conversant with the magnitude of the Scotch Herring fishery and the great value of the product in the European markets and the very large measure of reward reaped by the fishermen and others interested in the prosecution of this fishery. It is impossible to convince me that we may not equally participate in a like measure of success and reward from the employment of improved methods in the prosecution of our own Herring fishery. We have the fish in abundance; we have undoubted assurance that they are fully the equal of, and possibly superior to, the Scotch herring. We have also the incontrovertible fact that in the past three years a certain few amongst us who have taken the requisite degree of care and

employed the required methods in both curing and packing have realized figures considerably over double the price that has been realized from the ordinary pack for many years past. What has thus been done by the few is quite possible for us to make practicable for all those engaged in this taining the necessary instructing industry if we but determine to place within their reach the means of action and the other requirements that go to ensure a pack that will be accepted in the foreign markets as being equal to Scotch cure. I know that in the past year some packers in the District that I have the honor to represent have sold their herring for \$9 a barrel and those who had but a thousand barrels to sell were asked to supply thirty thousand. I need not enlarge upon this subject. Every honorable member of this House can picture for himself the beneficial result that would accrue from the cure and pack of our entire annual herring catch in the manner that would enable the realization of such prizes.

The Governor next reminds us that Professor Dunstan, an eminent English scientist, who visited the country last year with the view of personally examining and reporting upon the possibilities in our mineral wealth, devoted his personal attention during several weeks to this work but that the unfortunate outbreak of the war has delayed the expected report from Professor Dunstan, but it is gratifying to know that sufficient has been ascertained to warrant our expecting a very favorable report from Professor Dunstan, and from the reputation which he has and from the confidence with which his statements are accepted by capitalists, it is not too much to hope that the publication of his report when it reaches us will result in the development of a new interest in our natural resources that will result

advantageously to the Colony in the employment here of capital for the retrieving from nature of the vast quantity of valuable minerals which are now lying dormant in our soils.

The Governor conveys to us the pleasing assurance that the Joint Committee of both branches of the Legislature that was appointed in the last Session, and which sat as a Commission after the Session closed, has reported and that this report will be tabled during the present session. This report, too, should contain for us much that will call for the most serious consideration and it is to be hoped—as it may reasonably be expected—that from the character of the man who composed this Commission a report will reach this House that will recommend only such improvements as will be found practicable.

We also have the assurance from His Excellency that the Commission appointed under the authority of the Act passed in the last Session to enquire into the lamentable loss at the sealfishery of 1914 has concluded its labours and that its report will be tabled during the present Session. I have no doubt that this Legislature will give every consideration to this report and will act promptly upon any suggestions therein that will tend towards the minimising of the marine dangers to which our people are exposed, so that we may, reasonably hope, so far as human precautions can ensure it, to be exempt from repetitions of such dire disasters in the future.

The concluding paragraph in His Excellency's Speech conveys the pleasing assurance to us that at the present time negotiations are being actively carried on between the Government and a wealthy scientist, a Mr. Willson, of Ottawa, with a view to the establishing in Newfoundland of an industry of vast dimensions and one

that it is most earnestly to be hoped that the Government will do its utmost to encourage, as the establishment of such an industry here will mean far more for us industrially than any or possibly all the other industrial enterprises that have so far been exploited. Very many of us are aware of the benefits that accrue to this country from the creation of the Grand Falls industries, but I think it will become self-evident, as the details of this scheme will be submitted to this House, that the realization of this project holds more for us than all that we have hitherto attained in an industrial way. This industry is intended to compass the concentration of the water powers of a certain section of the country to an extent sufficient to furnish power for mechanical operations of the greatest magnitude. These I believe, I am correct in stating comprise the manufacture of fertilizers and of pulp, and as I am speaking on the authority of the Engineer, upon whose advice Mr. Willson and the other capitalists are proceeding, my statement that the expenditure comprised in the realization of this scheme embraces the stupendous total of from ten to eleven million dollars, may be taken as accurate. The damming and linking-up of the water powers in contemplation will alone call for an expenditure of six million four hundred thousand dollars (\$6,400,000) and the mills for the reduction and incorporation of the different constituents that go to produce the finished fertilizing product will call for a further expenditure of \$4,000,000, and as the requisite yearly income from this enterprise to cover alone the interest on the capital and to provide for depreciation must be at least a million dollars or more, it follows that the volume of labor to be employed must be exceptionally large and as all that any country

requires to ensure its prosperity is a sufficiency of remunerative labor for its operative population. It would appear to be a foregone conclusion that our condition must be most materially improved economically when this enterprise will, as I am reasonably confident it will, become an accomplished fact in the course of the coming few years.

It is further pleasing to us to know that a second industry that promises to be of very material importance to us is also under the Government's consideration at the present time. This is with a Company which undertakes the handling of a portion of our annual fish catch for the American markets through the medium of cold storage. Cold storage from the repeated attempts to grapple with it practically has become a somewhat hackneyed expression and I will await a submission of this Company's sought for charter to the Legislature before dealing with it in detail but I may say that personally I have been for years convinced of the entire practicability of a very large cold storage business in fish being done between Newfoundland and the American Continent. I have time and again stated to this House and, through the press, to the public, some of the peculiar advantages that would accrue to our fishery through the introduction of cold storage as a factor in the disposal of our annual catch. It must suffice for the present for me to remind this House that the special advantage of cold storage is that it imparts a marketable value to a large per centage of our annual catch that is now, and which must continue to be, treated as offal, whilst we adhere solely to the time-honoured dry-curing method universally employed. As I have previously stated in this House it takes 502 pounds of split fish to

make a dry quintal of 112, whereas when sold through the medium of cold storage every ounce of this 502 pounds is a marketable commodity.

I need not go into further detail to convey to the practical minds of Honorable members of this House what the realization of marketable prices will mean to the fishermen of this country for the large volume of fish that by present methods is treated merely as offal.

The concluding paragraph in His Excellency's speech expresses the hope that Divine Providence will guide us in our labours and I hope I am not arrogating anything to myself in supplementing that generous wish by expressing the desire that I certainly hope that during the present session every honourable member of this Chamber will consider that the honor and traditional dignity of the House rests in his hands: that there will, I hope, be no occasion for a display of acrimonious debate, or violent language or unseemly anger or vituperation of any kind; that each and every one of us will be imbued with loyalty and courtesy to one another, and that we will give our best efforts to the various measures submitted to this House for the development of the country and the improvement of the people.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion before this House, I hardly know where to begin. My hon. friend, Mr. Downey has delivered such an able address and has so fully gone through the Speech from the Throne that perhaps I had better turn to another matter; and I take this opportunity in the first place, and I feel it my duty as a parent to thank His Excellency and Lady Davidson, and also the Patriotic Association of the country and Sir Edward Morris and the other gentlemen

in connection with the Committee formed for the comfort and reception of our boys across the water. I say, Sir, that on behalf of the volunteers and their parents I feel it my duty to put this before the House, and I also think it my duty on their behalf to thank one and all in connection with these Committees. We appreciate what was done, and recognize the fact that every effort was put forward for the comfort and solace of our volunteers. I say, Sir, that when the call came "To Arms!" "To Arms!" there was a noble response through the country from East and West and North and South—in fact all over the Empire—and we must not forget that our mothers and grandmothers plied the needle to fit them out with comforts. Why, Sir, I am overcome with emotion when I think of these old ladies plying their needles and knitting hundreds of pairs of socks and cuffs for our boys. It demonstrated this fact, that they are the stock from which we came, the English, Irish and the Scotch. I feel, Sir, I cannot dwell much along the line of warfare today for reasons I need not mention here; but I would ask the patience and indulgence of the House while I refer to one or two matters in connection with the fisheries. It may be of interest to members of the House and our friends, and particularly our young people if I read a note or two in connection with the Canadian Fisheries.

Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the Fishery Commission appointed at the last Session of the Legislature. I note that the Report of that Committee will be tabled in a little while. I may say for the information of my hearers that this extract I propose to read is from a paper devoted to the young, and the heading of the article is: "Increasing

Canada's Income Through Her Fisheries," by J. J. Cowie of the Department of Naval Service Ottawa. I read this to show how the fisheries of Newfoundland could be increased by proper attention, and by being fostered, and by everyone trying to pull together for the benefit of the Colony and the advancement of the revenue.

"The fishing industry on the Pacific Coast is new compared with that on the Atlantic, but in a marvellously short time it has grown to such an extent that British Columbia now produces a much greater value of fish than any of the Atlantic provinces.

"The value of fish taken from all the waters of Canada to-day amounts to a sum of which we have every reason to be proud. I do not want to trouble your heads with long columns of dry figures, but a few figures showing how the industry has flourished in the course of the last 20 years, and the kinds of fish that contribute to our wealth, may not be out of place.

"In 1890 the total value of our fisheries was \$17,714,962; in 1900 it was \$21,557,639; in 1910 it was \$29,965,433; while in the season of 1913, the last year for which we have complete figures, it was \$33,207,748. To the latter total the sea fisheries contributed \$29,472,811, and the various inland fisheries, \$3,734,937.

"By Provinces we had the following results in 1913:—

British Columbia	\$13,891,398
Nova Scotia	8,297,626
New Brunswick	4,308,707
Ontario	2,674,685
Quebec	1,850,427
Prince Edward Island	1,280,447
Manitoba	606,272
Saskatchewan	148,602
Alberta	\$1,319
Yukon	68,265

"The salmon fishery of British Columbia is our greatest individual pro-

ducer of wealth, while the lobster and cod fisheries of the Atlantic come next in order.

"The value of a few of the chief kinds of fish caught during 1913 may be given here:—

Salmon	\$10,833,713
Lobsters	4,710,062
Cod	3,387,109
Herring	3,173,129
Hallbut	2,036,400
Mackerel	1,280,319
Whitefish	927,962
Haddock	841,511
Smelts	810,392
Sardines	676,668

The article goes on to say there are in all about 100,000 persons engaged in the fisheries. It continues:—"In addition to these there are a vast number of people, such as ship-builders, sailmakers, rope makers, coopers, teamsters, etc., who earn a livelihood indirectly through the fisheries. And if you take into consideration the families of those directly or indirectly engaged in this work, you discover that a very large proportion of the people of Canada are really dependent for their daily bread on the operations of our hardy toilers of the deep."

Now, for the sake of comparison, let us look at our own exports for the year ending June 30th, 1914. We exported fishery products amounting to \$10,907,687, or in round numbers, \$11,000,000. Now, Sir, I would like to point out, and we must not lose sight of the fact, that in addition to the eleven million dollars worth exported, we have a very large home consumption. There is a very large consumption all around our coast, east, west, north and south, and I would judge that it can be valued at not much less than a million dollars. Now, I am sure that if we had some way here to foster and encourage our fisheries, by encouraging our young people in the way that Canada is do-

ing, it would be of great benefit. There are some people, and I have known them, who are ashamed to acknowledge their calling. I am not a fisherman myself, but I am the son of a fisherman: I am a mechanic, and I am not ashamed of my calling. No man, no matter who he is, need be ashamed of his calling. Every calling in life is honourable, provided it is carried along on moral and social lines, and every man, I care not who he is, should stick to his business, put his energy into it and be not ashamed of his legitimate calling. We want our lawyers and our professional men, and our military men—our Kitcheners—and we want our boys in blue and our volunteers.

I must apologise, Mr. Speaker, for again approaching the subject of war, but at the present time it is a subject that occupies our minds to a great extent; although I hope it will soon terminate, and that victory will perch on our banners.

In connection with our fisheries and the Canadian figures I have just quoted, I want to point out that we have 40,000 men engaged in them, while in Canada, according to the figures of the Department, there are 100,000 men. They export about \$33,000,000, while our fisheries are worth about \$12,000,000; and I think we should make every effort to further foster and encourage this industry, and hold what we have got.

Now, Sir, there is another matter I want to refer to, and I do not wish to delay the House. I simply wish to rectify a mistake regarding recruiting at Harbour Grace. I would like to pay a tribute to the gentlemen who came out to encourage recruiting. They did a noble work. They went around amongst the people, and some of them at their own expense, to try and forward the recruiting movement. Now some misconception has arisen regarding recruiting in the District

I have the honour to represent. I have obtained a copy of the recruiting figures from the Magistrate, and while I do not wish the House to infer that we did anything more than our share, or even that we did enough, I want to see the District I represent getting credit for what it has done. I think that is only right on my part. We have over 100 naval reservists gone to the front from our district. We also had another hundred as recruits for the First Contingent from the District, and thirty more from Bay Roberts. In round figures, we had over two hundred, not counting those who enlisted in St. John's. These young men that I have referred to joined hands with others from all over the country, and to-day they are across the water or going to leave before long; and we wish them God-speed and God's protection; and we trust that the issue will be victory, and we can only hope that our boys will have a safe return. We read in the Good Book that 32,000 men or more mobilized for certain purposes; but the honour and glory fell to men who trusted in a Higher Power, and victory came to 300, whose watchword was: "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon." I felt my blood tingle as I read an account of the Canadian troops' conduct in one of the battles in France. The order was given, and they charged with a rush and drove back the enemy with shouts of "Canada and Old England." Sometimes when I lie at rest I see our boys lined up, and I think I hear the order given, and I see our boys rushing forward with the battle-cry of "Newfoundland and Old England."

Mr. Speaker, I have a painful duty to perform. Of those who went down in the Viknor and Clan McNaughton, six came from the district I have the honour to represent; and I must not forget also three of our soldier boys who died in hospital, making in all

sixty-five from Newfoundland who have already given their lives. I feel sure that this House tenders its deep sympathy to their parents and relatives. They died at their post, it may have been in conflict with the enemy, or the storm. What of the storm of to-day? The calm of to-morrow whispers a requiem, which lessens the tension of grief. The day will come when they shall come forth to their reward, having died for a righteous cause. There is not a true British heart pulsating in this House or in the Empire but will join with me in saying:—

"God save our Empire now
And never let her bow
At tyrant's knee.
Preserve her; strong for right
And ever brave to fight,
Defending truth with might,
While Empires be."

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, before I refer to the Speech from the Throne, I must mention the two addresses which we have just heard. I think that Mr. Downey should be complimented on his carefully considered speech; and also Mr. Parsons, whose heart, as we all know, is in what he said, and who put so much fire and enthusiasm into his remarks. I am sure no one was disappointed in the manner in which they addressed the House. They acquitted themselves in a manner that we would have expected them to do.

As we meet here to-day our minds are naturally filled with the great war that is being fought out in Europe. When we met here last in September, it was with a view to providing measures whereby the Government might have legislative sanction for such action as it might deem necessary in case of an emergency. At that time, the situation in Europe was critical; we felt somewhat anxious; the German army was rushing on Paris, and

had not yet been checked by the allied forces, its result was still uncertain. Since then, however, events have developed which have rendered the British people confident of ultimate victory.

The issues of the present war are so vital that they cannot be decided in any way but by a decisive victory. You know sir, that the issues that are involved, are not those of mere material conflict of interests. They are of a far more vital character. Great Britain and her allies are waging war against a domineering militarism; she represents the role of law and justice as against a civilisation which upholds the supremacy of force and state expediency. The two are irreconcilable, and not until we have a complete victory, and German militarism is crushed, can we have a permanent peace.

The war was started by a deliberate act of aggression on the part of Germany; an act which was a violation of sacred promises and the rights of a small country of which Germany had undertaken to guarantee the neutrality. Nor is this an isolated act of injustice. Since we met here last, Germany has almost daily committed gross violations of international law; her conduct in respect to neutral countries has been outrageous. These things we see continually referred to in the daily papers. In the meanwhile Germany has been nursing her fleet in the Kiel Canal issuing out only to kill defenceless women and children; sending air craft across to drop bombs upon unfortified towns, and then there is the submarine blockade of the English coast, the sinking of unarmed ships and drowning of their crews. Never before in the history of civilisation have such outrages been recorded. Every rule of the sea has been outraged. When merchantmen

are captured in war time, it has always been customary that they be taken to port and given a fair trial before the Prize Court but these German pirates not only sink liners in mid-ocean but do not give the passengers and crew an opportunity of escaping. This outrage has never been heard of before in history; much less in these times of modern civilisation. We have many instances of those on board merchantmen not being allowed to escape, and consequently losing their lives. At the present time Great Britain rules the seas, and controls the commerce of the world, and in view of what has happened her action in instituting a blockade and preventing food stuffs from going to Germany is amply justified. She would not have taken such measures, but was compelled to do so by the action taken by the German Government.

There is no question, but that we have before us a long struggle, nevertheless we are determined to win, and win we must. The war has not yet reached that stage when responsible statesmen can talk of or even consider peace or terms of peace. The principles of international law are at stake, and not until the rights that have been taken from Belgium are restored, will terms of peace be discussed.

One of the great facts that stand out in connection with the war is the unity which has been displayed by the British Empire in this gigantic struggle between right and wrong. We have seen every dominion and colony of the Empire contributing gladly to the fullest extent of its resources. Newfoundland has contributed its best manhood to the great war that is in progress. We, here in this country, have done our share. Already one thousand volunteers and an equal

number of naval reservists have gone forward, freely, and with a high patriotism to give their lives, if need be, for the great cause in which we are all so much concerned. We sincerely hope that they will return in time of victory. Already some of our young men have paid their last tribute while guarding the coast of the Old country in His Majesty's ships. I think that the names of these men, which have been recorded, will be written in the heroes' book of Newfoundland.

In dealing with the matters that we shall consider here during the coming session, we must bear in mind that the Empire is at war. The responsible ministers of the crown will receive no opposition from this side of the House, concerning any measures dealing with matters arising out of the war, or which are intended to alleviate the stress and strain that is on our people as a result of the war. But we must remember the people who sent us here and do our duty toward them. The more strenuous the times, the greater the responsibility and the greater the need for fair criticism which the Government will surely receive at the hands of the Opposition. We cannot expect to do justice to the country if we do not thrash out the questions brought before the House. In matters unconnected with the war we shall do our duty and give such criticism as the occasion requires, though, I hope, without any bitterness or partisan feeling. It is not my intention to go through the various paragraphs of the Speech from the Throne; that will come in due course later on in the session as measures are brought in, when we shall have an opportunity of doing them justice. But, I wish to make some reference to the matters of finance which were mentioned in the

Speech. The war is imposing on us heavy financial obligations and it behooves us to make every preparation possible for them. As the war continues the obligations will be becoming greater. We find, according to the speech of the Governor, which of course, is in fact the statement of his ministers, that there is a deficit in the revenues of the colony. I remember correctly the deficit was in the neighbourhood of \$237,000 at June 30th last. The deficit at the end of the coming year will be larger still; a great deal larger than the balance of the reserve still left in the Bank of Montreal. But there is no indication in the Governor's speech. We shall probably have an explanation of that from the Prime Minister when he speaks. Another fact is the loss that would be caused by the almost total failure of the seal fishery; and of course that will greatly influence the revenue of the country by reducing the imports during the next few months. It is fortunate that commerce, during the past year, has not been interrupted by the war to the extent that was expected, and we hope that this state of affairs is going to continue.

The British fleet has opened the seas to us, enabling us to carry on commerce almost as usual. It is to be hoped that this will have a great effect upon the price of our fishery products, which should rise in sympathy with other food stuffs. This would have a great effect upon the imports from which the revenue is derived. It is especially necessary in the present crisis that the Government should adopt a plan of strict economy and if this is done there is no reason why the colony should not be able to meet all its ordinary obligations out of current revenue.

In conclusion, I think, I may

express the hope that when we meet here again, the war will be over, and that we shall be congratulating ourselves upon a decisive victory, and that the German factor in the world's affairs will have been eliminated by a radical operation. I think that even then when these happy conditions return, there will come heavy obligations arising out of the war. It will leave a sad legacy of widows and orphans, and of parents who have lost their sons. These will have to be provided for by means of pensions in keeping with the positions which these people fill. These point to the obligation on the Government, of a prudent administration of the finance of the colony, with a great responsibility attached.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Speaker, I desire to delay the House for a very few minutes to refer to two or three matters that have been engaging our attention this afternoon. In the first place, I desire to follow the lead of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, in congratulating the gentlemen who proposed and seconded the motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. I think that I can conscientiously endorse everything that the Leader of the Opposition has said in regard to both these speeches. Mr. Downey's was a carefully prepared speech dealing with all the important questions referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I am quite sure that it will be a source of information and value to us who have heard it, as well as to a larger audience that it will subsequently have when it appears in the public prints. I would also like to congratulate my friend, Mr. Parsons, on the very fine address that he has given. I am sure that every word he has uttered in regard to the part played by Newfound-

land in this gigantic struggle, came from the bottom of his heart, as was evidenced by the choice diction in which he couched the statements he uttered, and I am sure that the address will form a valuable contribution to the war literature of this country and will gladden the hearts of those who read it. And if congratulations are in order, I do not think that I can be considered as in any way going out of the regular course of my duty if I offer my congratulations to the learned Leader of the Opposition, on the very able address that he has delivered this evening. It was an address that was worthy of himself, one that those who know him would naturally expect him to make, one that was worthy of the position which he so ably occupies. It would be absurd for anyone on this side of the House to expect the Opposition, even in time of war, to abdicate its important functions of criticising affairs of public importance along reasonable lines. We as a Government have come here this session, to defend every possible action of the Government in relation to the carrying on of public affairs of the country, and all we expect is that we will receive that fair play from the Opposition which was such a marked feature of the last session, and which is a feature not alone of this country, but of the whole Empire and its parliaments in dealing with matters in connection with the war.

And now, before going to the immediate question before us, I should like to tender my congratulations to my friend, the junior member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, who has returned to this House this afternoon, after an absence of something like nine years. I was here as a junior member in 1886, and Mr. Morine followed me the year after, and for twenty years I was in the Legislature with him until he resigned in 1905 or

1906. I can bear eloquent testimony to the industry and ability displayed by him in all that twenty years; but my testimony is unnecessary, because the records of the House show the work he has done, and although we have differed on many matters of public importance and shall probably continue to differ, it is only just that I should on this occasion welcome him back. It is in no official sense that I do this, but from my heart that I extend to him my congratulations on his return. During the whole time that he has been here, with the exception of one or two years, my friend has been in Opposition, and perhaps he has got so fond of it that that is the reason he has selected the other side of the House on this occasion. I know his heart is with us here, and if he consulted his wishes entirely, he would be sitting on this side of the House. But he has elected to sit on the other side of the House as an independent member. I am sure that from time to time we will have the benefit of his wise counsel in dealing with matters that may come before the House.

There are one or two matters, Mr. Spenker, that I would like to say in regard to the fiscal question referred to by Mr. Kent. He said that the time has arrived when we should put our house in order, so that when any difficulty may arise we may not be found in any disadvantageous position. Well, I can say, Sir, that that is the most important, the principal matter with which the Government has had to deal, and that it will receive every consideration. I do not look at the financial situation of the Colony either from a Government or trade standpoint with any pessimism whatever. In fact, considering the circumstances through which we are living at the present moment, I can say that I look forward to the future with

every optimism. My learned friend has referred to the deficit in the public accounts at the end of the fiscal year last June. He is quite correct that there was a shortage in the revenue over expenditure on June 30th last, and when we were in session in September last I think it was estimated at \$240,000. But to be absolutely accurate, I think it will be found when the accounts were settled that it was nearer to \$300,000. The accounts were not complete when the session was held in September, and when the Auditor-General and those in charge of the financial affairs of the Colony completed their audit, it was found that the deficit was in the neighbourhood of \$300,000. That was met out of the liquid asset of the Colony held in the bank for years to meet such an emergency as this. I remember when that fund was started in the Bank by Sir James Winter's Government in 1898 or 1899. It began, I think, with \$270,000 and grew until it stood at \$500,000. It was an amount put in the bank to meet such an emergency as we now face, and it was very fortunate for the Colony that last June we had that fund there. It has been treated as trust money by every Government that ever came in, and no Government has touched it, no matter how much they may have been tempted, to expend it on public works. From that sum we have taken \$300,000 to meet the deficit, so that we began the year with \$200,000 intact. What the exact deficit next June will be it is impossible to tell. But whether or no it will be large, will depend to a large extent upon those who are engaged in the trade of the Colony, it will depend upon the purchasing power of the people, it will depend on the imports made into the country and these factors will all be affected by individual action. If people are timid, if people are fearful even to expend

their legitimate earnings and legitimate incomes, if people with money to spend practice economy where economy becomes a crime, then we will have a shortage of revenue. But if the supplying merchant will remember that this is a year when he ought to risk a little of the money that has been hoarded up in thousands and millions money that has been made out of the country and out of the fisheries, if he will remember that this is the time to remember the condition of the country, the scarcity of labour, the existence of poverty, and hardship, and if he will spend his money in the importations that are necessary for the trade of the country then we will have no deficit. But if the supplying merchant says that this is a year when economy must be practiced, if every man who has a job to do puts it off because of a false idea of economy, if every man who wants a new coat prefers to go round in his old one because of fear of over-expenditure, then we will have a deficit. I hope there will be no deficit, but even if there is a deficit, we will probably get round the corner all right. We will probably find funds to meet it along legitimate lines and in ways that will not be questionable, but will be justifiable. We might have had more money to our credit if this war could have been anticipated. It was never contemplated a year or two ago. If we could have anticipated that we were to be plunged into this gigantic enterprise, then we might have added another million to our liquid asset in the bank. During the years that we were in office previous to the last election from 1909 to 1912 we had surpluses of nearly \$900,000. In the year 1909 there was a deficit of \$160,000. We had nothing to do with that. We had nothing to do with the expenditure of that year. The next

year we had a surplus of \$460,000. I think the next year it was \$270,000. Next year it was \$160,000. In other words between 1909 to 1912 we had nearly \$900,000 in the way of surpluses. Some person may say: why did you not put that in the bank? Why did you not anticipate a rainy day? Because we considered that there was enough there to meet any possible contingency. No one could have foreseen such a contingency as this. We gave back the surpluses to the people. We gave them back in light-houses, fog alarms, new schools, bridges and all the necessary public improvements all over the country; interest on Railway Loans, Old Age Pensions, and a thousand and one other ways in which there was necessity. That is where the surpluses went. Every dollar of them in the accounts there to-day will speak for themselves. But I say that if we had anticipated this war, the difficulty and emergency we are now facing, it would have been an easy matter to have allowed the public works to have remained, and to have put that money in the bank for a rainy day. But the difficulty we are now confronting came on us unawares. I quite agree with my learned friend's remarks this evening on the subject of this war. It is the most gigantic and most awful war that has ever visited the world as far as human history can tell, but out of the surrounding gloom our vision is gladdened by that great unity of the Empire which was the one factor that has decided the successful outcome of the struggle. This war has shown to the world a solid Empire; still more, it has proven to us that if we are to remain a solid and united Empire, if we are to stand together to exercise the civilising influence that has been the dominating characteristic of our existence, we

must all unite in contribution to the upkeep of such force as will be necessary to defend us against unwarranted aggression in the future. In the past the taxpayer of Great Britain has been satisfied to pay the whole bill. We have never expected and have never been asked to contribute one cent. India with her 300,000,000, Australia with her 4,000,000, New Zealand with her 1,000,000 and Canada with her 8,000,000 people, all have looked to the British soldier and sailor for protection. And when we saw the British war ship and the British tar there was a thrill of patriotism and of pleasure; but we have never realised until this war was thrust upon us how dependent we were upon them for our absolute protection. And now the war has come and we all realise that this Empire of ours with its 500,000,000 people cannot exist if the 45,000,000 of Great Britain alone are to bear the burden of defence. It has not been our fault that we have not contributed before. The British people have been satisfied to bear the burden, they have been satisfied with the trade and commerce that has come to them from the Colonies and from other countries owing to their supremacy of the seas. But now if we are to hold this Empire we must be prepared to police it. We must be prepared to sustain an army and navy that will uphold those principles of justice and liberty that the Empire stands for, against every possible combination of nations. I join with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in the hope that when we come back here next session this war will be over, that a lasting peace will be established, that the nations now struggling against us will have been defeated and that a peace satisfying to all will have been accomplished, a peace satisfactory not alone to the British Empire but also

to Belgium, France and Russia. The trouble is that while there are some losses that money can repay, while Belgium may be peculiarly satisfied for her monetary losses, while our loss and damage in trade may be made up by a money payment there are losses, the loss of the boy or the husband, that no money can make good. To those that have gone down, to those that may go down in the future the gratitude of the country goes out, and I hope that the measures that will be proposed by the Government in this direction will meet with the generous support of the whole House. There are those, sons and fathers, who have gone forth to fight for the rights and liberties for which their fathers and forefathers have fought in years gone by on many a battlefield. To those who die in such a struggle we cannot offer too great a gratitude. Our one and only hope is that a speedy end may come to the war and that when the terms of peace come to be settled they will be satisfactory and satisfying to all.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be ungracious of me to allow pass without any comment on my part, the very courteous personal remarks that have been uttered by the Prime Minister. I am sure that the House will understand that it is a very great pleasure for me to find myself sitting here again for Bonavista, an honour due in the first place to the kindness of the hon. member who sits on my right, Mr. Coaker, in making room for me, and secondly to the support of my old constituents in the district. It is quite true, as the Premier has said, that he and I are in one sense the two oldest members of the House, that is in the sense that we have been here for a longer period than any other member. He is now the father of the House, and I

must say that he has behind him a very large and promising family. As I sat here this afternoon listening to him speaking, I could close my eyes and almost imagine that twenty years had not passed away. He was singing the same old song that he sang then, almost in the same old words, and possibly with the same old effect. He called to mind the fact that there were certain dissimilarities in our careers. One of those is that he has always stuck to the Government, whereas I have always stuck to the Opposition. There is however, this difference also. It is evident that I have become broader in my views, because I find myself today, if not a Liberal, at least sitting behind the leader of the Liberals. And I find my learned friend is the leader of the Tories, and as I look back into the past, I cannot help of the House a detailed statement, congratulating him for leading the most Conservative party of Tories that I have ever seen, certainly to his own profit if not to the profit of the country. One thing he will at least admit and that is that in the past, as I hope in the future, my criticism of any measure in this House has been of a constructive nature. I have never criticised except in a constructive way, to build up for the good of Newfoundland, a country which I love no less than those who have been born in it.

COMMITTEE ON ADDRESS.

The following Committee was appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, namely:—Mr. Downey, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Stone, Mr. M. Kennedy, Mr. Higgins.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Morine gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: "An Act re-

lating to the sale of codfish on the Labrador Coast."

Hon. Minister of Finance & Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill further to amend "The Customs Act, 1898."

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens."

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Administration of Local Affairs."

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Seal Fishery.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Lloyd gave notice of question.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

Mr. Dwyer gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

REPORTS TABLED.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the following documents:—

Report of His Excellency Sir W.E. Davidson, K. C. M. G., (Governor), Chairman of the Patriotic Association of Newfoundland covering the course of the Volunteer movement in Newfoundland from its inception on Aug. 12th, 1914, to the end of March, 1915, in relation to the Great War now being waged in Europe; and Hon. Colonial Secretary, in view of the importance of the matters referred to in this report, requested the permission of the House for the printing of the same.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure and Balance Sheet of the St.

John's Municipal Council for the year 1914.

Statement of estimated revenue and expenditure of the St. John's Municipal Board for the year 1915.

Report of the Public Schools of Newfoundland under Church of England Boards for the year ended June 30th, 1914.

Report of the Commissioners appointed by His Excellency the Governor to enquire into and report upon the Sealing Disasters of 1914, together with the evidence and exhibits in connection with said enquiry.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Mr. Speaker presented to the House a Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable Executive Council appointing the Commission of Internal Economy for the Session of 1915, as follows:—

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, NEWFOUNDLAND.

Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable Executive Council approved by His Excellency the Governor on the 5th day April, 1915.

Under the provisions of Section 4 Cap. 1, 61 Vic., the following to be the Commission of Internal Economy of the Legislature, namely:—The President of the Legislative Council; Hon. R. K. Bishop; Hon. P. T. McGrath; His Honour the Speaker; Rt. Hon. Sir Edward P. Morris, P.C., K.C.M.G.; Hon. J. R. Bennett; Hon. C. H. Emerson, K.C.

Certified true copy.

(Sgd.)—ARTHUR MEWS,
Deputy Colonial Secretary.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, April 8th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 8, 1915.

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

REPORTS TABLED.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Resident Physician of the Asylum for the Insane for the year ending Dec. 31, 1914; Report of Council of Higher Education for year ending Dec. 31, 1914; and Report of Schools under Salvation Army Boards for year ending Dec. 31, 1914.

PETITION.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Harbour Main, who ask that a commission be appointed to fix the price of fish on the Labrador. I have also a petition from the inhabitants of Brigus, Carbonear, Burnt Head, Red Head, Bryant's Cove, Barened, Bay de Verde, Salmon Cove, Clarke's Beach, Grate's Cove, Caplin Cove, Job's Cove, Salmon Cove, all on the same subject. I suggest that this House should pass a bill, appointing a Board of three men for this Commission: One a representative of the Board of Trade; another a representative of the fishermen, and the third appointed by the other two. The hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, gave notice of a bill in connection with this matter, and there are forty or fifty other such petitions. I hope the petitions will be acted on by the Government. I beg that they be referred to the Department to which they relate.

QUESTIONS.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the table showing all amounts paid for awards for land taken under the Railway Extension Act, 1910, and amendments, and all amounts paid for arbitration fees, solicitors' fees, travelling and other expenses, giving names, dates, and object in each case, from January

1, 1914, to date.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The answer is in course of preparation.

MR. KENT asked Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to lay on table of House a copy of all correspondence between the Government or any member thereof, and H. E. the Governor, in relation to the appointment or retention of the offices of Minister of Justice and Minister of Agriculture and Mines, by Hon. R. A. Squires and Hon. S. D. Blandford, respectively.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The answer is in preparation.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, the dates, amounts, and parties, of all payments made from July 31st, 1909, to date under the Railway Extension Act, 1910, and amendments thereof, showing separately the amounts paid under the following headings: (1) To the contractor for construction work on each branch separately; (2) To the contractor for any of the works or material specified in Secs. 34, 36 and 37 of the contract, showing the particular works in respect of which such payment was made, and the branch line to which it related; (3) Other payments to the contractor or any other person, the authority for which is based upon the said Acts; (4) All requests or claims for payments made by the contractor to date which have not yet been paid, or which are either not admitted or are unsettled, and copy of all correspondence relating thereto.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE.—The answer is being prepared.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the Banks in the Colony, or elsewhere, with which the Government has had financial dealings, from Jan. 1st, 1914, to date, and whether any balance sheet showing the condition of the

various accounts between them and the Government, or any of its departments, have been furnished by these Banks, and, if so, to lay on the table a copy of such statements for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1914; also for the quarter ending March 31st, 1915.

HON. MIN. FINANCE.—This statement is being prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay upon the table of the House a report of the Judge of the Police Court in reference to the trial of Esau Gillingham, of Glenwood, for a breach of the Game Laws, and for the following particulars:—(a) To whom the package of beaver skins confiscated in this case, was addressed; (b) For the report of the policeman at Lewisporte, dated Dec. last, sent to Inspector Sullivan, in reference to two foxes being purchased from Samuel Russell and L. Pilley, of Lewisporte, by one Piercey, which foxes were captured out of the season, for which offence these two men were fined, but the buyers were not brought before the Courts.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have written the Department of Justice for this, and hope to have it shortly.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. Premier to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement, showing: (a) The cost of the investigation into the 'Newfoundland' Disaster held by Judge Knight; (b) The cost of the investigation into the two sealing disasters, held by the Sealing Disaster Commission, also a copy of report and evidence in each case.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In reply, Mr. Speaker, I may say (1) The statement of the cost of both investigations is being prepared, (2) The report of the Commission has been tabled; Judge Knight's report will also be tabled, and copies of the evidence.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether there has

been any irregularity discovered in the Registration Department of the Tax Office during the last six months, and whether one of the officials in that Department was short in his accounts; if so, what action has been taken in connection therewith by the Postmaster-General.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled a written answer.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the returns of all monies expended by the Grand Bank Road Board during 1914.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the information.

MR. STONE asked the Rt. Hon. Premier whether any Minister of the Crown is permitted to frank letters passing through the mail, when such letters concern the private business of such Minister.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There is no such authority.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House, a statement showing the amount paid the Newfoundland Produce Company for the mail service between St. John's and Cook's Harbour, during the past year, 1914; also (b) what arrangements were made with the Newfoundland Produce Company regarding the special Northern trips of the Fogota during the past winter, and what amount those trips will cost the Colony.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I may say that the Newfoundland Produce Company was paid in 1914 \$9,999.96 for services between St. John's and Cook's Harbour. The special northern trips of the Fogota were in lieu of two trips the Prospero was short. For that the Company was paid \$3,500.

MR. DWYER asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of

all moneys paid by, or charged, to St. John's East account from January 1st, 1914, to date, giving names, dates, and objects of each payment.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I hope to have that information to-morrow.

MR. GRIMES asked the Rt. Hon. Premier to lay upon the table of the House the report by Magistrate Benning of the trial of one Joseph Walsh, which took place last year, on a charge of misappropriating public monies.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to table that report.

LABRADOR FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order, and leave granted, and on motion of Mr. Morine, the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador Coast," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

CUSTOMS BILL.

Pursuant to order, and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend 'The Customs Act, 1898,'" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

Pursuant to order, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens," was introduced.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I may say that this Act is the Imperial Act passed last year, which is being extended to the different Dominions, some of which have already passed it.

The Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to order, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Administration of Local Affairs," was introduced.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I may say in relation to that Bill that it is the outcome of Resolutions passed here last session to the effect that it is desirable that we should take up the question of the present system of the election of Road Boards in the outports. The amendment I am bringing in may not, I think, meet all that may be desired, and my intention is to send the Bill immediately to a Select Committee, which will be very representative of outport districts, so that we may arrive at the best possible provisions before deciding on a Bill. I may say that since last session, circulars have been sent to all the representatives of outport districts, and to Magistrates and to Justices of the Peace, with a view to obtaining such information as to the mode of election and other matters as was available, and I think ~~out in order to get the most perfect~~ Bill, it will be desirable to send it to a Select Committee.

MR. KENT.—Did you receive answers to the circulars?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes I am afraid the information was not quite so full as might be desired. We sent out thirty-six circulars to thirty-six representatives, and got one reply.

The Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SEAL FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery," was introduced.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain to

the House that this Bill, which is now in the hands of the printer, simply contains the recommendations made by the Commissioners, who were appointed to enquire into the late disaster. It may be that there are many other matters that ought to go into the Bill, and it may be that some of the matters they have recommended ought not to become law. Therefore after the Bill is debated on the second reading, I propose to send it to a Select Committee, so that it may be given very full consideration. I am taking charge of the Bill at the request of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, with reference to the suggestion to send these Bills to Select Committees after second reading, might I suggest that it would be better to first go into a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of a full discussion of the various matters contained in the Bills, and after that discussion, refer them to Select Committees, then the Committees would have a knowledge of the opinions of the House to guide them in their work, whereas if you send them to Select Committees first, some members would perhaps not feel at liberty to fully debate them, and afterwards the work of the Select Committees might be knocked to pieces by a Committee of the Whole House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the suggestion. As a rule Bills have been sent to Select Committees after second reading; but I can see no possible objection to the suggestion of the hon. member.

MR. MORINE.—In technical questions the other is the better way, but in the present instance, I think, this is preferable.

The Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PATENTS AND TRADE MARKS
BILL.

Pursuant to order, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Patents and Trade Marks," was introduced.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I may say that this is along the lines of the Imperial Act, dealing with the nullification of Letters Patent issued to citizens of countries at war with His Majesty.

The Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Mr. Downey, on behalf of the Select Committee, appointed to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech, presented the report of the Select Committee as follows:—

"House of Assembly of Newfoundland.

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

"May it Please Your Excellency,—

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

Signed,

J. F. DOWNEY,
EDWD. PARSONS,
M. J. KENNEDY,
W. J. HIGGINS.

Assembly Room,
April 8th, 1915."

MR. DOWNEY moved that the report be received and adopted.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker. Before that motion is adopted I should like to make one or two observations.

One would naturally suppose, Sir,

that at a time like this—the first paragraph in a speech from the Throne would deal with the subject of the great war in which the Empire is now engaged. This House, Sir, met in session last September for the purpose of considering certain measures that were deemed necessary to be brought forward in connection with the war. Upon that occasion the House was assured that any measures introduced by the Government in connection with that subject would not only receive the hearty support but the endorsement and sympathy of every member on this side of the House and I think we may safely say at this time that any such measures as may be deemed necessary during the present session also will meet with the same hearty support and assistance from this side of the House. At that time, Sir, a heavy war cloud was hanging over the whole Empire; to-day that cloud has to some extent been lifted and we are beginning to feel that things are a little brighter than they were at that time. At the same time, Sir, we must not shut our eyes to the fact that it may be a long time yet before peace will be proclaimed. Authorities differ as to the probable duration of the war; but we are assured by those who have charge of the naval and military operations so far as Great Britain and her allies are concerned that eventually victory will crown our efforts. We must not however, rest upon that. We must prepare for the worst rather than for the best; and it behoves us in this country as a small portion of His Majesty's great Dominions to do our share of the work that must necessarily fall to His Majesty's subjects wherever they may be. In this country we have done something. We have equipped and sent forward to join the forces of His Majesty a Regiment of

about 1000 men. We have sent forward to the Admiralty a contribution of 1000 to man His Majesty's ships. We may be called upon to do more. It behoves us, Sir, I think, to still continue enlisting for both the Army and the Navy so that we may be prepared—or may help to prepare rather—for the days that are to come. The response from this country, I think, has been a noble one. When one considers the fact that we are not a military people, I think the manner in which our young men have responded to the call of duty—the call to serve their King and Country—should make us feel proud of them. I believe that as time goes on and if there should be greater necessity to send forth our men that they will not be backward; that they will to a greater extent respond to that call which is imposed upon them by the constitution; respond to the call to serve their King and country in the hour of its great need. We may well indeed, Sir, congratulate those men who so promptly and heroically came forward and offered their services whether it be on the land or on the sea, and we have every confidence that if more men are needed to serve in the army or the navy they will be forthcoming. A spirit of loyalty and patriotism has gone throughout the land and I feel that we all can rely upon those who are physically fit to come forward should the need become greater and should their services be called upon. For the present time we have carried out the obligations that were undertaken by the Government, and the number that were promised have gone forth. We wish them God-speed. We hope the day may soon come when this cruel war will be over and our men will come back with victory perched upon their banner. I say, Sir, we may well congratulate ourselves

upon feeling that our young men have come forward as they have; but after all they have only done their duty—they have only done Sir, what we would have expected from them. It is pleasing to note that they have done it so readily and so cheerfully. Our duty to the Empire is our first and paramount care. We are here to-day, Sir, as a Legislature only because we have an army and a navy. We go about our ordinary avocations, we conduct our business, our trade and our commerce, only because we have the protection of the Empire; the protection which the Empire affords us through the medium of its army and navy and I say, Sir, that during this session of the House and for all time we must ever bear in mind the fact that we only exist and carry on our trivial business and our legislation and our other avocations because we are under the protection of the British flag. Our paramount duty then is to our Empire and no matter what measures may come before this House during the present session the good of the Empire should be the prevailing thought and the prevailing consideration.

We are told in the Address that a measure will be introduced for the purpose of providing financial assistance to those who may be rendered destitute or brought to distress by reason of the fact that those upon whom they were dependent have fallen in the war or have been disabled. Such a measure, Sir, is only right and proper. The State must take care of those who have been left behind, and those who are dependent on our men who have so cheerfully gone forward in the perilous work of defending the Empire. It is gratifying to know that such a liberal response has been made to the appeal that was issued by the Patriotic Association for the

patriotic fund which was created for the purpose of providing assistance to the dependents of those who have gone forward to the war.

Some misapprehension prevailed as to the objects to which the Patriotic Fund was to be applied, but, Sir, there can be no further misapprehension because these objects have now been clearly set forth; and it is a matter of extreme importance that every man in the community should know exactly what the objects of this fund are, and how the money will be applied, so that he may have an opportunity of subscribing to the fund and feeling assured that it is well and faithfully applied. I believe there are men, men in this community, who have not subscribed, who could have done so, having refrained from doing so by reason of misapprehension of its objects. Now the objects of this fund are

1st. To augment, if possible, the resources of the families of Volunteers and Reservists who have gone on active service, where such families are unable to adequately maintain themselves without such aid.

2nd. To assist, if possible, men invalided from active service until they can secure employment, or until the State makes provision for them by pension or otherwise.

3rd. To assist, if possible, widows and other dependents of those who lose their lives while on active service until they become the beneficiaries of legislative enactment.

4th. To afford help, if possible, in such cases as do not come within the scope of legislative enactment, but which have a moral claim upon the generosity of the public.

I mention the objects of this fund because I think it is most desirable to do so and because it is within the scope of the address from the Throne.

His Excellency refers to the fact that such a fund exists and that it is generally being subscribed to, and he is pleased to note that the manner in which the amount of subscriptions is being augmented is gratifying. The call upon it must of necessity be great and may be greater even than at present we can anticipate. It is well in the interest of the community that the objects of the fund should clearly be set forth.

The efforts of the Women's Patriotic Association are also referred to by His Excellency and I am sure that we all, as representatives of the people, would desire to place on record our appreciation of the great and noble work that is being done by the women of Newfoundland in connection with this most cruel war. The quantities of material that have been worked up, knitted and sent forth, reflects most favourably to their credit—not to speak of the comforts they have afforded to the men who are fighting their battles in the trenches. I think it is noble on the part of these women, and we cannot too greatly show our appreciation of their work. I would like to mention here how sympathetic our people were throughout the whole country with the Belgians, in the sacrifices and sufferings they have had to endure. I need not relate the story of how Germany invaded their country, nor the story of the manner in which the homes of the people were devastated; how their ancient churches and buildings were destroyed, nor need I relate to you the destruction that was wrought throughout the land. But a great feeling of sympathy for that country spread throughout this island, and although no subscriptions were in any way solicited yet money came pouring in from all parts of the country in relief of the Belgians until a sum of over \$5,500 has been collect-

ed, not to speak of the quantities of clothing which were sent on. Of the \$5500 that has been sent in this fund in money, I am pleased to be able to say three fifths came from places outside St. John's. It was made up in small subscriptions, some from the smallest settlements in the Island and it shows how genuine and widespread was the sympathy for the sufferings of that brave heroic people. We all have a great deal to thank the Belgians for, because, perhaps, that dark cloud that was hanging over us at the early stages of the war might still be hanging over us had they not so nobly held the enemy at bay. But they did so at a terrible sacrifice.

The speech then goes on to refer to the fact that for the past fiscal year there was a deficit and for the coming year, the year ending in June next, a still greater deficit might be anticipated. What then, Sir, is our duty under these circumstances? We have as a country during the last five or six years increased our annual expenditure by a sum of about one million. In other words, we have to find one million dollars a year more than we did prior to 1905 in order to carry on our public services. The fixed annual charges against this country are one million more than they were five or six years ago. But, I may be told that if the expenditure has increased by a million-dollars our revenue has likewise increased by a similar amount. This is perfectly true. It has so increased. But, Sir, there is still to be said in that connection, that our fixed charges remain the same from year to year. Not only will they remain the same but they must of necessity increase, while on the other hand the revenue may not continue to increase in a like proportion. We must maintain our financial standing

and so regulate our affairs as to make our expenditure not exceed our income particularly now when we have to find such large sums of money to defray the expenses of that necessary service we have pledged ourselves to perform in connection with the war. I know not how the Government propose to make up this deficit. We must only wait until they bring in their measures for that purpose. We are assured, however, that the estimates about to be laid before us are framed to meet only indispensable requirements. Well, Sir, if this is so, they will receive my ready support. But I claim to myself the right to judge for myself what I, personally, should consider indispensable requirements. There are many things in our public service we can easily dispense with at the present time. There are many that we ought to dispense with. I think we ought to have the courage to come here and dispense with them until such time as our revenue returns to its former condition and enables us to reconsider some of these things. When it comes to cutting down expenses there is one thing I hope the Government will not do and that is cut down the Civil Service. I regard our Civil Service as one of our best assets, and in order to make our Civil service effective, we must pay the civil servants a good wage. I know men in the Civil Service to-day who perform excellent work on inadequate pay, and I know other men in the service who perform no work for fairly good pay. If we are going to touch the Civil Service let us not affect in any way the salaries of the deserving ones, and let us dispense altogether with the services of those who are not needed. I feel the Civil Service is one of our best assets. It is from them that the Government gets its advice. I do not mean advice in

matters of policy. But they may have to check their policy, sometimes, in accordance with this advice. Every Government must of necessity rely upon the Civil Service for information, and in order that we may have a reliable and efficient Civil Service, we make them of value and pay accordingly. A man there holding a principal office—a deputy Minister for instance—will have very poor encouragement to do his work unless he is being adequately paid, and he will have less encouragement if he finds that by reason of the stress of the times, his salary is reduced. It would be better to increase the salaries of the efficient ones and to do altogether away with those who can be dispensed with. The speech concludes as usual with the customary promise of some big industries, something looming up in the distance that will prove a cure for all our ills. I have seen references to those industries before, but I regret to state I have not been able in this case to gather any information as to the nature of these great proposals. I do not doubt but that in due time we shall hear of it, and I trust it will not prove to be the same kind of bubble that many of its predecessors were, but that it will bring forth all that we are led to expect from this paragraph of His Excellency's Speech.

MR. CRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, with other hon. members who have discussed His Excellency's Speech from the Throne, I wish to endorse all that has been said in relation to what has been done for the welfare and support of the Empire. We have good reason to feel proud of the efforts that have been put forth in the Colony for its maintenance and defense against the aggressions of the greatest military power known to-day. We believe from what has been said by those

qualified by their experience and knowledge of military affairs, that in the terrible struggle in which the Empire is engaged, all the support that is possible for the Colonies and other dependencies of the Empire to give must be forthcoming, if she is to emerge a victor in the struggle. We in Newfoundland must not be a whit behind others in doing our share, and that such a willingness can be expected in all that is required is fully evidenced by the noble response already made by our young men in joining the Army and the Navy. Not only are they defending the Empire and its shores, but they are also defending the cause of liberty and freedom. We are proud of our volunteers! We are proud of our Naval Reserve! It shows that there lurks in the men of Newfoundland, sons of the great British race, the same spirit, the same love of liberty, the same courage and devotion, the same heroism as existed in their fathers, who of yore fought and gained all that liberty and freedom we hold so dear to-day, obtaining it at great cost, handing it down to us to maintain, preserve and to improve. So we find the sons of Newfoundland lined up with the sons of the other Dominions of the Empire, ready to defend, with their lives, all that was handed down to them by their fathers. They are defending Democracy. Democracy is the opposite of Militarism. The former stands for Right as Might; the latter puts Might as Right. Let Germany succeed, and militarism will dominate the world. The people will have little to say in State affairs, and War will continue to be as big a factor, if not bigger, in settling future disputes between the nations. What is Britain's aim in this war? Mr. Asquith has stated it is, first, the definite repudiation of militarism as the governing factor in the relation of states, second, the independent exist-

ence and free development of smaller nationalities, third, the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambitions and for grouping alliances, of a real European co-partnership. Such, Sir, is the high aim of Britain in this War as expressed by its Premier, and is it not worthy of every assistance we can give and every sacrifice we can make? What do Mr. Asquith's statements mean? If they mean anything it is the construction of some international machinery that will lead to the settlement of disputes between nations by arbitration, instead of by the sword. Well may we feel proud that our boys are fighting for such great principles to govern the future conduct of nations. Our every hope and prayer should be that such will be the ultimate outcome of the present great struggle. Where the Government has been assisting in this direction it has my cordial support. But Sir, once we leave matters of Empire and touch upon our own local affairs, it is there we go by different roads. The Government takes one road. We, on the Opposition side, take the other. I take it that the Governor's Speech is intended to outline what the Government will do during the present session. There are some matters to which the Government promises to give attention, which are of deep concern. There are other matters of very great and grave importance to which no reference is made. I shall refer to these. There are unhappy conditions existing in the country to-day. The War and conditions of trade in other countries are being blamed for their existence. They may have played a part but not wholly. Another cause can be found, and that is the wanton extravagance of the present Government. All these with the bad fishery of last year and the closing down of the mines have placed many of our people in a very unfortunate position, and I cannot see

anything outlined in the Governor's Speech that will provide relief for them. It is true that at present the Government is allowing the Poor Commissioners to give out relief to those in destitute circumstances. But what does the relief amount to? A little flour, tea and molasses. What a diet on which a man must depend to sustain life for himself, his wife and little ones. I do not know how the members of the Government would like to live on such a diet. I do not think they would have the same ruddy countenances or such well-developed bodies as they show to-day. Why do they not do something? Have they no heart? Are they looking for precedent in this country. If none, let them look at Australia and New Zealand to-day and they will find that their Governments out of the large loans they have borrowed since the war, are using a considerable portion for relieving the unemployed. Australia is spending \$18,000,000 in this direction by giving employment on public works of various kinds. New Zealand is also spending part of her loan in this way, and where shortly after the war there were 75,000 men out of employment, only a few thousand are in that position to-day and they are receiving attention. It is the duty of the Government to provide against the starvation of its people. Money can be provided by our Government for the Army and Navy, and it is right that it should do so. It is also right and proper to provide our fishermen, our miners, our laborers and all others rendered poor by the war, bad trade and the other causes, against needless hardship and suffering. If we cannot do without our soldiers and our sailors, no more can we do without our fishermen, miners and other workers. They are equally useful to the State, equally necessary for its upkeep. They produce the wealth of the country and make the

wheels of industry revolve. Once they stop, the whole industry stops, and the country is paralyzed. No soldier could make war, no army could fight without the worker in the mine and factory. This has been fully illustrated of late in the present war. Over thirty thousand engineers had volunteered for the war, and most were accepted and sent to the front, with the result that they begin to find that their munition and gun shops could not turn out the quantities necessary, and that the Army and Navy would be useless unless their requirements were met. Many engineers were sent back to their workshops again. This serves to show that the fisherman, the miner, the clerk, the manager, the captain of industry plays his equally important part to the Empire in the fields of industry, trade and commerce, as that of the soldier and the sailor. The men who engage in our fishery and mining occupations are always exposed to hardships and dangers. On the average there are 87 of our fishermen who are drowned every year. Hundreds are injured in one way or another. Many men are killed in various other industries, and many more maimed for life. Industry has its victims as well as war, and to-day hundreds of men with their wives and little ones are suffering from the pangs of starvation, having failed after their arduous toil of the past year in securing the means to live. They did the best they could and failed, and the Government allows them to suffer, or to get a little flour, tea and molasses. Sir, this distribution of relief without an adequate return in labor is only pauperizing the people. They will not thank the Government for it. It is not charity that the able-bodied man wants, it is work, and the Government must provide it, not later on, but now. There are numbers

of these men who would rather suffer than allow people to know their condition. They are men who want to be independent and look every other person square in the face and say, "For we owe not any man." I hope before the Government closes this session it will cut down unnecessary expense in other directions, and use the savings for giving employment on public works.

There is another matter not referred to in the Governor's Speech, and that is the question of the Minimum Wage. The Premier some six years ago spoke favorably on it in a speech delivered in the T. A. Hall. But up to the present time we see no provision being made to establish it. I had hoped before now to see some commission appointed that would be representative of the employer and employee with an outside person representing the State, who would determine a minimum wage that would at least allow a family man sufficient to provide himself and dependents with the comforts and necessities of life. It is necessary for the protection of the good employer who seeks to be fair and just with his employee, but who is prevented from doing to the extent he would but for the unfair competition of the employer who pays his employees as little as he can. It is necessary for the protection of the employee who, failing this, is ever at the mercy of such unscrupulous employers who think of profit only, and never the welfare of their men.

Another matter referred to last year but not given consideration to in the Governor's Speech is that of Compulsory Education. I am sorry the Government does not seem to be about to do anything in this direction. I have had occasion to go through several outports within the past few months, and have seen children of schoolable age kept at home instead of being sent to

school. Asking the reason why, I was told that most of them belonged to families where there were five or six in family and that owing to the poor times the parents were unable to pay the school fees. Consequently through an indifferent public and an equally indifferent government scores of children are being deprived of their education which seriously handicaps them in their start in life. Evidently the government lacks the courage to deal with the question. School fees are now being collected by the various schools which might hamper them in their work should that revenue be cut off. Let the government provide the deficit and save the children by adopting free and compulsory education. My friend the hon. member for Hr. Grace, Mr. Parsons has directed our attention to the fisheries and in an interesting speech presented some striking figures relating to the development being made in the Canadian fisheries. He says the Canadian fisheries have almost doubled in value the past few years. Ours have not advanced in anything like the same proportion. Why this difference? As Mr. Parsons says it lies in the fact that the Canadian government has done everything to develop their fisheries and we have done very, very little. The fisheries are still the mainstay of the country. The greater portion of our population is dependent upon them for their livelihood and we should show a greater enterprising spirit. There is no telling the vast wealth that lies at our doors, beneath the sea. Teeming millions of fish of all kinds circle our coasts and if the government had spent half the money they spent on branch railways in exploiting to greater extent this industry our country would be much better off than it is. Surely the time has

come to take this matter up seriously. There is one part of the Governor's Speech I heartily endorse, and that is the promised provision for the granting of financial assistance to those killed in the war. I hope the government will not be niggardly in the provision to be made. That it will be substantial and capable of meeting fully the requirements of all those who will require to avail of it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few brief remarks on the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech.

The subject which is uppermost in the minds of the people of this country, as well as in all parts of the Empire, in fact through the civilized world is the mighty conflict which is now being waged by Britain and her Allies on the one side and Germany and her Allies on the other. The conflict affects everyone from the highest to the lowest. In the speech it occupies the greater part and overshadows everything else. Previous speakers have dilated in fluent and patriotic language on the part that all Britishers are playing in the great struggle, and have laid particular emphasis on what Newfoundland has done to help the Motherland in her hour of conflict and trial. I corroborate all that has been said concerning the action of our brave volunteers and the heroic sacrifice of our Naval Reservists who have given their lives freely in defence of Empire and home. As to the cause of the war, there is no difference of opinion although we may differ in giving expression to that opinion.

By the methods of warfare adopted by Germany to accomplish her designs and gain the victory, we may look upon her as the most barbarous nation in the world. But we must remember that war is Hell, also that our feelings

are very biased against our opponents, so that we only see their faults, and we give them no credit for having any good points at all. The policy of the German Emperor is to gain the mastery of the world. He has said "Our German people will be the granite block upon which the good God may complete His work of civilizing the World." This was the policy suggested to our blessed Lord by the devil at the opening of His ministry,—a policy which he instantly rejected with the words "Get thee behind me Satan." The spirit of the Christ would have become an altogether different spirit if he had decided to win the world by the sword instead of by the Cross. While the German Emperor claims to have God on his side, we have the spectacle of seeing millions of christians fighting millions of other christians. God cannot be on both sides, victory to one wrecks death, destruction and vengeance on the other, and no one can imagine the Almighty setting up his kingdom on this earth by force, bloodshed and murder. England to maintain her present dignity and honor among the nations of the world was compelled to engage in this war. She had given her signature to a treaty to protect the neutrality of Belgium. When that treaty to which Germany was a signatory was ruthlessly broken by that nation, nothing else was left for Britain but to take up the sword to maintain the principle of justice and right, and to show to the world that her word or signature was her bond, and no sacrifice was too great so that her integrity and honour may be maintained. As the world and society is constituted at the present time, I believe that if Germany is to be conquered, which we all in our hearts believe and pray for, it must be accomplished by force, therefore we as a colony of the Brit-

ish Empire believe in the freedom and justness of the British constitution must do all in our power to assist the motherland which we look to so dearly to bring victory with honour, to the cause which means so much for the weal or woe of the nations of the world.

There is one paragraph in the Speech: "to consider a measure to provide financial assistance towards their maintenance while on active service or to the dependants of those who lose their lives while so engaged." To this measure I give my hearty support, which so vitally affects many of our people who have lost those upon whom they were depending for support in the naval disasters which have caused the death of so many of our brave fellow countrymen.

I have a letter here from Rev. J. O. Britnell of Fogo which is a concrete example of the straitened and distressing circumstances of many of our people who have lost their loved ones upon whom they were dependent for support. The letter refers to the loss of one of my brave constituents of Fogo who went to his death in H. M. S. Bayano, and with the permission of the House I will read part of the letter which sets forth in a more explicit and convincing manner than any words of mine can, the true condition of things that obtain.

(Reads letter.)

Our brave naval reservists have freely shown their patriotism and heroism by giving their lives in our defence, and I trust that all we can possibly do will be done to provide for the wants of those who are left to mourn the loss of their loved ones. I was pleased to hear from Mr. Clift the hon. member for Twillingate, that the funds of the Patriotic Association

will be used to assist such cases as I have mentioned. No fund will be more highly appreciated and be devoted to any more deserving or honourable use.

The Speech also refers to the seal fishery:—"The unfavourable outlook of the Seal Fishery this year is to be regretted, but there is this cause for comparative satisfaction, that the escape of so many young seals will contribute to the conservation of this industry, so that while those engaged in the venture will lose the returns which it brings to them ordinarily, the potential wealth which the Seal Fishery represents will be much enhanced in later years."

We deplore the fact that there will be a great shortage in the earnings of our people by the failure of the seal fishery this spring. It seems that nature has enforced practically a close season for the killing of seals, and what could not be accomplished by legislation the elements of Nature have brought about, which we hope will be for the benefit of future generations, although our needs are so great at the present time that any set back in any of our fishery industries will entail hardship and suffering. The conserving of any industry or asset the country may possess, of course is foreign to the policy of the present Government. Our natural resources on the land if not on the sea must be exploited and if possible turned into money to provide big grants for party supporters and Government members. The policy of the present Government has been to increase the public debt of the Colony with no commensurate industry that will give employment of a permanent nature or increase the earning power of our people by one dollar. Debts are being piled up so that taxation hangs like a millstone on the necks of the peo-

ple, and future generations will have to bear the burdens brought about by the wanton extravagance and blundering policy of the present Government.

Another paragraph says:—"The Revenue for the past fiscal year showed a deficit, the result of the depression which had been manifesting itself for some time previously in Newfoundland, as well as in other parts of the world. This condition of affairs was rendered more acute by the outbreak of the war, and for the current fiscal year an even greater shortage is apprehended."

No one expected that the revenue would be anything but short. Effects always follow causes. The Government had sown to the wind and now they were reaping the whirlwind.

Money had been scattered broadcast to the hungry crowd of heelers and supporters. Positions, salaries and sops had to be provided to satisfy the swarm of office seekers, till a depleted treasury finds the country bordering on the brink of financial chaos and ruin. The popularity of the Government is now on the wane, and a disappointed electorate is only waiting the opportunity to put saner and safer men in charge of the ship of state and save her from becoming a derelict.

There is one thing which seems contradictory in this speech and that is this sentence:—

"Towards reducing this adverse balance my Ministers propose to utilize the Cash Reserve provided for such emergencies, and proposals will be submitted to you for dealing with the amount which will remain to be liquidated."

The Premier has stated that \$300,000 of that Cash Reserve had already been taken to make up the deficit in

revenue for the year ended June 30th, 1914. The reserve now is \$200,000, and with this amount the Government is going to pay off an adverse balance which is foreshadowed in the Speech as being greater than that of last year. How the Premier is going to pay a debt of \$300,000 or more with \$200,000. I will leave him to explain? This he will undoubtedly do to his own satisfaction if not to the satisfaction of an intelligent electorate. We are told that a deficit must be faced, but what we must consider in criticising the policy of the Government is not the future or present deficit but the deficit of last June before there was any talk of the war, although they had four months previous to the close of the Budget year to collect revenue from the increased taxation of last February's session. That increased taxation for the four months was supposed to give them \$200,000 extra. The war had nothing whatever to do with the deficit of last June. That deficit was due to the lack of foresight and blundering wasteful policy of a Government composed of men without any financial ability whatever.

The Reserve of \$500,000 which had been set aside for a rainy day by a wise and sane Government, had to be taken to pay the debts incurred by the hoodling policy of the present Government. If any business concern spends all its capital without making any provision for the future in the way of a corresponding asset as a security in the time of depression of trade, what will happen?—bankruptcy and ruin.

It is just the same with an individual and a Government. We have to deplore the condition with which we are face to face to-day through the unwise policy of an incapable administration. The poor old Colony is now

hard and fast on the rocks, and methinks new men will have to take command if she is ever to float in the calm water of independence and security.

To remedy existing conditions the Premier suggested that all who could should buy a new overcoat, meaning of course that we should continue business as usual. It might be quite easy for the members of the Government and their supporters to follow the Premier's advice, but the most of us on this side of the House must be content to cut our garment according to our cloth. He, the Premier, also stated that economy at the present time was a crime. According to the wasteful, extravagant policy of the Government we quite believe that economy has been considered a crime by them in handling the revenue of this country since they assumed office in 1909—a policy or doctrine which has been so strictly adhered to that now we find wilful waste bringing woe and want.

We were told by the leaders of society at the opening of the war, that economy should be practiced by all, every nickel should be saved, for hard and trying times were yet to come.

In view of existing conditions the estimates have been prepared to meet only indispensable requirements. From this statement we conclude that we have been subjected to unnecessary expenditure in the past, if any curtailment in the estimates is to take place now. This is an admission of unnecessary and wasteful expenditure which has brought us to our present deplorable condition.

We are also told in the Speech "that an industry of exceptional magnitude, involving the expenditure of many millions of dollars in developing our water powers and utilizing some of our valuable natural resources in the

manufacture of a variety of commodities," will be proposed for our attention. We are promised a land flowing with milk and honey. I can't see how future enterprises will help us out of our present difficulties. The sins of the past and the shortcomings of the present are to be forgotten by what the future will bring us. Every Speech from the Throne contains great things for the future, with the hope of diverting our attention from our present mismanagement, and thus make the people think that everything is all right, and we are just on the eve of some mighty undertaking that will bring comfort and plenty to everybody. Any further remarks I will reserve for some future session when I will avail myself of the opportunity to make a few more comments on the policy of the Government.

MR. JENNINGS.—I rise for the purpose of making a few remarks in reference to yesterday's Speech from the Throne.

I was not able to be present at that time and on that account missed the opportunity of hearing the address from the other side of the House.

Hon. members of the Government will certainly have reason to say that the Opposition are using their machine guns first, contrary to the methods employed at present in the Dardanelles. They send in the "Queen Elizabeth" first to take the bearings and find the range, and after her work is done the smaller ships go at closer quarters and finish the job. Well, I'm only a rifle anyhow, and not likely to do much damage to the other side.

This brings me to the first and chief subject contained in the address, this terrible war in which the British Empire is involved.

Any effort that our country has made to help the Empire in this hour

of need is certainly to be regarded as only our duty. I am not aware of the number of recruits that have come from Twillingate District, but I believe we are somewhat behind St. John's and the Southern Districts. I think this is partly due to the distance we are away from the recruiting centre. In matters of this kind men influence and entice others, and in this case would be a strong factor in increasing the number of recruits. Personally I have always used every influence for what I believed to be the best interests of the Empire, and had I been of age and physically fit should have considered it my duty to enlist and fight in defence of King and Country. Someone is at the front stopping bullets for me, fighting for the flag which represents so much to every British possession over which it flies. I should consider this a duty too, as some small return for the peace and safety we now enjoy owing to the supremacy of Great Britain on the sea.

I could not help thinking last summer when war was first declared of the helpless condition of this city to defend itself against an attack from a German cruiser. How easy it was if there was no British navy to dread, for one of those ships to land a crew and loot the banks and commercial firms along Water Street, thus leaving the country in a ruined condition. Britain's supremacy on the sea has saved us from such a fate.

I have not heard any opinions expressed as to how favorably the Contingent sent by Newfoundland may compare to that sent by Canada. I read in the "Weekly Witness" of Montreal a short time ago, that out of the first contingent sent from that country, consisting of 32,000 men only 5,000 were Canadian born, 4,000 British, and 1,000 French Canadians. Now

Sir, I believe that the Newfoundland Contingent were the descendants of Newfoundlanders for three generations or more, and in that respect at least, I think we can compare favorably with our larger neighbor. At the same time there seems to exist a spirit in the British born, a pride of Empire which is not so easily aroused in the Colonial born.

When I went back to the District after last winter's session and told the people there of the increased taxation, there was naturally a great deal of complaint, they considered it was due to bad management on the part of the Government and should have been avoided, but I have never heard a single complaint because of taxes due to the war. If you can get the people to realize that increase in the tariff is due entirely to that cause and nothing else, I believe the great majority are willing to bear their part of the burden and not blame the Government for conditions over which they had no control, but 12 months ago it was different, when the Government had to increase taxation for reasons which some of us at least believed might have been avoided.

That clause referring to the maintenance of those who suffer partial or total disablement while in the service of their King and Empire will of course have the full support of this House, Opposition as well as Government.

I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, for the failure of the seal fishery. We have for the past three weeks, in the District of Twillingate, been able to see from our hills the steel ships jammed in the ice, unable to reach the seals. Maybe, some people think that we of the North are glad of the fact that these ships missed the seals, but such is not the case. We realize that the great shortage in the catch

will be badly felt at St. John's, and what affects trade here in the city affects more or less the whole Island. I am pleased to hear, however, that the ships are now free, and hope they will be successful in getting saving trips.

I greatly regret the financial deficit which we now face and trust that there will be found some way out of the trouble. It is certainly too bad, the burden of taxation seems already more than we can bear, and I hope that in regulating the tariff, the increased burden will be placed on those best able to bear it.

Referring to the Civil Service, it has been remarked that these officials are poorly paid. If this is the case, how is it so many people are after the jobs. They certainly go to a lot of trouble to get an appointment and have a fair understanding of the salary offered before applying. Once in the service they say they cannot live on the salary given, and ask for an increase; now if the salary was not good enough why seek for the position and if not satisfied I suppose they can get out. If their ability is such that they cannot possibly be spared, they should be paid accordingly, but I think we are doing all the country can afford at the present time in that direction, and should cut the garment according to the cloth. I know the feeling of the people with regard to the Civil Service, and nothing would be more unpopular than increased expenditure for that purpose under the present circumstances.

I am glad to be able to say that there is but little destitution in Twillingate District. This is chiefly owing to the herring fishery, the spring fishery on the South Side, and the fall's fishery on the North Side, coupled with the logging industry which is so near at hand.

The shore cod fishery was extremely bad, and if there had been no herring fishery, scores and possibly hundreds of families would have been in a state of destitution. It is incumbent on the Government of this country to do all in their power to preserve and promote this industry.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I suppose, as leader of the Union Party, it would be indiscreet on my part to allow the Address to pass without a few remarks. I was exceedingly amused to hear the Premier's remarks on yesterday in connection with this question of economy. I agree with the speakers on this side of the House when they say that they believe he was not sincere, and that he really and truly could not mean that to economize was a crime. Now, if he believes that, I would like to know why he has not advised the Reid-Nfld. Co. against dismissing 500 of their employees—turning them out in the dead of the winter to exist as best they may—and putting up the plea that they did it because of war conditions. We find the Government, who had authority last year to raise \$2,000,000 to complete, or partly complete some of those branch railways, coming back from London with one million temporary loan in order to aid the Reid Company to complete some work on those railways during the past season. Now, if they got one million dollars they might have got two million, because the Premier then certainly knew the condition of the finances of the country so far as Customs returns were concerned, and might have aided the Colony by giving labor had he secured the other million dollars. Although he went over in March, he knew from the statements made here that the revenue would be very short; and when he found that he could not raise a permanent loan, he ought to have done his utmost to raise a temporary loan,

not of one million dollars, but of two millions, and then he would have had an extra million to help tide the people over the present crisis caused by the war; but he did not do so. He states now that the Water Street merchants have millions of dollars laid by from profits made in connection with their businesses during past years, and he calls upon those men now not to be timid, but to be venturesome. Well, the Reid-Nfld. Co., who have accumulated so many millions from work done in this country since they have been here, might have done something in that direction. After all, they have contracts to build certain branch railways, to complete them and to operate them, and it certainly would not have been too much to expect that they would make an effort to tide the people, which they had in their employ, at any rate, over the winter; but we find that these were the very men who led the way in the dismissal of their employees. Last year the Government promised in the Speech from the Throne on the opening of the House that the branch railways to Trepassey, Heart's Content and Bay de Verde would be in operation during the year. They are not in operation to-day, I presume because there is not sufficient rolling stock and locomotives to operate the line; but here is what the Government said last year:—"Railway extension during the year has been rapid and eminently satisfactory. The equivalent of sixty-four miles of railway has been completed. The Trepassey Branch has been all but finished, and is now being operated to Renew's on schedule time. The early summer months ought to be sufficient to have this line brought up to contract specification, so that the autumn may see the entire branch operated."

Now, the Trepassey branch is not yet completed, although the statement here is that it was all but finished at

that date, and was being operated to Renewals on schedule time. The autumn did not see the Branch operated.

The Speech goes on: "The Heart's Content branch has also been practically completed, and will be operated early in the present year."

This statement was made last January, and the Heart's Content branch is not yet completed, or at least if it is completed, it is not in operation; and if it is completed it is a very great reflection upon the Government that they do not make the Reid-Nfld. Company operate it. They have a contract to operate it. The people on the south side of Trinity Bay do not know what the Government put the railway there for. They are using it now to haul wood over. No effort is being made to compel the Company to operate the road; and yet the Premier comes in here and tells us that we ought to get the second overcoat, if we have one, in order to keep the country going and to aid customs returns. The Speech of last year goes on to say that "The Bay de Verde branch has been graded, the rails and ballasting far advanced, and some of the stations built. It should be ready for operation in the early fall. The Fortune Bay Branch has been graded for sixteen miles and rails laid to the fifteenth mile, but not yet ballasted. The Bonne Bay branch was commenced late in the season, and the work done to date is but preliminary."

When I was down in Bay de Verde district the people from one end of the district to the other were indignant because of the non-operation of the railway and wanted to know for what purpose this railway had been built. Stations have been built during the election campaign of 1913. That fall there were 1500 men employed on railway work in that district. Stations were built then that have never been used, that an operator has never been

in; roads that have never been used were then built connecting these stations with various settlements. As I have said, over 1500 men were employed in this work during that fall. For what? In order to secure votes for the Government supporters. Now, the people of Bay de Verde know that more than a million dollars has been spent on that railway, and they want it operated. The rails are there, the stations are there, the roads are there; everything is ready; and they want to hear the sound of a whistle. Why have these roads not been operated as the contract provides? And yet the Premier wants to know why we have not bought a second overcoat! I might say, though, that some of our men did have a certain amount of belief in what he stated, because three of them actually did go and get overcoats to-day. Now, they had the pluck to carry out the Premier's suggestion, and I hope the Government members will do likewise.

It is a serious thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have not had a greater effort made by the Government in order to afford the people an opportunity to earn sufficient to tide them over this great crisis. Many things could have been done. We are all aware that the Government just now have not a bed of roses to lie upon. We know that conditions are pretty hard with them. But yet look at the wonderful things which are being done in England at the present time, and they are only being done because the Government is courageous and determined to do the utmost in their power to help the people out. To-day, in England things are being done by Mr. Lloyd-George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which, if they were done by him two or three years ago, would have earned for him the name of being the greatest Socialist that ever existed.

But he has done these things and come out on top. He had the foresight and the courage to carry out the suggestions which were made to him, I presume, by men who knew all about these various matters, and as a consequence Great Britain has not suffered to any great extent because of the war. Now, we in Newfoundland have not seriously considered the situation of the country as it stands. I don't think that five men out of a hundred have seriously thought of what our position at the present time really is. Last year we had a shortage of 250,000 quintals of fish for the year, which at \$6 a quintal means a million and a half dollars; in addition to that there were a million quintals which were sold at a loss of 50 cents a quintal because of the conditions which prevailed at the time the fish was shipped; that is a half million more which the fishermen lost because of war conditions. Of course, the money that was lost because of the shortage in the catch was not the result of war conditions, but at the same time it meant a million and a half out of the fishermen's pockets. Then there is another half million that has been taken out of the earnings of the fishermen because of the excessive profits charged on provisions owing to war conditions. That makes a total of 2½ million, which is quite a lot of money when you come to look into the earnings of the people. It does not come as a surprise to me that the revenue is short. Anyone with common sense who looked around him knew that it must be so. They state that there were \$300,000 short last year, and the amount this year will be a great deal more. I am somewhat surprised at the figure for last year because when the House opened in September we were told that the shortage would be \$237,000, and the

difference between that amount and \$300,000 is considerable. This was caused through the policy of the Government, and through lack of economy in administering the affairs of the colony. The Government last February put on taxation that permitted them to raise \$250,000 more than they otherwise would have received from the time that they put the taxation on until the end of the fiscal year. That meant \$550,000 that the Government were out in their estimate for the year 1913-14, if we add the \$360,000 covered by loans spent in 1913, it will total \$910,000. Now Mr. Speaker, we are surprised that there was a shortage of \$300,000 last year and we are surprised to be told that the deficiency for the present year is going to amount to a greater sum than that. I have heard men who have been watching the revenue during recent months claim that \$500,000 will be the deficiency for the current year. Well, if \$500,000 is the deficiency for 1914-15, what is it going to be at the end of 1915-16? We cannot expect any great improvement in trade, the seal fishery has been a blank—there is going to be a loss to the Government of from \$200,000 to \$250,000 on that account alone—and we certainly won't be able to make up in any way that I see any great amount of revenue from ordinary sources. I would like to know what is going to happen when the war ceases. A great sum of money will have to be raised in order to make two ends meet and enable us to live as an independent colony. There is this million which the Premier got last summer; the other million that he did not get; there is a million which will have to be raised to meet the war expenditure; he will have to get at least two millions more in order to complete the remaining unfinished branch railways, (last year

we were told that two millions would be about enough to complete all the remaining branches, but I dare say when we get down to facts and figures, we will find that two millions have already been spent and that at least the government will want at least another two millions to complete the contract). That will be at least five millions that will have to be raised. Well, I would like to know who would want to be Premier of Newfoundland and have to face the London markets and secure this loan. Sir Edward Morris will certainly be entitled to our deepest gratitude if he can go across at the end of the war and raise \$5,000,000 at 4 per cent in order to get us out of this hole in which he has placed us. A loan of \$360,000 was authorized last year to pay for expenditure incurred in 1913 that I suppose a cent has not yet been raised on, and there were several temporary loans from the banks that when added will probably come to another million; then we will have to lose a certain amount in raising the loans as we did on the other loans, and before we are through with these obligations that the country has incurred, it will mean not less than 6½ or 7 million dollars. Then when we take into account the deficiency for 1915-16 and 14-15 which will amount to \$800,000, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that by that time there will not be fifteen men in the whole country who will know the right thing to do.

The Government say in their speech that "Negotiations are in progress between my Ministers and a corporation which proposes to establish in this Island and on Labrador, an industry of exceptional magnitude, involving the expenditure of many millions of dollars in the development of our water powers and the utilizing of some

of our valuable natural resources in the manufacture of a variety of commodities. The enterprise promises to be one affording new avenues of employment for great numbers of our people, and serving as an auxiliary for our staple industry. To this and other measures dealing with undertakings of lesser scope your attention will be invited."

Isn't it peculiar that every time the House meets there is a paragraph similar to the one I have just read in the Governor's speech. There is always something wonderful going to happen in a few months time. Last year we had this in the Speech:—

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

When that was put there they knew very well that nothing was going to come of it, and do they think that there are twenty men in the whole country today who believe that anything is going to come out of that paragraph in their speech this year?

Here is another one:—

"It is encouraging to observe that your efforts to attract the attention of outside capitalists to the varied and natural resources of the country are gradually bearing fruit. My Ministers are at present in negotiation with the representative of a large group of British investors with a view to the utilization of some of the vast water powers of Labrador and the establishment of very large industries calculated to

afford permanent employment to numbers of our people, and to reproduce in that land the transformation that has been effected in our own Island in recent years."

Now, what do you think of that? Last year we were going to have a man come down here and take charge of Grand Falls, in Hamilton Inlet, and establish a tremendous industrial undertaking; put up tremendous machinery, and all that sort of thing. The whole country was going to blossom as a rose. The wonderful thing about this is that the Premier never seems to learn anything; he does not appear to get wise from year to year; surely he ought to know by this time that he cannot cod the House with this sort of thing any longer. Now we are going to have more great machinery, great mills, great dams. Mr. Downey told us that there is a Company going to spend eleven millions, only eleven millions, and that within two years they are going to have all the machinery in operation. Well, now is the time for these great things to come along. What we want is something material, something to work on. We have had all we want of great promises, pretty speeches, bright phrases. Now, I hope, if I have the pleasure of sitting here again another year that I will not hear any more such paragraphs as that in the Speech. If the Premier will take a suggestion from me he will leave them out in the future. Do the best you can in those matters, and if your negotiations come to anything, then tell us about it, and we will give you all the credit that you deserve.

Now, I would like to know whether the Government intend to bring in any further legislation this year to strengthen the Act in connection with combines and monopolies, which was passed here at the last session. Up to

the present the Act has been inoperative because of the fact that there is no penalty imposed for the breach of it. There were a number of cases during the last year in which a Commission appointed under that Act might have been called upon to investigate certain combines which were believed to exist, but an investigation would be useless because even if it were found that any wrong had been done there was no way in which the guilty parties could be punished. They would only laugh at us. There are lots of things which we know of and perhaps lots of things that we do not know of in this respect, but we do know this, that there have been combines existing in St. John's for many years. During the past fall there have been several combines in existence, but there was nothing which we could do to prevent them from operating. There was no use in calling the attention of anybody to what was going on, because the Act was inoperative so far as getting after the people responsible was concerned and the matter had to be overlooked. Now, here is a chance for the Government to do something, if, as they say, they really and sincerely wish to aid the common masses against the injuries that result from those combines.

Now there is another thing that I wish to call attention to. I hope that the Supervisor of Debates, or whoever is responsible for having the debates published, will see that the speeches from this side of the House are correctly reported. The reports of our speeches last year were simply an abomination. There was no sense in them. It was a case of simply putting in a sentence here and there. On the other hand, I noticed that all the speeches of members on the other side were splendidly reported; so that we were not given a fair show. If you

are going to publish the speeches, then publish them correctly; if you cannot do it correctly, then don't do it at all. As I have said I don't know whether the Supervisor is responsible or not, but if he is not then I think he ought to see that whoever is responsible is brought to book and that there will be no repetition of what occurred last year.

The Minister of Finance and Customs is not present. I was going to ask him why he permitted the Bonaventure to sail from Channel on the 10th March instead of on the 13th. The law as passed here last session, provided that steel ships could not sail south or west from St. John's until the 13th March under a fine not exceeding \$4,000. The ship sailed on the 10th. The Act provides that any three members of any crew may take action against the owners of the ship for sailing before the time. And that is what is intended to be done. But the Customs people should have been more alive to their duties, and should not have permitted the ship to sail.

There is a lot of talk about a duty going on molasses. I notice that nothing has been said in the Speech regarding this, and I hope that the Government does not intend to do anything in this connection. The cost of molasses is really 10 cents a gallon higher than last year, and if it is intended to put 4 or 5 cents more on it, then it will merely mean that the poor people will be compelled to use less sweetening.

You must not increase the price of molasses for if you do, you deprive the fishermen of one of their most used commodities. I ask the Government to take this matter into consideration. Our friend, Mr. Clift, has suggested that there be a decrease in expenditure. Something must be done to prevent this outrageous expenditure

now going on. Do not try to meet increased demands by taxing the people of the Colony any greater. If the Colony is in such a desperate condition that you must find more money do not increase taxation but reduce expenditure. I find that that there are men standing around at many places who are Government officials doing nothing. You have a man at Morton's Harbor, holding a Government position there, who gets a salary of \$400 or \$500, and is not earning a fifth of it. There is another at Lewisporte getting \$900, and another at Exploits getting \$500, with nothing to do. If these men are not earning their money, they are not wanted. Poor fishermen have to bear the burden imposed upon them, as a result of paying these idle Government officials large salaries. There are three Custom officials in Twillingate District, and don't earn \$200 for which the work could easily be done. With regard to the explanation given by the Hon. Colonial Secretary, in respect to the matter of wrong doing in the Registration Department of the Post Office. Now, we look upon the Colonial Secretary as a man who is honest and reliable. He admitted that there were irregularities in the Registration Office of the General Post Office. Why did the matter not come before the Government? He might have said: "Well, I did not know of it until now, but I will do everything in my power to get at the root of the matter." The books in that department of the Post Office are short by \$180. I do not care who is offended, but this kind of thing must not go on. If I were head of any public department I should punish any one who did any wrong. Is the Government going to allow that sort of thing to go on? Put the pruning knife into all those matters and try to administer justice to all.

There is another matter of which I wish to speak. I was very sorry to read in a paper today a report from one of the members of the Upper House, who talked about the price of fish becoming lower in the future. I think that the hon. member ought to have refrained from speaking upon that subject. It is very poor encouragement for our toiling fishermen to hear of such utterings. Times will be hard during the coming year. We ought to encourage our men instead of discouraging them by saying that the price of fish will come down in value. Why should it come down? If the war continues why should the price of fish be any lower than it is now. If they buy cheaper the fish will be in the buyers' stores when the price advances again, and they will again make big profits. The price must keep up. I am sorry that this statement was ever made and I hope that the Government will do all it can to remove that impression from the minds of our fishermen. As it is, salt will be fifty cents dearer than it was last year. In fact, supplies generally will be very much higher in price. The Government ought to try to give a little advantage to the fishermen of the country, and give them a chance to get to the fishery this year. If there were no men to prosecute the fishery, it would be a sad state of affairs. There are men in Bell Island who have not a chance to work; and over a thousand men in Conception Bay who are looking for something to do. Something must be done. There ought to be some way of arranging supplies for those men the coming spring. Our men are anxious to work if they can only find work to do. If the Government does not do something to aid those men it will be very injurious to the finances of the Colony. There will be no employment up

the country, and there will be very little work at the mines or mills, hence the men must fish or starve.

There is a lot of discrepancy in the manner in which relief is given out to our people. I hope the Government is not responsible for that. Relief is being given to some and denied others just as badly in need. Men are refused, and because they are not Tories. The man asks for some assistance, but does not get it because he voted on the wrong side of politics. No able bodied man wants pauper money. He desires work for aid given him, but work is denied him. During the winter I suggested that the Government might take drums and hoops from men in Conception Bay. And if these men had the opportunity of selling such it would help many over the hardest time this Spring. Do not make paupers of those men. There are public works to be attended to in Conception Bay which would, if started, help these people out. There is no destitution in Green Bay or Fogo District, and not much in Bonavista and Trinity Districts. The men in these bays can go into the lumber woods and earn enough to supply their pressing requirements. I ask the Government to issue grants to parts of Conception Bay and supply employment during the next month. Put it in the hands of some public-spirited men; I do not care who they are. We ought to do all that is possible to ease the burden of the fishermen of Conception Bay during the next few weeks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter which I wish to mention before I take my seat. The Allan people are getting \$20,000 subsidy for trans-Atlantic service between here and the Old Country. The Government ought to see that they put decent boats on the service. I think that the

time has come when the Government ought to see that this is done. We have one company getting \$20,000 subsidy which is giving a 50 per cent worse service than another which gets no subsidy from the Colony. I refer to the Furness-Withy Co. \$20,000 should not be thrown away on the Allans, and they should be compelled to put on first class boats for this money.

In regard to the war, I endorse all that has been said by the various speakers. I am sorry that it took us so long to make up the thousand men for the Naval Reserve. I think that the authorities are responsible for much of the slackness in enlisting for the Navy. The Naval Reservists are getting only twenty-six cents a day, while the volunteers for the Army get one dollar a day. When the fishermen come here to join the Naval Reserve and find that the pay is only about one quarter of what the volunteers are getting, many of them turn away from the Navy and join the volunteers. If it had been assured these men that after the war they would get one dollar a day the same as the volunteers the response would have been much larger. After the war you will find that it will be difficult to win the favour of the fishermen towards the Naval Reserve. They are continually complaining about the treatment accorded them, and they come to my office with their complaints, and I know what their feelings are towards the Navy. They complain that the whole town turns out to bid adieu to the volunteers, but the Naval lads leave without any farewell or fuss. These men who have lost their lives have given all they possessed for King and Country. There is no cause so noble as that of fighting for King and Country, and I am sure that the memory of the lads who have

sunk beneath the waves will always be appreciated by their fellow countrymen. The king, flag, and the throne was as dear to them as their lives, and they died to uphold the glory and honor of the same. If, by any possible chance, the Germans should destroy a part of our fleet and men were wanted to man warships it would be found that 5,000 of our fishermen would willingly come forward and take their places on the fleet. Some now think the Empire can get along without them, but if the call to duty was urgent it would be found that there would be a ready response. The dependents of these brave men who have given their lives for the Empire ought to be properly cared for; and I hope no mean pension will be awarded them when the matter is being arranged. The Government may do wrong, and act unfairly, but the fault is not attributable to the Constitution, for under it we possess every liberty available to man. If wrongs are committed we have to blame but ourselves and our indifference to the principles of democracy. We can't blame the Constitution or the Flag or the Throne. The country will regard these men who have gone down, as heroes, and the younger men coming up will be influenced for good by the examples of these brave men who sacrificed their lives at the altar of duty in order to do their all to protect our liberties and freedom.

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

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

Mr. Lloyd gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question.

Mr. Coaker gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to intro-

duce a Bill entitled: "An Act to regulate the employment of the men engaged in Logging."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, April 9th, 1915, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly

FRIDAY, April 9th, 1915.

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

REPORT TABLED.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled Fourth Interim Report of Dominions Royal Commission.

QUESTIONS.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House an itemized statement of all expenses connected with the propagation of lobsters in Bonavista District the past year, 1914, and the names of persons to whom amounts were paid, the amounts paid to each, and for what purpose.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The answer to this question is being made ready.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance for a statement showing the quantities of goods imported, and the revenue received respectively from them: (a) between March 11th, 1914, and June 30th, 1914; (b) between July 1st, 1914, and March 31st, 1915; under the heads and sub-heads, set forth in the Revenue Act, 1905, as amended on March 11th, 1914, showing in each case the increase of revenue under these heads from the increased tariff of March 11th, 1914.

HON. MIN. FINANCE.—The answer is being prepared.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House returns of all moneys spent in Bay de Verde District on roads

the past twelve months; to furnish a list of amounts sent out to each settlement in the District, and to whom sent.

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

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House complete returns of Patrick Doyle, Relieving Officer of Gull Island, and of William Garland, late Relieving Officer of Lower Island Cove, both in Bay de Verde District, for the years ending 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914 and for 1915, to date; to furnish the names of all persons to whom relief or donations of Government moneys of any kind have been given out through the above-named persons, and the amounts to each.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The answer is being prepared.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the revenue and expenditure of the Colony in each of the six months, ending January 31st, 1915, and for each month in the corresponding period in the years 1913-14 and 1912-13.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE.—The answer is in course of preparation.

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

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The Imperial Government has made an advance of one million dollars to this

Colony for military expenditure. This amount has been advanced as a war loan at the same rate of interest as that paid by the British Government. The time for repayment of this loan will be arranged at a later date between this Colony and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. From the loan the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars raised from the Bank of Montreal as a temporary loan, was paid off, and the balance is now to the credit of the Colony. There is no correspondence to be tabled.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all payments made under (1) General Contingencies; (2) Section 23b. of the Audit Act; (3) Order of the Governor-in-Council, from January 1st, 1914, to date.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—The answer is being prepared.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether the Railway Loan authorized by 4 Geo. V., Cap. 21, has been raised; if so, what amount has been received and on what terms; if not, how was the money provided to carry on the works the loan was intended to cover; on what terms and conditions; what has been done thereunder; what amount received and how much has been expended and for what purpose; and to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence, accounts, documents or papers relating to the said matters or any of them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The whole of the amount to be raised under 4 Geo. V., Cap. 21, has not been raised. When I was in London in June last I was advised by our financial agents, Messrs. Coates & Co., that it would be in the interests of the Colony if the Act provided for four per cent. instead of three and one-half per cent. One million dollars had been raised by a temporary loan from

them, and expended for the purpose of the loan authorized to be raised.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the cost of the Postal Telegraph Building recently erected at Badger, whether it was erected under contract and, if so, to whom it was awarded.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The answer is in course of preparation.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the returns of five hundred dollars allocated for a public wharf at Harry's Harbour in the District of Twillingate, in May and August, 1913, and sent to Edward Bedman.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES laid on the table the information asked for.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary why a courier was not appointed to convey mails from Milbertown to the logging camps up Red Indian Lake, as recommended by the people, and laid before the Government.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In the month of January I received some correspondence in reference to this matter, to which I replied that I would immediately take it up with the Postmaster General. That official, after investigation, said that it would mean the creation of a new service, for which no provision had been made in the Estimates. The matter was allowed to rest, but I am in sympathy with the request of the people of Milbertown, especially when they are practically cut off for two months of the year from all intercourse with the rest of the people of the Colony. It seems very desirable that some means should be adopted to remedy this state of affairs. The Postmaster General has gone into this matter thoroughly.

I will endeavour before next session to have such arrangements made that will give postal facilities to those engaged in the lumber camps, possibly by some such means as appointing one of the lumber men postmaster pro tem. I can assure the hon. member that everything possible will be done in the interests of the loggers.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary what amount is paid per trip to F. Thistle for conveying the mail from King's Point to Three Arms, calling at Rattling Brook, Jackson's Cove and Harry's Harbour, and whether that service is weekly or bi-weekly.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to inform the hon. member that \$7.00 is paid per trip, and the service is performed bi-weekly.

LOGGING BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the employment of the men engaged in Logging," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The adjourned debate on the Address in Reply was resumed.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a few remarks for I do not want to let this opportunity slip by without making some slight comment on the speech from the Throne. It is indeed of an extraordinary nature, but perhaps this is owing to the war conditions now prevailing all over the world and as I may say, Sir, not altogether so remarkable for what it contains as it is for what it does not. When we came into the House and were confronted by the flags of Great Britain and the Allies, we were reminded how the mother country is fighting for her existence, and it is gratifying to per-

ceive that in the present conflict the people of Newfoundland maintain so patriotic a view. The intense seriousness of the situation is brought home to us by the fact that already some of our men, who bravely went forth to defend the Empire have sacrificed their lives. And it makes us feel very proud, when we consider that they have done so. Never before in the annals of history have we had the occasion. I hope, however, that soon this European war will be over, that this war forced on the world by the German Emperor will be brought to an early end, and that Great Britain will emerge victorious. A great number of our men have responded nobly to the call, and I feel that they will give a good account of themselves, so that we here in Newfoundland will be proud of them, proud of their coming forward to protect our dear old Newfoundland. I think it sufficient to say but a few words concerning the war because it has already been discussed and dilated upon very fully in this House and all over the country. With regard to the Speech from the Throne I confess I am altogether disappointed to find there is no provision made for the people of this colony who to-day are out of employment I am thoroughly in accord with the provisions of the Speech in reference to those who suffer partial or total disablement whilst engaged on active service—a measure which I feel sure will command public sympathy. On this side of the House we shall be glad to give all the support we possibly can to this measure. Some financial provision, of course, must be afforded to those left behind dependent. As regards the seal fishery, I may say that I regard this as one of our most important assets. It is unfortunately very bad this year, and the seal fish-

ery is an industry upon which the colony largely depends; it would if it had been successful, have proved a great benefit. I should be very pleased to see the sealers coming home with a good trip; it would mean a good year for the men themselves and their families at home in general and would largely benefit the colony.

As regards our revenue, we were told last year in September that the deficit was \$237,000. But as a matter of fact, it was \$260,000, a difference of nearly seventy thousand. This of course is only a "hea bite." But these hea-bites are large when summed up, very large indeed. At the present time the colony is in a deplorable condition, brought about by the administration of the present Government. I think I am safe in saying that one of the gentlemen of the Upper House has been content with following our policy, having seen the error of his ways, evidently, for in regard to tuberculosis and the agricultural policy he remarks that extravagance has marked the career of the present Government and that only now are we beginning to realize that they are up against it hard and fast. The ship is stranded. I know that if the present state of affairs is deplorable, a great deal has been brought about by the war. But the war alone will not suffice to cover up the sins of the Government. The country is in too bad a state. The branch railways, the Trepassay branch, the Bay de Verde branch, the line from Heart's Content, are doing nothing. The only cars that run over the tracks are those on which the men get out their wood. A great deal of poverty and destitution is here in our midst in St. John's. Something surely should be done to ameliorate this situation. I do not mean that men should be given relief without work. Many are quite willing to work, pro-

viding they can only get employment. They do not want to be called paupers but they merely want to earn an honest dollar.

We are told negotiations are in progress for the utilization of some of our natural resources. But, we have been hearing this from time to time in every Speech from the Throne, with which the Legislature has been opened for years past and it has never materialized. It was nothing more or less than a bag of gas and only requires a match and it will explode. This paragraph hints at things which will only go up in smoke. We do not for a moment place any confidence in them until we have been afforded evidences of their practical success. I hope that the government will consider their ways and be wise and in the near future try to do something to try and relieve the destitution which now prevails so seriously over the colony.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words relative to matters now in discussion. I may say that I can thoroughly endorse the sentiments of the previous speakers as to what they have said with regard to the war. I have indeed been very pleased to see that so many of our young men should so promptly come forward to sacrifice, if need be, their lives in such a noble cause. I cannot comprehend, personally, how it arises in this enlightened age that Europe should be plunged in international warfare. It seems to me that war should never exist nowadays—although I suppose, it makes no difference whether I comprehend it or not. We can only hope that the time is not far distant when this war will come to an end, and the British Empire be victorious—for this must be the only end. I must also say a great deal of credit is due to the ladies of

Newfoundland for they have worked nobly throughout the colony to promote the comfort of our soldiers, who have gone forth to fight the battles of the Empire, whilst engaged in their work. They deserve the greatest praise and I am glad to note what has been said in this respect from the Speech from the Throne. As regards the Speech from the Throne, I would say, that we have heard speeches from the Throne before, all promising things like this from time to time, and yet, as the former speaker has just remarked, they have gone up in smoke, and never yet have they come up to the promises made in the various speeches from the Throne.

We have all got work to do. We must look after the country. It is true we have a responsibility towards our soldiers and sailors, but we have also a duty towards those at home to see that they do not starve. There is a great battle, a battle against starvation going on in this country. This is one of the best countries in the world containing some of the best men as has been often proved.

From what has been already said it would appear that this country is in a deplorable condition. I do not know whether to believe it or not. I was going to say I do not know who to believe. It is almost bewildering to a person without much education who has not spent 30 years in public life to know who or what to believe. It is a job to understand. I would not like to say anything that is not true or reasonable. But last year I understood the Prime Minister to say the country was in a flourishing condition. Then how does it happen that to-day we are in a bad condition. I was walking down Water Street this morning, and a man said to me "This is a wonderful state of things." I said "Why?" He said "The country is in

such bad shape." I said: "Oh, no! That is not true, the country is flourishing." I did not see how it could be had when we were told by those who ought to know that it was flourishing. I could not believe the man on the street when a man of 30 years' experience in politics had said otherwise. Still the country is not in a good condition and one reason is on account of the war. We have to pay out some money on that account. But the war has not been on for two years. It has only been on a few months. I do not think it is the war that has caused this deplorable condition. The reason is because of extravagance. I believe that if the men who are governing this country had the interest of the people at heart the country would not be in this condition. For years we have had good revenues and good fisheries. Despite this we are now in a financial crisis. What is going to happen if we have a poor fishery? Before we even thought of war this country had to be taxed heavily. What for? Not because of the war. I do not see how anyone can believe that the condition is due to the war. We know that that is not due to the war. We know that the reason is that so much money has been wasted round the country, and nothing is coming in from it. We are trying to live above our means. We have got into a hole and we are going to have a job to get out of it. If we could not steer clear of the hole in prosperous times we are not going to do much in bad times. The fishery last year was poor. The sealing fishery this spring is a failure so that we are in for bad times.

That reminds me of something a person said to me last year. He said: "You are the right man to have in the House." I said: "Why?" He said: "Because if the bottom falls out of

the chest you will be able to solder it in again."

Previous speakers have mentioned the question of railways. They were supposed to have been built for \$4,000,000. That was the impression of the people. It may not have been the Prime Minister's impression, but it was the impression he gave the people. He only spoke of \$4,000,000. It is true that he did not mention rolling stock and extras, but the people did not know that, and if he had told them what it was going to cost it is probable they would not have stood for it.

We have not yet felt the worst of these times. I wish we had. In a few days' time I suppose we shall know more about it, and what we learn the public at large will know as well.

I do not want to detain the House much longer. Others wish to speak after me, and as it is April this year when the House meets we do not wish to be kept here any longer than is necessary. The House should be opened in the winter, so that everyone can attend with least inconvenience. There are very few who wish it to be opened at this time of year.

As I said before, if the business of the Government were carried on properly this country ought to be flourishing. It ought to be a prosperous country, and it is sad to find it in the deplorable condition in which it now is, entirely through extravagance.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations on the Address in Reply before the Debate closes.

I do not often have occasion to congratulate the Government and the Prime Minister, but on this occasion I have pleasure in tendering them my congratulations. I think it very appropriate on an occasion such as this, the Chamber should be decorated as

it is. It is particularly appropriate, Sir, that the desk at which you sit should be draped in the folds of the Union Jack, that emblem that expresses so fully the attitude of the Empire today. It is appropriate as pointing to the unity of force and of interest that is shown in the tremendous difficulties which we are now facing, but it is more appropriate in being placed where it is. All the liberties of the people and the Empire are dependent upon the desk at which you sit. You represent Sir, the rights of the people, the voice of the people as expressed through this House of Parliament. That flag is the emblem of the attitude of the Empire in this world struggle, this struggle in which the two great principles are at stake, the principle that right and liberty shall prevail as represented by our force and that of our Allies, and the principle of might as represented by our opponents. Shall popular Government as exemplified by the allied cause prevail, or shall there be a triumph of might over right, a triumph of physical force. It is because of the justice of our cause that we are in this struggle. That is why we are proud to be in the struggle. That is why we are proud of the stock from which we have sprung, English, Irish, Scotch or Welsh, whether in Newfoundland or anywhere else in the Empire. We think we have reached the stage where we are going to give an account to the world and to history of what we have done. It is therefore very appropriate that the one thing that dominates us here today is the Union Jack of Old England.

But notwithstanding my congratulation of the Government, I cannot help thinking that there was a note struck in the Prime Minister's speech a note of disappointment. And this note of disappointment ran not alone

throughout the Prime Minister's speech, but also throughout the whole speech from the Throne. It seemed that he was sorry that he was Prime Minister and not able to lay upon the House a statement of something that Newfoundland ought to have done, but has not done. And Newfoundland has not been able to do this because of the Premier's misdeeds of the past. It is true that he said that he was prepared to defend every act that had been done by the Government in the past, every vote they had asked for, every vote that he had obtained, but none the less he told us that no one could have foreseen the war, and therefore there was something that might have been done if it had been foreseen. There was something that might have been done, something that should have been done, that has not been done. To-day we are proud of the work that has been done by the volunteers, but one thing we are not proud of is the way that the Newfoundland Government has treated the Naval Reserve. Here in this country we have numbers of men able and willing to go with the Naval Reserve, but have been compelled to go elsewhere because the Government did not find itself able to supplement their pay. That I think is one of the causes of the sorrow in the Prime Minister's speech. I remember seeing in a paper some time ago what was supposed to be one of the Premier's remarks on one of his periodic visits to England. He said in effect that if it ever became necessary Newfoundland would be able to man twenty Dreadnoughts.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—
I never said that.

MR. LLOYD—Well if you never said it it was attributed to you.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It was very near to what I did say. I

said they would be able to man the Dreadnoughts of Britain, and they are doing that to-day.

DR. LLOYD—I may be wrong. In any case I am very pleased that they are doing work more important than manning the Dreadnoughts. Many of them are disappointed because they are not in Dreadnoughts. They expected to be put there because the leader of the Government told them that that was where they were going. The Naval Reserve men are now in places where they can give the best service, where they are best fitted for. It would take years and years of training to turn out a man fit to handle the guns and work the machinery of a Dreadnought. But, Sir, they are at the post of honour. They are at a post more important and in this respect more honourable than manning a Dreadnought, because they are at a post of greater danger. They are at the post of greater danger because they are in the North Sea. They are in the North Sea which is heavily mined and full of submarines. They are clearing the North Sea for England's commerce and although they are not in Dreadnoughts, except perhaps a few, they are doing their duty at the most dangerous of all posts. That is a very honourable position to be in.

But, I say, Sir, there was a note of disappointment in the speech and that note was at the end of it. I do not know what it foreboded. I was wondering. I say I thought that possibly the Prime Minister was sorry for his misdeeds of the past. I noted on opening day that the Government assigned the seconding of the Address to the hon. member for Harbor Grace, Mr. Parsons, who gave a most patriotic speech, a very able speech and one that will be a great pleasure to all that read it. I note that in his speech he lays great stress on the fact

that he was the son of a fisherman. He was very proud of it and told us that none should be ashamed of his calling and he dwelt at great length upon that point. I was wondering why the Government had assigned that duty to him and why he dwelt on the question of calling and it struck me that the reason why the Government had assigned the seconding to him and the reason why he dwelt so much on this question was that the Prime Minister saw the end of his term of office approaching and he thought it fit to ask one of the calling followed by Mr. Parsons to "undertake" the duty of attending to the obsequies.

Sir, it is natural that the war should overshadow everything—it enters into all our calculations, this great event of the past year, this great event that hangs over us but there was another event that had a marked effect on Newfoundland and I was pleased to note in the Speech from the Throne that the Government intends to introduce legislation as a result of findings of the Commission to enquire into the sealing disaster. Let there be no possible doubt but that such legislation is necessary. I remember a remark made some years ago by the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, in reference to a certain industry. It was to the effect that if that industry could not be carried on except by the loss of a large number of lives, then let that industry go. This is the question we have before us; if the sealing industry cannot be carried on without, or cannot bear the cost of preventing disasters and loss of life, such as we experienced in 1914, let that industry go. It is not worth keeping if it costs us 250 men. The dangers are great and at every move the life is risked. We should consider whether the voyage is worth the risk which it involves.

A good deal has been said in refer-

ence to the sealing disaster and the punishment of those responsible and I want to define my position. I believe that it is possible to assign responsibility in these cases but this House must assign responsibility only by legislation. This House is not fitted to be a tribunal. This House is not a court of Justice, and it is not proper that this House should inflict punishment directly upon the offenders. What they should do is to make a law, under which persons responsible for such conduct, would be tried before a Court in the ordinary way.

Now, Sir, to make reference to the deficit of this year and the deficit of the past year ending June 30th. That deficit was not unexpected on this side of the House. It was foretold long before the session met; it was foretold last session by the Opposition on account of the Government not making satisfactory financial arrangements for the year.

It will be remembered that even the House was distinctly warned of it, and the budget of 1913 was termed an election budget. Of course the suggestion was disregarded, but now it appears we were correct. It will be remembered that when the duties were taken off, it was pointed out here that with the reduced revenue it would be impossible to meet the usual expenditure. The Minister of Finance told this House just previous to the election that that Budget would produce a surplus of \$50,000, and now he admits that instead, there was a deficit of \$300,000, or that his estimate was \$350,000 out. Last session he had the means of reconsidering his position. He could safely have reconsidered the matter and come in with his story, and we could not have said but that it was to some extent genuine. It will be remembered also that he made a proposition for taxation to the Government here. He computed that

the proposition would bring in \$720,000 per year. As the result of what seemed to him to be an extraordinary year, he found it necessary to impose a further tax in the form of a surtax of 10 per cent., which he said would straighten things up. This he reckoned would bring in \$600,000 extra, and \$200,000 towards the fiscal year ending June 30th last. So the position of affairs is this: In the preceding year he said that there would be a surplus of \$50,000. The next spring he came back and asked for \$240,000 more, so that his estimates were nearly \$200,000 out. But with this extra he was going to meet the expenditure. Now he comes back and says that he did not do this; that he was \$200,000 short. It means that he was really out \$600,000 in his calculations, and this is the sin that we have to put up with. But now, in spite of the extra taxation, there is going to be even a greater deficit than there was last year, so that it seems the Government were wise in appointing an undertaker to prepare for their obsequies. Now, Sir, there is still hope. There is a ray of light that means that the Government is hopeful of getting out of this hole. There is a ray of hope with the note of sadness discerned in the Premier's remarks. We are told that the Budget will contain extra taxation, and the reason put into the Governor's mouth is that it is because of the depression that has been manifesting itself for some time. It is strange that they could not foresee that depression before the end of the year. The position of the country is undoubtedly very serious. It is the greatest and most serious crisis outside of the war, that the Colony has had to face, and that state is due solely to the Government, and was brought about by them. But now all parties must unite and extricate the country from the clutches that are fast clos-

ing on it.

Twelve months ago, from this side of the House, we pointed out where the Government was going to land us, and now they have accomplished what we predicted. Now that we are in this state, it is up to the Government to act quickly and do what is necessary to get us out of this condition. If we are going to be asked to increase taxation, we want to know first the result of the increase twelve months ago. We want to know the result of the increase six months ago, to find out if the increase has produced any benefit at all. We must find out if the imports can respond to the increase. It is idle to discuss the subject until we know where we stand. And I would strongly express the desire that the information asked for should be promptly furnished. I have no doubt that the Hon. Minister of Finance will see the desirability of this and will have it attended to.

During the last session we discussed over and over again the floating of the Railway Loan authorized by this House. We asked again and again if the Government intended to have that issued at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and pointed out that it would be impossible to get investors to take it up. This was well known to everybody, but the Government passed the Bill, and when the Prime Minister went to England he was told by the financial agents that the loan bill was useless, and he did not put it on the market. He secured, however, a temporary loan of \$1,000,000 for one year. This must be paid back immediately at the end of the year, and what will have been the result of the delay?

A few days ago the Canadian Government obtained a loan, which they had offered 12 months ago at 4 per cent.; with the approval of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Hon. David Lloyd George, they got it on the mar-

ket, but at 4½ per cent. and at 99. That is: for every \$99 they receive, they must pay back \$100 with 4½ interest. It is unlikely that we are going to do better than Canada in this respect. This is but one instance of the lack of financial foresight on the part of the present Government. Blindfolded, the expenditure has been increased regardless of the revenue. We were told the other day that the cost of the public service for the last 4 or 5 years had increased \$900,000, and yet we find that last June there was a deficit of \$300,000 in one year, and, I fear, a greater deficit for the coming year. So reckless has been the financing of the present Government that we have not even got the \$500,000 reserve that we had to our credit a year ago, \$300,000 having been taken to balance up the accounts last June 30th, and the other \$200,000 with the extra taxation is to be used to level up the deficit of this year. That is, Sir, our present position, the worst the Colony has had to face, and this side of the House is anxiously looking forward to the outcome.

There is hope in the fact that in spite of war which commenced last August, and the consequent dislocation of trade, through the effectiveness of the British Navy our trade was soon running as usual, and thus far only one of our fish vessels has been sunk by Germany, notwithstanding the fact that we have been ever since carrying on our trade with Spain, Italy, Greece and Brazil. I have been in this country for a long time, some 25 years, and have seen some things of the recuperative power of the Colony. I remember the great fire of 1892, and saw how quickly the city was rebuilt; I saw the 1894 Bank Crash, and how quickly the people recovered, and how in 6 years we were again in a state of prosperity. It is in the recuperative powers of the Colony, then, that lies the hope of our getting out of

this without financial disaster.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker. Just two or three words in reply to the hon. member. I did not intend to add anything further to the debate, but I think the observations which he has made call for two or three remarks from me in reply.

I always like to hear the hon. member speak, and as a rule, if properly interpreted, something can be learned from his remarks; but I am afraid he is too often a Cassandra, a prophet of evil. That is really the only fault I have to find with him; in other respects I rather like him for the fearless and open way in which he puts forward his case. But that is the position which an Opposition has always to take. The moment the Opposition ceases to come out and make at least an effort to put forward a strong case against the Government, they are under suspicion. Their very life depends upon attacking the Government. It does not matter whether the Government is right or wrong the Opposition has to condemn it.

My learned friend opened here today as a prophet of evil, and told us that we were right up against a funeral, and that we anticipated this by putting forward my friend from Harbor Grace as the Undertaker. Well, I think every one in this chamber will say that if this funeral goes on, the chief mourner ought to be my friend on the other side, because he would fill that bill better than any man I know in this House or in this community. He won't require to wear any crape; he has been a mourner in this House as long as I can remember him. Now, I could close my eyes this afternoon and fancy myself back here thirty years ago, when I heard exactly the same old statement—that we were going on the rocks; and I have listened to it annually from the other side

of the House ever since. It was always the same old story—that the country was, as my friend from Trinity Bay said, in a most deplorable condition. But he had the frankness to say that he was perplexed as to whom to believe. That was the burden of his lay. Some one had met him down on Water Street this morning and told him that the country was in a most deplorable condition; but from what he had heard from other people who ought to know something about it, things were the very opposite; and he hardly knew how to make up his mind as to whether we were in a good or a bad condition. But my learned friend, the hon. member for Trinity, has no doubt on his mind. He tells us this afternoon that we are right up against a first class funeral. Well, I have only to say in reply that I have listened to that prediction too, for the last thirty years. When I came here in 1886 it was the same thing. When Sir William Whiteway advocated the railway across the country, and was supported in his views by the very best minds in the community, he was told that it meant ruin, and Confederation, and other catastrophes for Newfoundland. He had practically, to leave public life, in 1886, very largely for that reason, and an entirely new Government was called in because the country was stamped by exactly the same cry that we are listening to to-day, that things were in a most deplorable condition and that the bottom was dropping out of everything; and the people who do not always consider what they are doing were foolish enough at the time to be misled and carried away by these prophets of evil. And what happened? Within four years the whole country, from north to south and from east to west, was crying out for the return of Sir William Whiteway;

the men who turned him out were snowed under, and their names are forgotten to-day in Newfoundland, (unless it to be to identify them with the depression and bad times and low prices for fish and stagnation for the three or four years that they were in power.) And then Sir William Whiteway came back in 1889. He came in on the policy of building the railway—first to Exploits, and then on to Port aux Basques—and then we had to listen to the same tune, played by different people it is true, but the same old tune on the same old fiddle: that we were on the eve of bankruptcy; that we were in a hole; that the country was on the rocks; and that there was no hope of redemption. And we went on; and the Fire, to which my hon. friend has referred, came in '92, and the Bank Crash came in '94, and the Colony, through no fault of her own, went through a period of severe financial depression. We were told then that the end had come, that there was no hope—no chance of saving the old ship from the rocks. And what happened? After a while everything was put in order, and we have been sailing along ever since, prosperity following prosperity, good times following good times, our revenue increasing almost every year imports and exports increasing, until to-day we have doubled the value of our imports and exports compared to what they were in what was then considered good times. Then another change came in 1897, and Sir William Whiteway was turned out again by a Party who very largely depended on the very cry that we are listening to to-day, namely, that we were at the end of taxation; that no more money could be obtained for the public service of the colony without bankruptcy. And what are the facts? We have more than doubled our revenue since

then, and still the country is not insolvent, and has not gone into confederation, or been annexed by the United States, or become a Crown Colony. If you will look at the Estimates for 1897 you will find that since that date the colony has added over \$2,000,000, to the cost of carrying on the public service of the colony. And then Sir Robert Bond came into power. He came in 1900, and then there were men in the House who said that we would never again see a bit of prosperity; that his coming in meant the end of all prosperity and advancement; but he went on for eight years, and when he laid down the conduct of public affairs in 1908 we had increased our public service during that time \$1,000,000. And we were told here yesterday by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Clift) that we had increased the public Estimates, or the cost of the public service, since we have been in office nearly \$1,000,000. That is quite true, and I am only sorry that we have not been able to increase it by a greater sum, because there is a crying need all over the country for further increases. But what I object to is the unfairness of saying that we have done anything which our predecessors did not do. If Mr. Speaker, you will look at the figures, you will find that from 1900 to 1909—the eight years during which Sir Robert Bond was in power the public service of this colony was increased by between \$900,000 and \$1,000,000; and I make bold to say that for the increases which have taken place during the last 6 years, by which we have increased the annual public vote by a proportionate amount, we are able to show value for value as compared with the increases made by him. Why have we added \$1,000,000 a year to the vote for the public services? Because when

we came in we found most of these services absolutely perishing for need of assistance. Take the vote for education; we added \$100,000 a year to the pay of the starving teachers to educate the poorest children in the colony. There is a hundred thousand dollars which might have been saved, if you like. We might have had the Estimates \$100,000 less, but we could not have increased the teachers' salaries and we could not have kept the schools open. We have added \$30,000 a year for new lights and new fog alarms to keep our people from going ashore in the fog. Does my learned friend want us to put these lights out? We have added \$60,000 a year for Old Age pensions. For years before we put that vote on the statute book, Party after Party came into office, very often on the promise to carry that out, and never did it. The same is true, Mr. Speaker, of all the other votes. Take the Marine and Fisheries Department, take the relief of the poor, take the charitable institutions, the hospitals and all the other institutions in the country, take the Customs service, and you will find where the million dollars went; and I am only sorry, Sir, that the temporary set back caused by the war and by the depression that preceded the war, does not enable us to come in here and ask for still further increases in relation to these various public services.

Whenever my hon. friends on the other side have no other subject to discuss they always fall back on the railway branches and their cost, on the principle that any stick is good enough to beat a dog. We built the railway branches, it is true, but we built them because we had a mandate from the country to build them; we built them because for years in this House, from both sides, resolution af-

ter resolution had been passed calling for the construction of these railway branches, in order to give to the Outport people, those who were being taxed for the main trunk and getting no advantage from it, some of the blessings and advantages of railway connection. It was no haphazard policy; it was not done in the dark; we did it with our eyes open; and to-day I say that except for the mere temporary depression all that we have done in the way of increased public services is more than justified by the condition of the country. I think it is a mistake for those who hold public positions in this country to be continually and at all times taking such a gloomy view of our affairs both public and commercial. I do not believe in the principle of sticking our heads in the sand and going along as if everything were perfect. I am a thorough believer in public criticism, the fullest ventilation and the fullest examination of all our public matters, but the members on the other side of the House know that the condition of this country to-day is not fairly described when we are told that the Colony's affairs are in a most deplorable condition. It is true we have had a deficit—a deficit on the 30th June last of \$300,000. It has been stated against me here this evening that when we were in war session, I made the statement that the deficit would be \$240,000. Now, when that statement was made I did not question it. It was made by one hon. member on the other side and all the others that have followed have quoted the same figures. It is quite possible that if I were asked here last year if a deficit was likely, I may have made an estimate, but I could only have made an estimate. The Auditor General of the Colony did not know in the month of October what the exact deficit

was; and I invite the hon. member who made the statement now to quote the words I used in reference to that. It will be found that there was some calculation in relation to it. But whether it was \$240,000 or \$300,000, it was due entirely to the causes I suggested here on the opening day—due to the depression that has been felt all over the world and in which this colony has shared. We cannot run away from the cycles of depression any more than we can from the cycles of prosperity which follow countries. We have only got to look at the neighbouring country of Canada and the Provinces that make up that Dominion, to see that that whole country has been affected in precisely the same way. Then this depression has been followed by the war, and if there is a deficit on the 30th June next it will hardly be contended that we are to blame for that shortage or that we are in any way responsible for it. I can only say here this evening, Mr. Speaker, that I am quite satisfied that before this session closes the Minister of Finance will be able to lay a statement before the House which will be satisfactory to everyone in it as regards the present financial position of the Colony—or at least satisfactory to those who want to be satisfied and who are not discussing public affairs from a purely party standpoint with the desire to make a point against an opponent. Look at the changes which we have made in the public service of the Colony during the last six years, and add them all up, and then you will understand why it is that we have increased the vote for that service within \$100,000 of \$1,000,000 during that period. Hon. members forget the advance which the country has made right along the line, not alone in its exports, but in its imports,—and when I say imports I do not refer to

that class of imports which cannot fairly find a place amongst those which represent the earning powers of the people—large importations for industrial construction and that sort of thing—but I refer to the imports of last year and the year before, when very little will be found in the list except food and clothes and comforts for our people. And what do these figures show? In 1906, the year Sir Robert Bond came into power, the Estimates voted here in this Chamber were \$1,900,000; the year he went out they amounted to nearly \$2,800,000, or an increase of \$1,000,000 in round numbers. Now, we have been in office six years, and almost a similar increase has taken place. In other words, we have increased the public service of the Colony in six years as much as our predecessors increased it in eight, but there has been a large proportionate increase in the earning power of our people, as measured by the imports and exports of the Colony. If you will look at the imports for 1906, Mr. Speaker, you will find that they amounted that year to \$7,476,000; in 1908 they had gone up to \$11,400,000, or an increase in eight years of \$4,000,000; and during the last six years they have increased over \$5,000,000. Now, I take it that this is about as fair a test of the prosperity of the Colony as one could find. Side by side with that you have your exports, showing a proportionate increase. In 1906 the total exports from Newfoundland amounted to \$8,000,000 (I am speaking in round numbers); in 1908, eight years afterwards, they amounted to \$11,000,000; and last year they amounted to \$15,000,000. If that is not a test of the advancement and prosperity of the country and the increased purchasing power of the people, then I don't know anything about it. Now, what are we going to do? Are we going to sit down and not

help the country? Are we going to be content with the same number of lighthouses and fog alarms that were in existence forty years ago? Are we going to deny the petitions that come in here day after day from the old people of the country for old age pensions and continue to dole out pauper relief at 3c. a day? Are we going to continue to permit the children all over the country to grow into manhood without knowing the rudiments of education? Or, are we going to do as we have done, increase the education grant in 6 years by \$100,000?

These are the reasons why there is a deficit to-day, and I think they are very commendable reasons. I do not share the gloom of my friend from Trinity who has just spoken. On the contrary, I think the outlook for the future is bright for Newfoundland and for everyone in it, and I justify that statement by the statistics of the past.

Look at the imports and exports of this country for the last fifty years, and I see the gradual improvement in the condition of the people of the country as measured by these figures. Our people are living better. They are better fed, better clothed, and better educated. There was a time when many a man who today is wearing broadcloth had to put up with a canvas jumper and take 70 cents a day, where today he is getting \$1.50. And that bears out the statement which I have made. There is no justification whatever for the gloomy outlook that has been painted here this evening. We could not have avoided this war. Countries that are not akin to the British Empire, as we are, are suffering today. Our financial position today is not any worse than that of Canada, our great neighbor of 8,000,000 people at our doors. Any one who has examined the financial statement made by the Finance Minister the other day at Ottawa and compared it

with our financial condition, will find that we are very much better off. This war is not going to last for ever. We know that we have got to win, and that it is only a question of time. Those who have charge of the war on the other side know what they are about. They are great organizers — big men who don't try to accomplish things in a hurry and make mistakes; but they are preparing for their final effort, and when they make it, they will obtain results.

Then large revenues will come back to Newfoundland again. No one need be despondent about the future. Dr. Lloyd has said that Newfoundland is wonderful for its recuperative powers. Peace will bring the reaction; the country today is yielding to a storm that is having its effect on other countries as well, and when the storm has passed by, the revenue will increase as it did before, and we shall wonder why we ever allowed it to depress us.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak at this stage of the debate, but I cannot sit still and listen without a word to what has been said here this evening, and not refer to some points in which the Hon. Prime Minister showed a curious confusion of thought. This is not the time to deal with the question of the responsibility of this Government. When the returns come in I shall be in a better position to do so; then I shall examine the financial state of the country and see whether his optimism is justified. While the Premier was speaking, he referred to the learned Doctor as the prophet of evil of the House. It may be that the Doctor deserves the name, and that he will prove the only true prophet in this House. The Premier, on the other hand, has a super-abundance of optimism. It is as bad to be too optimis-

tic as it is to be too pessimistic. I consider that the Premier is the father of optimism in Newfoundland, but he has very often been associated with funerals and disasters. For instance, during the years 1889 to 1894 he sat in the Whitway Government, who were either blind to or closed their eyes to the then existing condition of commercial affairs which led to the crash of the year 1894, and we found it necessary to obtain help from the Mother Country. Then again in 1897 he had another funeral and the people of this country turned him out of office because of hard times. Now in 1914 he and his friends are again in office, and again the country is facing a crisis. If the funeral does not take place, it will be because other doctors have been called in.

There is another curious thing that I noticed in reading the debates of this House when I was out of it. There is a curious twist in the brain of my rt. hon. friend, in that he is able to dissociate himself with the actions of the various Governments of which he has been a member. He imagines that he is no sinner because he is a hoary headed sinner; that is what it amounts to when he pleads what the Bond Government did. Because that Government when he was in it, increased the Estimates one million dollars, then he himself must now increase it one million more. Because one spends three million is no reason why another should spend two million; it may be a reason to the contrary; the expenditure of one million may make the other an extravagance; and yet he thinks he is justified in doing so because he did it before when he was in another Government. It is not a justification, but a condemnation.

There is another curious thing that made me wonder whether he had ever sat down to seriously consider it. Al-

low me to quote a few figures concerning the revenue of the country:

In 1906 the imports were valued at \$7,400,000; the exports at \$8,000,000.

In 1908 the imports were valued at \$11,000,000; the exports at \$11,000,000.

In 1914 the imports were valued at \$16,000,000; the exports at \$16,000,000.

That means prosperity. But it means something else, namely, that everything that the country earns, it spends. There is not a dollar left in reserve. If the exports of this Colony were \$8,000,000 in one year, and the imports were only \$7,000,000 that would be money saved and kept in the country. But when you look at what the exports and imports actually amount to, you find another state of affairs. The result is, there must be depression. The fault is not with his Government any more than with any other Government. There are depressions in the history of every country. We all know it. Then why not provide accordingly? That is the reason for the condition of the country at present.

Now then there is another thing that has not been taken notice of; these figures prove that the expenditure of all the borrowed money in this country, has not created any productivity in the colony. The price of codfish had risen, but that is not through any expenditure of money in this country. We are depending solely upon the annual production of this country.

I find that there are certain features in the financing of this Colony that no one has paid any attention to. Improper expenditures are not confined to any one Government in this country. It is no use to discuss now who does it, but what has been done. What are the fundamental errors?

How can they be obviated? My learned friend talks about the future in a very optimistic vein, but the financial condition of the Colony is worse than it was represented today. This is not a time to talk too much about that, but the Premier must not be led away by his great tendency to be optimistic. There will be no such immediate rush of prosperity when the war ends. The depression then will be twenty times worse than it is now. Look at the millions of men struggling back from the armies into the factories of the world. Every country at war is now expending vast loans, and while this expending goes on prosperity seems to abound. That is what is wrong here to-day. When the war is over, can the world immediately respond after the great loss that has taken place. We have to expect a still worse depression than we have at present. What did an hon. gentleman say in the Upper House in moving the Address in Reply? That we must look for a decrease in the price of fish. Upon what ground did the hon. gentleman base this view? We have got to ask the people of this Colony to believe that economy is necessary. It is better to tell the people the truth. What we spend they have got to provide. It seems to me that that is the true patriotic way in which to look at it. We had better not make too much noise about our difficulties just now; but we should not endeavor to delude the people into an optimism not based on fact.

The debate was adjourned until Monday.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, April 12th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 12th, 1915.

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

REPORTS TABLED.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister tabled the Report of the Commission of Internal Economy.

The Hon. Minister of Finance tabled the following financial statements:—

Detailed Statement of Game and Inland Fisheries Board, 1913-14.

Colonial Secretary's Department Trust Account, 1913-14.

Statement of Current Account of the Government of Newfoundland for the year ending 30th June, 1914

Balance Sheet of Treasury Account for the year ended 30th June, 1914.

Public Debt to 30th June, 1914.

Statement of Teachers' Pension Fund for the year ending 30th June, 1914.

PETITIONS.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Codroy and vicinity for the erection of a lighthouse on the S.E. end of Codroy Island. There is urgent need for the erection of a light on this particular point, as Codroy is the only harbour of refuge on the stretch of one hundred and sixty miles of coast between Port aux Basques and Bay of Islands. Owing to Codroy Island being in the shadow, as it were, of the Cape Anguille Mountains, which rise sheer from the water immediately behind it, it is almost impossible to distinguish the Island from the mainland in stormy or foggy weather. When making for the entrance to Codroy, the light on Cape Anguille is obscured, which intensifies the difficulty. Many vessels bound into and out of the Gulf of St. Lawrence have now to fight out many a hard time in open water, which they could readily avoid were the light here sought for in operation. I beg that this petition be

referred to the Department to which it relates.

I have also a petition from Flat Bay—a place of some 500 people—asking that that place be made a flag station of the railway. Owing to the absence of a regular station, the goods suffer considerable damage. They ask the House to make a provision for the same. It would be a matter of very little expenditure. I beg leave to refer this petition to the Department to which it relates.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Flat Bay, asking that the Legislature will order the construction of a freight shed and waiting room there. The trains already stop at Flat Bay, but as there is no way of protecting freight received or brought to the siding, for shipment, from rain and snow, much loss occurs. Flat Bay is an important settlement. The interests of 300 people are involved in this request, and I certainly hope the House will be able to accede to the prayer of the petitioners. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. CLIFT—I beg leave to present a petition from Samuel Parsons and others of Lush's Bight in the District of Twillingate, wherein the petitioners ask for a telephone connection with Caldwell's. The distance is not very great, and the poles are already there to be used in connection with telegraph service. So, therefore, it would merely be a matter of putting up the wires. As this is extremely important for the inhabitants of that part of the country, I would ask that it receive a favourable response from the department to which I ask that it be referred.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Friday's Bay, in respect of a road, and also a petition from Esau Hewlett and others of Port Anson, asking that that place

be made a part of call for the coastal service.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the following petitions: One from Herring Neck asking for a sum of money to construct a public wharf at that place. The petition points out that they have for some time been asking for this grant, but that as yet they have received no answer to their request. The petition is largely signed. I would ask that the request be referred to the Department to which it belongs and trust it will receive the consideration it deserves. Another petition from Boat Harber in the District of Twillingate, asking that a public wharf be erected in that place, and another from Black Duck Cove asking for a sum of money to construct a distance of one-half mile. This is a new settlement, and it appears there is no road connecting it with other places. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it belongs; also one from the inhabitants of North-West Arm, Filley's Island, Triton and Port Anson on the subject of old age pensions. I beg to move that these several petitions be referred to the Department to which they relate.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Twillingate asking that the sum of two hundred dollars be expended in improving a branch road from Cottle Cove to Black Duck Cove. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Melbourne, asking that one hundred and fifty dollars be expended on the main line road. The road is near the water-side, and unless immediate repairs are effected, the bank will founder and make the road impassable. This is a very important road, being largely used by the public, especially during

the summer season. I trust the money asked for will be forthcoming.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition.

QUESTIONS.

HON. COL. SECRETARY tabled answer to question asked by Mr. Coaker in relation to expenditure on Budget Post Office.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES tabled answer to question asked by Mr. Winsor.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House, copies of returns of Trinity-King's Cove Main Line, and King's Cove-Deerua Marsh Line, for 1911-12.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS tabled the answer.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House, copies of returns of all monies allocated to Thom. Devine, King's Cove, from 1910 to date, and the object of each allocation.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS tabled the answer.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House returns of all monies spent in Bay de Verde District on roads the past twelve months; to furnish a list of amounts sent out to each settlement in the District, and to whom sent.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS tabled the answer.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the returns of the expenditure of all grants, other than local road grants, expended at Norris' Arm during the past two years. Also, a statement showing what grants have been issued by his Department during the last two years to be expended at Norris' Arm.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—The reply to that question will be tabled to-morrow.

LOGGING BILL.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the Employment of the Men Engaged in Logging."

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill I do not intend to delay the House with any lengthy remarks. This Bill is very much like the one presented last year that passed through this chamber with one or two slight alterations. Last year's bill provided that each man should be supplied with a mattress. That clause has been taken out, and we are leaving the matter of beds to the discretion of the Government Inspector, who was to be appointed under the 4th Section of last year's Bill. I do that because I find that the employers are anxious to do all they can to fit sleeping bunks as comfortably as possible, and I think it better to leave that to the Government Inspector. Another thing I discovered while up visiting the camps, and that is that mattresses were provided in several camps, but at the end of the season they had to be thrown away. They could not be used again. The system of employing men in the camps was such that it would be unsanitary to keep mattresses there. One crew would come in October and leave at the end of December. Another crew would come then and stay until February. Then another lot would come. The same bed would be used by three men in succession. That was a matter which last year caused some friction amongst employers.

The Anglo-Nfld. Development Company have agreed with me to provide a canvas bottom in the bunks. If they do that, all the trouble and discomfort will be removed. At the present time there is trouble similar to that in regard to the sealing steamers. The bottoms of the beds are formed of rough lumber. The men put down green bows. The A.N.D. Co. provide

a canvas covering, on which the men can put material, either hay or spruce tops or birch rind, which they can always get around the camps. Then when a man leaves, he leaves the covering, and the next man coming along can make a new bedding for himself. This covering is taken from the camps at the end of the season and washed, so that it is used again next season.

There is also an alteration in Section 4. The Section now gives ten days after any complaint is made by the Inspector before any action is taken. Last year's Act provided that the Inspector should complain, and if there was no remedy of it, he could take action. Now, 10 days are given before action is taken.

The clause about a minimum wage was taken out last year, and it can stay out.

All the other clauses are exactly similar to the Act of last year.

I do not think there is anything in this Bill that employers can object to. It is very clear and very reasonable. When we consider that there are such a large number of men engaged in logging, we must come to the conclusion that it is important to have the industry properly run. These companies have made it a permanent industry. They intend to go on from year to year cutting logs, and so they must see that it is to their own benefit to make the men comfortable. The men are more content than ever, and are getting more used to the business.

They find the food is improving, accommodation is improving, and there is an improvement in the camps throughout the past twelve months. Many of the camps built since last year have been fitted as laid down in this Bill. They have put in board flooring and board roofs. No one could complain of the food that I found in the camps at Badger. I held a meeting there one night, and asked the men if they had any complaints.

Some of the bosses were there. One or two thought they should have some change from beans at breakfast. It was a continuous feast of beans. If they could get potatoes it would be a change, and the Companies are going to give the men fish and potatoes for breakfast. Some men thought they should get a little cheese for tea. The Companies are doing all in their power to make the men content, because they will not be able to get the men to do the work unless they make the camps comfortable.

They get a good wage. The men are promised \$35 a month, but many get \$25. Some men who go up with a promise of \$28 get only \$24 because they are a little slack. There were very few complaints, and they are not having as much trouble as in the past. I do not want to have any friction between the Companies and the men. They are doing their best to help the men out. But the men are of opinion that the Legislature should take the matter up and something should be done. We found tremendous feeling at Council meetings against the Upper House in not passing this measure. I hope we won't have any trouble this year. The members of the Upper House ought to realize that we do not send a measure up from this House unless there is some cause for it. We know the situation, and we do not introduce a measure unless we know there is reason for it. I beg to move the second reading.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the second reading stand deferred until to-morrow, as the bill has not been printed.

MR. COAKER—I have no objection. Bill ordered to stand deferred until to-morrow.

LABRADOR FISHERY BILL.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador Coast."

On motion of **MR. MORINE**, this order stands deferred.

CUSTOMS BILL.

Second reading of Bill further to amend "The Customs Act, 1898."

On motion of **HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS**, this order stands deferred.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

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

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker in moving the second reading of this bill I may say that it is practically a copy of the Imperial Act dealing with the naturalization of Aliens. It is the outcome of a great many negotiations and conferences that have been going on for a great many years between the Dominions and the mother country. The principle of the Bill has been put in a very attractive form by the statement of one statesman; he said it means that a British subject anywhere is a British subject everywhere. In this country we have had on the Statute Book an Act respecting the naturalization of Aliens. It goes back to a time prior to the old consolidation of 1872 and since then there have been amendments dealing with the rights of aliens in regard to holding land and other rights.

An anomaly that has existed in the past has been that a British subject naturalized in one dominion is not a British subject when he leaves that Dominion, and any rights and privileges which they exercised when abroad were due more to the courtesy of His Majesty's government and his plenipotentiaries than to any rights. For instance, an American who went to live in Canada and became a British subject, if he left Canada and went to the States he became an American again and if he went to Eng-

land he would represent no nationality whatever as far as his rights were concerned. This anomaly has been considered for a number of years, and this Bill is the outcome of negotiations, and combines all the good points in our own legislation with the unity given by the Imperial Act making a British subject in any dominion a British subject anywhere throughout the Empire, giving him all the rights of a British subject all over the world. In other words it is Imperial naturalisation. This Act while conferring these rights and privileges throughout all dominions does not deal with the question of the rights of citizenship. It does not touch that at all.

As I said the matter has been for some years the subject of negotiation between the Dominions and the mother country. It was before the Imperial Conference of 1907 and in 1908 it was considered by all the Dominions. In 1911 it was again before the Imperial Conference and the following propositions were then agreed to:—

(1) Imperial naturalisation should be world wide and uniform. Each dominion can be left to deal with it by Legislation as it thinks fit.

(2) England finds it necessary to maintain five years as a qualification period.

(3) The grant of Imperial naturalisation is in every case discretionary and shall be granted by the government of the area in which the last twelve months was spent.

(4) The Imperial Act should be so framed as to induce every Dominion to adopt it.

(5) Nothing now passed should affect the validity of local laws.

It will be noticed that the qualification period to become a British subject may be spent anywhere in the Empire but the last year must be spent where the naturalisation is granted.

If hon. members will look at the Bill I will describe briefly the Sections so that we may be able to follow it a little more closely when we go into Committee.

Section (1) simply deals with the definition of a British subject, in other words who may be deemed a naturalised British subject.

Section (2) deals with the form of certificate and its contents.

On page 3, Section 3, the effect of the certificate of naturalization is dealt with. In other words the rights to which he would become entitled on receiving a certificate.

Section 4 deals with special certificate in cases of doubt.

Section 5 deals with the case of those under a disability such as minors.

Section 6 covers cases of those already naturalised.

Section 7 deals with revocation of certificate.

Section 9 — This section deals with those Dominions specified in Schedule 1 of this act (for this is in 3 parts of which this is Part 2.) who have not adopted Part 2 of the British naturalisation and status of Aliens Act 1914.

Part 3—Page 5—Sec. 10 deals with the national status of married women and infant children.

Sec. 11 deals with the national status of British and Alien widows.

Sec. 12 deals with the national status of children, while minors.

Sec. 13 deals with those who voluntarily become naturalized into any other country.

Sec. 14, Page 6, deals with persons who though born British subjects have been adopted by some foreign country.

Sec. 15 deals with British subject's resident in certain foreign states.

Sec. 16 deals with liberties, duties, and obligations of those who have ceased to be British subjects.

Sec. 17 deals with the Status of Aliens as regards property.

Sec. 18, Page 7, deals with the trial of aliens as if natural-born British subjects.

Sec. 19, gives the Governor-in-Council the power to make regulations generally for carrying into effect the objects of this Act, and also deals with some particular cases indicated.

Page 8, Section 20 deals with the accepting as evidence in Court procedure of the declaration or a true certified copy thereof.

Section 21 deals with the proof of naturalization by production of naturalization certificate or a true certified copy thereof.

Section 22 deals with the taking as evidence of certified entries taken from the records of the Colonial Secretary.

Section 23 deals with punishment for false representations or statements false in a material particular on conviction.

Section 24 deals with the form of oath of Allegiance.

Section 25 deals with and excludes from this Act those who have been granted letters of denization by His Majesty.

Section 26 deals with the definitions of the various words and expressions used through this Act.

Section 27 deals with the repealing of Chapter 145 of the Consolidated Statutes (2nd series) entitled "Of the Naturalization of Aliens," the Act 63 Victoria, Sess. 2, Cap. 7 entitled "An Act to confer certain rights on Aliens," and the Act 8, Edward 7 Cap. 2, entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 145 of the Consolidated Statutes (second series) entitled "Of the Naturalization of Allies."

Now you will notice by Section 27, that Chapter 145 of the Consolidated Statutes, (2nd series), and the Act 63 Victoria, Sess. 2, Cap. 7 are repealed,

and also the Act 8, Edward VII, Cap. 2, which Amends Chapter 145 of the Consolidated Statutes, but it will be noticed when we come into committee on this Bill that all the vital parts of this Chapter have been included in this bill and improved upon. From Chapter 145 Consolidated Statutes it will be seen that an alien may be naturalized after 5 years residence, and the Chapter deals with the necessary declarations and oaths, fees payable to the issuing stipendiary magistrate and certificates;—Section 7 will be found to be covered in this present bill, and includes the rights of aliens naturalized into British subjects. Section 8 deals with the penalty for false declaration and Section 9 with defalcation.

Now the Act 63 Victoria, Sess. 2, Cap. 7, also repealed, is now covered by Sec. 17 of this Bill, and sub-sections 2, 3, and 4, provide more accurately for finer national distinctions such as needed at the present time.

The Act 8 Edw. VII, Chap. 2 has also been repealed. The certificate of Naturalization has been included also in this bill, and some finer distinctions have been drawn.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a great improvement on the old one, and will fill a long felt want in this colony. It is only at such times as this that we can feel and appreciate the intricate nature of such laws as the one which is being introduced to-day.

When this becomes law, no matter what portion of the British Empire a person has resided in, he will retain his rights as a naturalized citizen on coming here if such be his desire, without again going over the same performances as before, and the naturalized British subject of New Zealand will be a naturalized British subject of Newfoundland immediately on his arrival here, and this same

state of affairs will exist all over our Empire.

In passing this Act this House will be doing what other portions of the Empire are doing for last year England adopted this, and it is now being passed in Canada.

MR. KENT—I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to discuss this Bill at the present time, but I am sure that it is a very desirable Bill. If you remember, two or three years ago I brought this matter before the House, and this is the remedy for the very difficulties I then referred to. Of course this law does not affect in any way the British subject who is already a British subject. It only affects persons seeking to become British subjects. The law before was most unsatisfactory, and I think the government has done well in introducing it so promptly after its passing in England. This Act provides that a British subject is a British subject as long as he is a resident of a British dominion. I notice however, in section I, that the grandchildren of a British subject have not been included. Up to the present time a person once a British subject has always been a British subject, but the privilege is now given those who do not appreciate this, of withdrawing themselves from the Empire. As this is a copy of what has already been passed in England and what is now being passed in Canada, I think that this Bill will be received and approved of by the whole House in its present form.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens" was read a second time; and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An

Act to amend the Law respecting the administration of Local Affairs."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, With reference to this amendment it will be remembered that last session, the leader of the opposition, Mr. Kent, presented to this House several petitions dealing with the subject of the appointment of Road Boards in this colony. The Resolution he introduced was to the effect that some machinery ought to be provided whereby localities might be entitled to elect their own Boards for local affairs.

Now it will be remembered that this resolution was favorably received by the House and a general desire expressed to make it convenient and possible to have elective Road Boards all over the country and to find out the sentiment of the people of the various settlements and outposts as regards them. Accordingly at the close of the session a circular was drawn up by the department and was sent to the various district representatives, magistrates, and justices of the peace and other parties likely to afford information and the report of the department, I shall with the permission of this House, table, as also a lot of other matter received in this same connection.

In this report it is stated that the replies have given little or no explanation, and I am afraid that there will have been no advantage in that part of the report. The Secretary says that nearly all those who have forwarded replies could give little or no information, and the few others could give information only about the immediate neighbourhood of where they lived. It was indicated that to do their work thoroughly it would be necessary for the agents invited to travel and thus incur expenses which in the present case it was not thought worth while to expend.

Formerly all these Boards were appointed by the Governor and Council; but lately a practice has grown up of arranging for meetings to be held and Boards elected wherever the people asked for it and then the Governor-in-Council would appoint the Boards so elected.

I say that the information obtained from this report is not at all practical because Mr. Speaker, the desire of the Government this session is to bring in a bill that will suit the desires of the people and especially the people of the outports to whom the Act will apply.

It may be desirable at this junction to give a short history of this movement. Local Road Boards were first appointed in 1833, and were appointed by the Governor in Council. The make up of such boards was faulty and objectionable as such a board would naturally be. The various members of the board moreover were unpaid, and had to perform their onerous duties freely and often at their own expense. Like the School Boards they worked for nothing. While there might have been mistakes in the past we are hopeful that there will be less in the future, and we must give them all credit for the valuable and gratuitous work they have done.

In 1838 an act was passed under Sir Robert Thorburn's Premiership and another supplementary one was passed in 1890. Under that act power was conferred upon the Governor in Council to define necessary limits as they thought fit. The petition under that bill had to be approved of by two thirds of the qualified electors, and on a petition signed by these being presented to the Governor in Council, it was ordered accordingly. Under this bill a majority of the electors will suffice for this same purpose. This act was law until 1897,

In that year the first 17 sections were repealed and before any benefit or otherwise had resulted, in 1898 a bill was passed reverting in the main back to the bill of 1890; "An Act for the Administration of local Affairs in outport Districts" The point is however that none of these acts were ever availed of, or if they were it was only in very rare cases. Every effort was made to make these arrangements as simple as possible but the people did not take advantage of them, although they have been on the Statute Book so many years.

In the meantime a system has grown up by which boards are elected in a very simple manner by public meetings presided over by a Magistrate; and these boards are recognized by the Governor-in-Council and are appointed just as if the exact letter of the law had been carried out. Today we have eight of these boards in Twillingate district, three in Fogo, sixty in Bonavista, twenty-seven in Trinity, ten in Port de Grave, one in St. John's East, at Bell Island, one in Fortune Bay, one in Burin, and thirty in the district of St. Barbe. Now, as I have said, these boards have been elected in a very simple way by rules and regulations which have been formulated by the Attorney-General, and they seem to work out all right as far as these particular districts are concerned. Whether the whole, or a reasonable and fair proportion of the people within the boundaries, are enabled to get to the election is a matter, of course, that I am not able to speak about. After all, one of the principles that we will have to aim at in any legislation will be not to make the boundaries of the various districts so large that a great number of the people will be precluded from being at the meeting when a Board is being elected. In some places, such as Grand Bank, Placentia prop-

er and many other settlements that we know of and are familiar with, the boundaries are very small, and it is a very easy matter to have an election with a fair hope that all the voters in the settlement will be there. Take Grand Bank, with 1600 people and probably 400 voters, as an illustration. There you have a settlement not much larger than Bannerman Park. Probably there are not two houses in Grand Bank a quarter of a mile from each other, so small is the radius. But on the other hand, take a case like this (I am merely citing this as an illustration): In one section of the district of St. Barbe, where the Board has \$124 to expend, there are included the south side of White Bay, Middle Arm, Beck's Arm, Bear Cove, Wild Cove, Pound Cove, Westport, Furbeck Cove, Beeches, Hampton, and one or two other settlements. Each little place has a small expenditure, and the difficulty would be to get a fair proportion of the people within those boundaries to come to a common meeting. I have had prepared a list of all the road boards all over the country and the area over which they exercise jurisdiction. That will be important and of value in arriving at any decision on the question of settling the division of the jurisdictions. I have also had a statement prepared showing the population of the settlements in each district. For instance, there are something like 1500 settlements in Newfoundland. Of these 1500 settlements, 950 have a population of less than 100. Take, for instance, the district of Fortune. There are 107 settlements in that district, of which there are 69 with less than 100 people; 23 with under 200 people; 11 with under 300 people; and only 4 with over 300. Now, a population of 300 would probably represent about 60 voters, so that you see it will not be a very easy matter to deal with, unless you group a number of small set-

tlements together in order to bring the provisions of this Bill into operation. On the other hand, there are a number of important settlements in the Island that might adopt some system. For instance, there are 63 settlements with over 500 of a population; 5 with over 3,000; 7 with over 2,000; 26 with over 1,000, and 46 with over 700. Many of these settlements, I have no doubt, would be very glad if some simple way were devised by which they might avail of the Act. The difficulty will be, I think, in linking up sparsely settled places at a considerable distance apart. Now, this Bill proposes an amendment to the legislation to which I have referred and which is at present on the Statute Book, to the effect that the Governor-in-Council may upon petition signed by a majority of the duly qualified electors of any town or settlement having, within a radius of three miles, not less than one hundred electors, from time to time, by proclamation prescribe sectional divisions in this Colony, to which this Act shall apply; and shall by such proclamation define the limits and boundaries of each sectional division; which sectional divisions are in this Act described as a section. Now, that can be reduced, if desirable, or the radius can be increased, or the number of duly qualified electors can be reduced. The next section merely deals with determining the validity of the signatures to the petition. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I know we are all very anxious that a bill may be the result of the resolution of last session. I think that when we get into Committee on this Bill—as I propose to send it to a Select Committee—we may be able to arrive at a conclusion that may be satisfactory.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I don't think this Bill ought to go to second reading this afternoon. I must say frankly that I am very much disap-

pointed with the Bill, and I think it meets neither the need nor the desire that exists almost universally throughout the country for some reform in the matter of local administration. Recognizing the difficulties which had to be faced in dealing with this matter, we on this side of the House prepared resolutions a year in advance, in order that the problems which the question involves might be taken up seriously during the year that elapsed between the holding of the last session and the present one. Everybody must recognize that in approaching the problem of organizing a system of control of local affairs in this Colony we are up against serious difficulties that no person can minimize, but I think that if these difficulties are seriously faced with a desire to produce results, they can be overcome. Now, the measure which is before us this afternoon is, I think, no improvement on the conditions which exist at the present time. However, the Prime Minister has in his possession, which he proposes to table, a quantity of information which he obtained from various sources in the country and which he had compiled by the Department of Public Works. This, I think, ought to be submitted to the House, so that the House would have time to consider the information which it contains. But I cannot help remarking here that I think it is a pity that this information has not been more seriously dealt with during recess, and some form of proposals seriously made for the purpose of organizing the country on the lines that were universally accepted by the House last session. I don't think that this Bill ought to go to second reading this afternoon, and I would ask that the matter stand over until we have had an opportunity of examining the information which the Prime Minister proposes to table.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I have no objection what-

ever to the Bill standing over until to-morrow for second reading; but I can assure my learned friend that the matter has been taken up most seriously. What the hon. member asked for last session was that the whole country should be divided into districts, sections or divisions. That would mean, if done properly and legally—if you have an enquiry, and there is no other way of doing it—an expenditure of thousands of dollars. Now, I am proposing here a very simple way in which the present system may be extended. If that is not desirable, I am prepared to accept any proposal that may be made by any member on the other side of the House, if it be fair and reasonable, as I have no doubt it will be; but I object to my learned friend making the statement that what is submitted here this evening has not been seriously considered. I can assure him that it has been seriously considered, and if there is no bill here this evening dividing the country up into divisional districts or sections, it is on account of the great difficulties surrounding the question. You have only got to look at the papers that I propose to table to see where these difficulties come in. There are cases where there are a dozen settlements under one Road Board, expending \$100, with a jurisdiction of twenty miles. Well, now, if you think you are going to get people to travel twenty or thirty miles merely to cast a vote in relation to a small local road board with an expenditure of \$100, you have very much more faith than I have. But, however, be that as it may, my only desire now is to give the very best measure possible to the outports in relation to the election of their road boards, and I shall be very glad to have any proposal from any member on the other side of the House or on this side in relation to perfecting the measure. I am merely going back in this Bill to

the principle that was affirmed 25 years ago in this Legislature.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier, before we go into the second reading of this Bill, whether he has the original bill, which is now being amended, printed, so that we may see the whole Bill?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is being printed now. I anticipated that very reasonable and proper desire, and gave instructions to have the bill introduced by Mr. Morine 1898, printed. It will be here to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—Is that the latest Bill?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is the latest. There was a slight amendment made in 1899. The difficulty was this: The Act introduced in '98 provided that the Governor-in-Council should divide the whole country into all the sections that should be required; then the Government discovered that that was impossible, unless engineers were sent out or some other way was devised of getting the boundaries of all the places that were to have elective boards; then an amendment was made under which the Governor-in-Council were given power to define from time to time, from week to week, month to month or year to year, such places as it was thought desirable to bring under the provisions of the Act. For instance, suppose the people of Cupids asked for an elective board. The Government would decide on Cupids; then the people of Bonne Bay asked to have the Act applied to that place, and that would be decided on. But there are a number of very small places that it is impossible to include under the provisions of this or any other Act, no matter how you may desire to do it. To give an example, there is a settlement in my own district, Blackhead, about four miles from St. John's. There are seven families in that settlement. Now, how are you going to deal with Blackhead? Are

you going to send a Magistrate out there, have an election take place and a road board appointed, where the expenditure is about \$30 and the expenses of the election would probably be more than that? Well, there are 900 settlements in Newfoundland today, having a population of less than one hundred, and there is the difficulty.

MR. COAKER—What do you do with Blackhead?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We leave it entirely in the hands of the Road Inspector. He goes out there two or three times a year and deals with whatever work is to be done in connection with the repair of the roads in that neighborhood. The same thing is done in connection with another settlement, about nine miles away—Maddox Cove. I think there are about 29 families there.

On motion, the second reading of this Bill was adjourned until to-morrow.

SEAL FISHERY BILL.

Second Reading of Seal Fishery Bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I was just waiting for the Prime Minister to make the motion. I am going to ask him to defer the second reading of this Bill I would like to make a suggestion, and that is that in future all bills down for second reading shall not be proceeded with until 24 hours after the printed bills are laid before us. Then we will have had a chance to read the bill, we will know what the principle of it is, and we will not have to be asking to have it deferred. Under the present system of laying the printed bill on members' desks just as the motion is made, nobody can possibly know what the principle of the bill is, and members

sometimes make unnecessary objections that would not be made if it were a rule of practice that bills should be in members' hands 24 hours before second reading.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have no objections Mr. Speaker. I would point out to the hon. member that this has been the practice.

On motion, this order was deferred until to-morrow.

PATENTS BILL.

Second reading of Bill respecting Patents and Trade Marks.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker— This is a bill of one section. I have already explained it to the House. It is a copy of the Imperial Act, giving the Governor in Council power to make rules and regulations suspending any letters patent granted to a subject of any nation at war with His Majesty and also the registration of any trade marks the proprietor whereof is a subject of any nation at war with His Majesty. That is the whole effect of the Bill. We have been asked by the Board of Trade through the Secretary of State to take powers so that if desirable we may be able to annul these letters patent and registration of trade marks. I move the second reading.

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The debate on the Address in Reply was resumed.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make one or two brief remarks in reference to the matter now before the House, namely, the Address in Reply. The Speech from the Throne, which we had the privilege of hearing last Wednesday, like other speeches from the Throne hitherto delivered

contained very little that would justify criticism.

In my humble opinion Mr. Speaker, I think His Excellency's Ministers in preparing the Speech took good care not to outline the policy of the Government as it should be outlined. There are many things, Sir, which one would expect to appear in the Speech which do not appear at all. Judging from its contents, one would imagine that this little country of ours was getting along fairly well and was in a very good condition financially, and the gentlemen that compose the powers that be were doing their very best to carry out their promises formerly made to the people. But this is not so Mr. Speaker, but rather to the contrary. I do not pretend to know what should be the construction of a Speech from the Throne, but this much I do know that the Government of today promise much and performed very little. "Like cats' feet Sir, they showed soft pads but carried sharp claws". They promised faithfully to punish wasteful expenditure, and manage the affairs of the colony in the very best possible way, and along the most economical lines without any extra taxation. This they did not do for we are awakened to the fact that taxation has been increased to such an extent that the taxpayers are unable to shoulder the burden. I think Mr. Speaker it can be conscientiously said that no Government Party since Britain our noble Motherland handed over to our forefathers the gift of responsible government, has wasted as much public moneys as the present Government since they took charge of the public affairs of our Colony in 1909 up to the present time. I think Sir, I am perfectly safe in making that statement.

It is said Sir, that cause and effect work together in this world. "That there is no effect without a cause"

Well, Sir, the cause for the financial conditions of our colony at the present time is misrule, not war. Bad management not adversity. Government conditions, Mr. Speaker has come about by extravagance. It has come about Sir, by building all kinds of railways to all kinds of places simply to catch votes.

The hon. member for Fogo Mr. Halfyard said in one of his speeches which he made here last winter 1914 that nearly all of the members of His Majesty's Government were bound together by a golden chain. I think the hon. member was pretty nearly right in making that statement. In fact, Sir, I think we must all admit that he was absolutely right when we come to consider the enormous amounts paid for arbitration fees, the big sums paid for trips abroad, the huge prices paid for land for railway purposes, ten times what it was worth, and the other useless expenditures that have been made too numerous to mention.

I fail to see Mr. Speaker very much that the present government has done that has been a revenue increasing industry. In 1908 and 1909 the Prime Minister informed the electorate that if he and his Party were returned to power of all the good things they would do for the people. They would open new markets in Central and South America and also in Mexico for our codfish; they would give us peat to take the place of coals. They would build us five branch railways for \$1,000,000 with no increased taxation. They would erect a number of bait depots to provide bait for the fishermen to help them to catch more fish, and a lot of other things they promised to do. But what do we find when they got the chance to redeem these promises,

There is no market opened in Central and South America and Mexico. There

is no peat to replace the black diamond. The branch railways will cost us only about \$10,000,000. There is no bait depots established to assist fishermen to catch more fish consequently the universal cry from the fishermen in the months of July and August the two best months in the year for fishermen to secure a livelihood is no bait. If some of these promises were carried out the burden of living would be somewhat lessened. I would like to see Sir, all these promises outlined in the Speech from the Throne so that the people may see that the Government hasn't entirely forgotten all about these good things that they formerly promised to the people.

The former part of His Excellency's Speech, Mr. Speaker refers largely to this awful war that is now overshadowing the whole of christian Europe, and a part of the Orient as well. I do not profess to know very much about this war or what brought it about, but what puzzles me is that in this enlightened age in this noontide blaze of the gospel of the Twentieth century that christian nations cannot settle disputes by international arbitration instead of strife. Great many people say that the cause of this war was due to the assassination of the Austrian Arch Duke. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that is hardly correct. I think Germany was making preparation for this war for many years. I think, Sir, that the Sarajevo murder was the occasion, and not the cause. The real cause it is said Sir, was on this wise. The German Emperor said to be the heir of the Austrian throne "you want to get to the Aegean, I want to get to the English. You take Servia and I will take Belgium.

Servia is exhausted by two wars. Belgium will not face me. You will of course, have to deal with Russia; but she will only act like a jack in the box, pop up to very soon pop down

again; at the most she will only fume a little, just like she did when you took Bosnia. Little Japan was too much for Russia's drunken army, I will have to deal with France and England. France is a socialistic republic, with no control of her people, and as a military power is decrepit. Britain has a very little pampered toy army, and by her voluntary methods cannot raise more. She has no command over her Empire. I have my Secret Service everywhere. Our armies are equal to the lot, but we will have to stand together and be careful to choose a proper time, a wise moment when some of these opponents are crippled." This was long before the assassination of the Austrian Archduke.

The German military class, Mr. Speaker, all knew that this world wide war of aggression was intended. They were making preparation for years. When the war commenced Germany was the only nation prepared to strike an effective blow, that is proof positive Sir, that Germany wanted war. She wanted war, and she got it. When Christian diplomats repeatedly requested the Kaiser on behalf of humanity and international law to stay his hand, he, drunk with power, tucked up his shirt sleeves, so to speak, inspected his fighting apparatus, and said by his action if not by his words, what care I for international laws? What care I for humanity? What care I for anything? I am going to win. Victory is sure. Might is Right. This war Mr. Speaker, is none other than the war of Germany, England, Sir, is fighting a just fight. She is fighting for principles of true Democracy, and the freedom of the world, and I firmly believe, Sir, that it is the duty of this Colony to respond to the call for men both for the Army and Navy, just as it is the duty of other parts of the

Empire to respond. Let us think of the blessings that we are enjoying, and think and ponder over how they are suffering in Belgium and the North of France. We can go about our daily work in peace, walk about our streets without the least bit of fear, enjoy life in every detail as we hitherto enjoyed it, lie down to sleep at night secure and safe from the enemy, because on the seven seas our British brothers are so courageous, so heroic, so daring in fighting our battles.

If it was not for these heroes Mr. Speaker, the conditions of our Colony would be vice versa from what it is at the present time. If the enemy's ships had command of the sea, where and for what price could our fish be sold, instead of being paid \$6.50, \$7.00 and \$8.00 per quintal, as was paid in this town last fall and winter, it would be left to rot on our shores with no buyer available.

Again Sir, our Colony depends almost entirely on its importations. Where could we get the food that we consume and the clothes that we wear, and from what part of the world could it be brought if the enemy's ships had charge and over-ruled? But it is not so, Mr. Speaker. Our ships are in charge, permitting commerce to be carried on as usual. We can take our local papers almost daily, and see the fact that ships laden with our produce leave our shores and cross the Atlantic in safety, and steamships come across the ocean to this Colony as if no war were on.

These blessings should lead us to do our very best to assist the mother country in this awful crisis.

This is no time, Mr. Speaker, for any loyal British subject to fold his arms. This is no time to loan our cars. We can't do too much Sir, to

assist in this great struggle to preserve British Liberty.

Our protection by the British Navy, Sir, is something beyond our estimation. We can thank God today that the heroes that compose the crews of the British dreadsoughts, cruisers, and submarines are our safety in this awful crisis. The heroism of the men, Mr. Speaker, is something surprising. Take for instance the engineer and firemen who go down into the bowels of these ships and stay there for hours in a temperature of 120 degrees, almost naked, black as Ethiopians, piling in coals and forcing the ship to its utmost speed. These men Sir, in many cases win the naval battles.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that the best of history has never been written. It never has. I feel like using the words of a certain poet, who said:

"Just fancy a fireman down below,
In the awful heat and torture of
the fires that leap and dance
In and out the furnace doors that
never close.
On in silence he must work,
For with him there's no'er a chance
On his brow to feel the outer breeze
that blows.
For they have locked him in a room
down below,
In a burning, blazing tomb down be-
low,
Where he cannot see the sky, can-
not learn in time to fly
When destruction stalketh nigh
down below.

"Though his name is never mention-
ed,
Though we see or know him not,
Though his deeds may never bring
him worldly fame,
He is a man above the others,
And the bravest of the lot,
And the hero of the battle just the
same.
He the man who does the work down
below,
From the labour does not shirk
down below.
He is shovelling day and night,
Feeding flames ablazing bright,
Keeping up a killing fight, down be-
low.

Heroism indeed Sir!

Hitherto, Mr. Speaker, England has been fighting our battles, and we as a Colony have been doing nothing. We have not done or paid a proper part. Not a man, not a dollar has the Colony contributed to the upkeep of this great Navy which has been doing so much for us.

We have accepted all our former blessings, so to speak, without even saying thank you, and the benefits without contribution. We acted real mean, Mr. Speaker, and consented to be recipients at the expense of our fellow Britishers on the other side of the water. Our former actions as the eldest daughter of the noble Motherland, reminds me of an old story which I read some time ago of an old man, his wife, and a bear. I guess many of you have heard or read the story; but for the benefit of those who didn't hear or read it, and by way of illustration I will give you the benefit of it. The story runs thus—An old man and his wife were in their kitchen quietly enjoying themselves with the door open. Unexpectedly a bear walked in. Naturally you expect the man to assist in getting the bear from the home, or at least you'd expect him to lead in the fight, but, Sir, in this case it was otherwise. When he saw the bear he ran for the chimney corner and climbed upon what the old folks called the potsticks, and left Betty, his better half, to fight the bear alone; but courageous Betty got a rifle, aimed, fired, and killed her enemy. After the bear lay dead on the floor, after the victory this man on the potsticks, that played the coward, shouted out to the top of his voice: "Glory be to God, Betty and I killed the bear."

After the victory was won you see the man that played the coward seemed to want an equal share of the work poor Betty accomplished single handed. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, we have been doing something

similar with Britain. While the dear old Motherland has fought and won previous battles, Newfoundland, her eldest daughter, has played the coward, acted the man on the potsticks. But now, Mr. Speaker, the scene is changed, and Newfoundland is expected to do her duty, and she is intended to do so. England today is in great peril. This is the greatest crisis that we have ever seen. As an Empire our very existence is at stake. England needs our help. A message comes over the water to the effect Your King and Country Need You, and Newfoundland, Sir, is nobly responding to the call. She is letting the outside world know that part of the British Lion is on this side of the Atlantic. We ought to be proud of the beautiful sacrifices they have made. Mr. Parsons, the hon. member for Harbor Grace, in seconding the Speech, gave us the number that has gone from his District. I don't exactly know the number from Bonavista District, but in Bonavista town where I live, we have contributed about 80 for the Army and Navy. One father there, Sir, has given his two boys, his only boys. They were fitted out for next summer's fishery, but the two boys went to fight for King, Country and British freedom, and left father behind to paddle his own canoe. Beautiful sacrifice for the preservation of British Liberty. Other young men have gone and left only mother in the home. Words fail to express, Sir, what these mothers feel in parting with their boys.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not a believer in war, but rather the contrary. I feel like classing myself with Wellington, who said: "The military profession is a damnable profession"; with General Sherman, who said: "War is hell"; with Martin Luther, who said: "Cannons and firearms are cruel and murderous

machines;" with George Fox who said: "There never was a good war or a bad peace;" with John Wesley, who said, "War is the business of hell;" with Moses in the Decalogue, who through Almighty God, said: "Thou shalt not kill;" with Jesus, the Peacemaker, the carpenter of Nazareth, and the Saviour of the World, Who said: "Take not up the sword, they that take up the sword shall perish by the sword." But, Sir, although war is horrible, cruel and devilish, I believe Britain is perfectly justified before God and man, in the action she has taken in fighting to defend the weak "and to stop the ideals of the Corsican from obliterating by force of arms the ideals of the Man of Galilee."

I sincerely hope and trust, Mr. Speaker, that Britain will win in this battle, and when the smoke is cleared away that the time will speedily come when the universal brotherhood of man and the universal fatherhood of God will be more fully recognized, and that forts and warships will go out of existence, and "swords will be beaten into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks," "and the wolf will dwell with the kid", "the leopard will lie down with the lamb," and "the calf and young lion and fating together, and a little child shall lead them."

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any part in this debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, but seeing it has prolonged to such a length, I feel I would not be doing my duty if I let the opportunity pass without making a few remarks. I must say, in my humble opinion the Speech from the Throne is so flat it is almost impossible for an ordinary speaker to hook fast, yet I must endorse the former part of the Speech which makes reference to the great struggle

our Mother Country is now engaged in. I do not intend to deal on the cause or nature of this war, for I think my hon. colleague, Mr. Abbott, who has just spoken, did justice to that part, and I must congratulate him on his splendid address. But I wish to assure the Government I am with them in every reasonable way to enable the Mother Country to come off victorious. As a lover of home and country it is an unwelcome feeling to me to think that my second annual session in this House finds our beloved Motherland fighting her life and death struggle, the greatest known in the civilized world, not a struggle between civilized and uncivilized, but we may say a struggle between brothers and brothers. Yet we cannot for a moment think that the land that gave our fathers birth is going under, for we believe as sure as the sun rises and sets, so sure are we that the Mother Country will be victorious in this great conflict,—a conflict on principle, for right and liberty, which all under her noble flag do enjoy, and without a doubt when this struggle is ended there will be thousands more added to that great number which to-day do heartily sing Rule Britannia, for her ruling means freedom whether on sea or land, and which inspired all of her Colonies to nobly respond to help her in time of need. Mr. Speaker, I think we should feel proud of the young men of this Colony who so nobly responded to the call, and are gone to defend the Motherland and the land that gave them birth, when we think that they never breathed in a military atmosphere, never heard the clash of swords or the roar of the cannon, but always felt safe under the wing of the British Empire.

There is one matter I wish to mention before this House, that is, during the winter most of our public papers made reference to the young men of

the outports, as to why there were not greater numbers coming forward to volunteer, as well as the city lads. As a representative of an outport district I wish to assure hon. members of this House that the young men of the outports are not one bit disloyal. We are told that what makes the British soldier so brave and heroic is because the man in command says, follow me and charge the enemy. I don't believe the public meetings held by ministers and magistrates is going to have the desired effect upon the young men of the outports. What is wanted is some man that has offered his service for King and Country, to say to the young men, follow me, your Mother Country is at stake and needs your help in this struggle. Now, Sir, if the age limit was advanced a little more, the speaker before you would be ready for this part of the work. But when we consider the number already gone from Bonavista District, I don't think we are far behind, if not leading, in this share of the help given the Mother Country.

I wish to refer to the clause in the Speech from the Throne which makes some reference to the great prospects to our people who will engage in the fisheries the present season. I hope this will be so, and not as we have been having in the past, great prospects before the fish was caught, but when it was ready for shipping they would find things in a hopeless condition. Our men are just about tired of this treatment, especially our young men and the independent planters. They feel more like dropping the whole thing than they do to continue. They are getting disheartened over past treatment in prices of fish. If we want to develop the carrying resources of this country, interest must be taken in our fisheries. The Government should take some active steps in this matter, and not to allow past occurrences to be repeated.

While listening to the interesting remarks from the hon. member for Hr. Grace, Mr. Parsons, as he told this House of the increase in the Canadian fisheries, and gave us some well-prepared figures to justify his statement, I thought that what has given them this increase, is it because the Canadian fishermen are any better than our Newfoundland fishermen. That is not so, Mr. Speaker, but it is because of the interest taken by the Canadian Government in her fisheries that gave them this increase. And I say, if some of the thousands that the present Government have wasted on a foolish agricultural policy and picnic parties and other useless things, if this money had been handed over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be used according to his knowledge about our fisheries, there would also be an increase in our fishery, as well as the Canadian fishery.

Further on in the Speech reference is made to the deficit for the past year. The war conditions have been somewhat held responsible for this. But I say that it is not the war that has caused the deficit, it is the useless expenditure, spending and living above our means. What applies to an individual applies to a country. No one can live above their means and spend more than they are earning. But this is what the present Government has been doing, and leaves poor old Newfoundland almost a total wreck. I suppose the Hon. Premier will say, as he told my friend, Dr. Lloyd, a little time ago, when he mentioned about the condition of the country, that the Liberal party was playing the same old tune on the same old fiddle they always had, I thought to myself if the Liberal party only had one tune for their fiddle, the Government only got one record for their gramophone, and that record is a mandate from the people to build Branch railways. So just a word of

advice to the leader of our Union party, if ever he gets a musical instrument for our party, to make sure and have more than one tune or one record. The Hon. Premier said they might have been prepared for this if they had foreseen the present war, for, said he, we have had a surplus of \$960,000 the past five years. But, he said, we gave it back to the people again to build light houses, fog alarms and telephones. I say the Hon. Premier is not right in this statement, for the money that built our light houses, fog alarms and telephones was borrowed, the sum of \$250,000, which was included in the loan of 1910, and not the money that was taken from our people by taxes. I have no doubt that it went back to the people, as the Hon. the Premier stated, but I do doubt if those that paid in most, got most back, and we have scarcely anything to show for the expenditure of this wonderful surplus. Government money is a bit different from other money. It has two returns to show it has been spent, one in labour and one on paper, but I am afraid that for some of this surplus there are no returns, neither on labour nor on paper, for we know of some thousands of dollars that have been out for two and three years, nobody reaping any benefit but the holder, still the Government is troubling nothing about it. Therefore, how can we refrain from attacking the Government when we know of such transactions I have referred to.

The last clause of the Speech from the Throne is full of glowing promises for the utilizing of some of the natural resources of our country. This seems to be a principal point to be practiced by the present Government from its infancy, painting fancy pictures of imagination, building castles in the air, just to deceive the people. Why do they act thus? One would be led to ask the question, if it is

hereditary or environment that has caused it. Surely it cannot be hereditary, for my hon. colleague, Mr. Morine, told us that the Hon. Premier was a descendant of the Liberal party, so it must be environment and not hereditary, for the Liberal party, bad as they were, never practiced such deceit. Considering the wonderful promises included in the Speech from the Throne last year, added with those of this year, one would say a government with such means could build a prosperous country on a frozen zone. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that these glowing promises should have more than mere deceptions for its purpose, for poor old Newfoundland is flooded with promises, but starving for want of fulfilment.

Before closing my remarks I say again I am with the Government in any move they make to strengthen the forces to aid the British Empire in the conflict before her. But in the meantime I am still an opponent to many of the actions of the present Government.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to address the House at any length, as I have already spoken in connection with the Speech from the Throne; but there are one or two matters to which I would like to refer before the debate closes.

I could not help thinking when the Prime Minister, was speaking the other day that he had not attempted any justification in reply to the comments or any answer to the criticisms that have been directed against the Government's policy from this side of the House and particularly by the member for Trinity. Dr. Lloyd. Dr. Lloyd had directed a criticism fairly, honestly and squarely against the financial actions of the government and the critical condition to which these actions had reduced the colony. The Prime Minister instead of answering

these criticisms as one would have expected he should have done, treated them lightly by referring to them as being similar to those he had been hearing from the Opposition for thirty years in the House. Perhaps, there is a certain amount of truth in the fact that generally the opposition does not see eye to eye with the government, as you always expect criticism of its actions from this side of the House, and to that extent it is probably true that the government must expect its wrong doings to be dealt with by us. I know supporters will not do so. It is one of our first duties to criticise—to criticise fairly and honestly, and I think the criticism directed from this side of the House during this debate has been fair and honest and made in discharge of our public duties towards the electors of the country. It is a confession of weakness, to answer criticisms of this kind by commentaries such as those the Prime Minister has used.

If you consider the present position of the Colony and if you impartially judge the actions of the present government since they assumed power, what conclusion must you come to. I should like to premise my remarks by saying that Newfoundland as a whole is a sound country. It has valuable resources, it has a fine geographical position, it has a splendid and virile people. Nature has in some respects been kind to it. All it requires is a fair opportunity to develop along natural lines. If it is given the chance it will take its place and rank first amongst the Dominions of the Empire. But, you may have a healthy state and have poor administrators, and many of the ills that affect the state may be ascribed not to the condition of the state itself, but to the actions of those who rule it. In the present case, I am sorry to say that the condition which you find in this

country to-day is attributable to the policy, or rather want of policy, that the government has acted on since coming into power. They have been in power about six years. At the time they assumed office this country was in a sound financial condition. It had developed its resources during the preceding years. A number of industrial undertakings had been established and everything pointed to a great future along the lines of legitimate development of our natural resources. Our financial strain to-day is partly due to the fact that we have not had from that time to this one single industrial undertaking which would tend to develop the resources of the country established. We have passed from a condition in which our finances were sound and healthy to a condition in which we must admit it is the reverse. You had under the former administration that of Sir Robert Bond year after year surpluses of revenue over expenditure. You had the reduction and readjustment of the tariff in a manner that caused the burdens of taxation to fall upon the shoulders of those best able to bear them by removing the duties from the necessaries of life and enabling the poor man to enjoy as far as his condition will allow him free imports of necessaries for his business and his needs. You had also at that time a reserve accumulated from revenue placed to the credit of the Colony which was available as a strong asset in case of emergency and was a strong asset when necessary to apply for loans to carry on public utilities and public undertakings. You had during that time most of the public works, which during recent years have been charged to capital account, undertaken and carried out of ordinary revenue and still you had surpluses and were able to accumulate a reserve. To-day, unfortunately, we have

conditions which were not so promising as they were. Another feature of that time was the yearly increasing balance of trade, which was continually favouring the colony showing the Colony at that time to be absolutely sound in every way. To-day the same resources are there, but they are not being used in a way that the people of this colony should expect. To-day the picture is reversed. During the first years of the present government's administration there were still the benefits and fruits of the undertakings of the previous Government and prosperity which had flourished at that time continued to flourish. It continued in spite of the actions of the present Government. But, as time went on and as the inevitable consequences of the policy of the present Government worked itself out, you have today increased taxation, a very heavy burden of debt, an adverse balance of trade and no reserve. That is a condition, that ought not to exist. It is not due to any possibility of the Colony itself. I said before, Newfoundland is sound through and through. All it needs is proper administration in order to recuperate rapidly from the present condition to which its affairs have been reduced. The only undertaking of any magnitude by the present government has been the construction of branch railways and this was done under the worst possible conditions. It is not necessary for me to go into the history of that undertaking. I have repeated it year after year. It is one of these things it is necessary to keep before us all the time. The Prime Minister the other day said that he had a mandate from the people to build these railways. Yes, he did have a mandate to build branch railways but he had no mandate from the people to carry out the contracts upon the terms and conditions and obliga-

tions submitted to this House. To-day the condition of borrowing on the foreign financial market shows how foolish it was for this country under the circumstances to have substituted the payment of the contractor in gold instead of bonds. The Prime Minister pointed out that the concession for this was that \$600 a mile was taken off the contract price. Even on the contract itself as I pointed out last year that was only a nominal concession because where it is taken off the mileage construction price it is more than made up on the payment for material. But even suppose it was. Look at the difference in amount paid contractors as between \$600 a mile and the amount that will be lost on the actual contract price (which will probably be in the vicinity of \$10,000,000) before it is finished due to the paying in gold instead of bonds. To-day, Sir, you would probably have to pay—as the Dominion of Canada has had to pay—four and half per cent. You would certainly have to pay four, as the Prime Minister found last year when he went to float a loan which had been passed through this House at 3½ in spite of the warnings and the protests which we made during the Session.

The expenditure was another matter the Prime Minister referred to the other day and the fact that the Government during the term of its administration had had surpluses aggregating \$900,000 and that they gave this back to the people. These surpluses are due not to the careful management of the revenue, not to careful expenditure of the revenue, not to the fact that public works were economically carried on, but due primarily to the fact that works which other governments in this country have always performed out of current account, were executed under Loans by the present Government. Take

this condition in 1909. There was a loan bill that year of \$430,000 part of which was to cover what was termed a deficit on the previous year's account. I dealt with this last year and showed from the figures that the deficit was in no way traceable to the previous administration which had only occupied office for two thirds of the year, and had no voice in making up the accounts. There was another loan bill for \$400,000 in 1910. In 1911 there was one for \$520,000; in 1912 \$250,000 and in 1914 \$350,000, in all \$1,960,000. If you take off that 1910 loan which was never raised and which was impliedly cancelled the following year, there remain \$1,560,000. You must add to that the amount of the Surplus Trust Fund that was left there by preceding Governments and which amounted to \$560,000. That gives you \$2,060,000. It was by borrowing these amounts that the Government was able to carry on this work and show surpluses of \$900,000. In reality our finances of these years show deficits which would have been apparent if you had carried out public works on Current account as is usual in this country. If it was the intention to cover these works by loans then the first thing the Government should have done when it came into power in 1909 was to meet the amount which would be allocated to capital account by reduction of taxation at that time. Instead of that we all know the unfortunate history of their dealing with taxation.

The Session before last—preceding the General election—a most sweeping reduction of taxation was brought in by the Minister of Finance. He at that time indicated a surplus for the next year, a surplus of about \$250,000. Before that year expired, last year during the session he found that his financial proposition would not work out as he had been told it would work

out and he not only replaced an amount equivalent to that previously removed but placed an amount of nearly three quarters of a million dollars a year on the ordinary taxation. This, was all before the War occurred, and before the war was even thought of being in course of development. This was in face of the statement of two or three months before that he had anticipated a surplus. His anticipated surplus was turned into an actual deficit of \$300,000. His predictions were made at a time when the government, through the Minister of finance painted the condition of the country as being of unprecedented prosperity.

Just one or two words more, I would like to refer to our resources for a minute. I mean our internal resources. I do not think the Government has had any definite policy regarding the development of our resources. They propose year after year projects which never materialize. Year after year we have heard in Governor's speech after Governor's speech that negotiations have been entered into but we never have anything definite or concrete that you can point to as a definite concrete business like proposition. Now we have to-day a proposition which from the language itself would puzzle the wit of man to find out what it means. The Speech from the Throne says:

(Quotes paragraph.)

I had hope that that veiled cloud of words which is placed in that paragraph would have been explained by the Prime Minister or by some person else in the course of debate on the Address in Reply I think, when Ministers put a proposition like that in a Speech from the Throne and when you ask the Governor of the Colony to read that seriously in his Speech then if you do not consider it expedient to put some definite in-

formation concerning it in the Speech, some explanation or some outline of the proposition or something concerning the subject matter of the negotiations ought to be explained to the house during the debate. I came across a cutting the other day in a paper. I do not know if it refers to this proposition. It is taken from a Canadian paper and is dated St. John's Nfld. January 22. The extract is as follows:—"The extraction of nitrogen from the atmosphere on a large scale for use as a fertilizer is proposed by capitalists who have just obtained a concession from the colonial government for the use of Grand Falls in Labrador. The plans call for the development of one million horse power from the falls to generate electricity."

I do not know whether that is the proposition. If it is I would like to ask the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if he were here, whether there is any truth in the statement that this concession of Grand Falls Labrador has been made.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. KENT—I am glad to know that.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is no concession. They have been given the right to examine it.

MR. KENT—Will we get particulars?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, the whole agreement will be tabled.

MR. KENT—That brings me to a point I want to accentuate, and that is that all our dealings with our valuable natural resources, our mining, lumbering, pulp and paper and other resources have been on an altogether wrong basis. I think it is due to the people of this Colony that the Colony should get a greater revenue from these than it has been getting. They to-day form the subject of dealings by speculators who never intend to

deal seriously with them. I am prepared to admit that a certain amount of speculation is necessary, if you want to develop these resources, but I think that it ought to be borne in mind that these valuable resources are the property of the people of the country. Take New Zealand. New Zealand derives a very large revenue from the fact that a large portion of the public property of that kind is controlled by the Government, or if not exactly controlled, the Government derives a large revenue from them. Here we practically receive nothing. The revenue from the Crown Lands Department a few years ago made a rise when a number of people rushed in there, but to-day, as may be seen from the Auditor-General's last report, it is practically back to where it was in 1908. This is largely due to the fact that our Crown Lands Act and the regulations which govern these resources are on a wrong basis. We will wake up when it is too late and find these things all passed out of our control. I think it is necessary to conserve these resources as far as possible.

In glancing through the Standard of Empire I noticed an item in reference to the export of manufactured wood. I do not know the origin of it, except that it is from the Newfoundland correspondent of that paper who is, I understand, the Hon. Mr. Watson. Referring to the fact that last year the embargo was raised on pit props through patriotic motives, it says:—

"A campaign is now in progress in the Colony for the removal of the prohibition against the export of unmanufactured wood, which has always been operative, but was temporarily raised last September to admit of the shipping of timber to England for use as pit props in the coal mines there. This, however, was only made effective for the present season, and unless the Legislature at the session

now due extends the Act for a further period, it will be impossible to make use of it after the end of 1915. It is now being argued that not only should the term for which this arrangement is effective be extended until the close of the war, but that a reversal of the whole colonial policy in this direction which aimed at the stimulation of local manufactures, ought to be undertaken."

That, of course, deals with one of our most important resources, and I hope that the Government will not be likely to be influenced by any campaign, however strongly it may be conducted, for reversing the policy of the country in this connection. The policies followed so far for preserving our forest wealth and making it a valuable asset of the Colony has been a sound one and should be persisted in, and I hope that the Government will persist in it. This clipping, which is from a very responsible paper, and which comes from a person of considerable influence, does not I hope, in any way influence the policy of the Government.

There was another matter to which I want to refer, and it is one which I think it was due to the House that the Prime Minister or some member of the Government should have dealt with before now, and I am surprised that it has not been dealt with. I refer to the fact that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and the Minister of Justice do not sit in the House. That was the subject of discussion here last year. Our views on the matter we then placed as strongly as we could before the Government. Since then developments have taken place, and the position has changed and changed very much for the worse.

The incumbents of these offices are Mr. Blandford, who is Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and Mr. Squires, who is Minister of Justice. Mr. Blandford sought election as Minister

of Agriculture and Mines at the hands of the people of Bonavista, and he was decisively defeated, and the will of the electors of that constituency pronounced in no uncertain manner as to Mr. Blandford representing the district. In spite of that, and in spite of the will of these electors, Mr. Blandford was retained in the portfolio of Agriculture and Mines, and without even seeking another constituency, as it might be said that there was some particular reason for not being elected in Bonavista District, he is put into the Legislative Council in order to retain this portfolio in defiance of the will of the electorate.

Then, Mr. Squires was also defeated—by the electors of Trinity District—and he was appointed Minister of Justice in place of another candidate who was defeated in Bonavista; and Mr. Squires is not sent back to the District which he formerly represented, or to any other district to seek election at the hands of the people, or confirmation of the appointment which has been made. Then, he also was appointed to the Upper House. That brings us to another feature of this question, which is objectionable. The fact that these men are appointed to portfolios in defiance of the will of the electors, is one point. The Government cannot offer the excuse, that they have not men in the party who could fill these offices. Surely the Prime Minister could find a man in his party who could fill the office of Minister of Agriculture and Mines as well as Mr. Blandford, or probably better. Surely he could find a man who would fill the office of Minister of Justice as well as Mr. Squires. To say otherwise is to admit that these other men are totally incompetent and unfitted to fill these positions. Then as to the question of the position in the Upper House, I submit that the appointment of Messrs. Blandford and Squires to the Upper House is

using the Upper House for a purpose for which it was never intended it should be used. It is necessary to have a certain amount of representation of the Government and of the Executive Council in the Upper House for the purpose of taking charge of Government Legislation and explaining the motives and the object and the policy of the Government to members of the Legislative Council; but making the Legislature a mere partisan Chamber is wrong and the appointment of four members out of nine of the Executive Council to the Upper House is wrong, and is diverting the Legislative Council from the constitutional purpose it was intended to serve. The Legislative Council, is supposed to consist of the mature minds of the Colony, men who have had experience in business, in politics and in other directions, and who have won distinction and who can debate the matters which perhaps here would not receive the attention which maturer minds might give them, but to turn that body into a partisan body containing four members of the Executive Council out of nine is diverting it entirely from the purpose for which it is intended; and besides it is bringing it directly into conflict with the will of the electors. The present case of two men decisively defeated being placed in the House brings the Council as a body that holds such a position in our constitution, into violent conflict with the will of the electors, and unnecessarily I think, and to serve no useful purpose. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that the Government should recognize the fact that the financial condition of the Colony is not the same as when they took charge. I think they ought at least enter on a more careful policy in connection with our finances than they have hitherto done. I have already referred to the financial policy of the Govern-

ment up to the time of the war. Now since the outbreak of the war these duties are stronger and more necessary. In times such as those brought about by the war the duty of economy and prudent administration is more necessary than at another time, because difficulties will probably arise that we have not hitherto experienced and that we can hardly fathom at the present time, difficulties arising out of the war which have never occurred on such a large scale in the history of the world before. Such disorganization of trade and business calls for careful, prudent and economical government, and especially in connection with the obligations of the Government arising from the war. These the Government must deal with. But, I think that the Government which under the present circumstances shows extravagance or deals extravagantly in public affairs or fails to take advantage of the warnings given them, will deserve the censure of the people of the country and will probably get it when the time comes.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations on the matters now under discussion. The motion has been fully and liberally discussed, and still with, I am glad to state, but little acrimony. The first paragraph of the Speech casts a shadow over every subsequent paragraph just as the subject it treats casts a gloom over the Empire and the entire world. It has been said on the opposite side of the House that the Speech is tinged with sorrow. The immense efforts of the Motherland are reflected in these paragraphs, and surely, surely it must be permeated with a deep and unforgettable sadness. Surely, the men or the body of men who have had the privilege and opportunity of framing these sentences, were imbued with a deep sympathy with the tragedy of the subject discussed, else

they were unfit, incapacitated by lack of sympathy for the position which exacted from them the framing of those sentences. Sorrow! Is then this a time for the flippant discussion of a world's tragedy, the echo of which is found so strongly in the opening paragraph of the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor?

As we are sure of the victory that awaits us ultimately—for have not as yet many thousands given up their very lives—so we determine to aid the Motherland in this her hour of need, that the mighty fabric of her Empire towards the framing of which was shed the blood of those brave men of yore, our ancestors, the blood that tingles in the veins of us today, might be upheld and kept firm, as firm as it has ever been throughout the ages. This should be the fixed idea of every British subject. They must be true and they will be true, and all of us will gladly help and contribute in keeping intact that of which we are all so proud, the Motherland. This feeling permeates with pride every one who believes in her power, prestige and high moral standard, and the victory of the flag will be victory over militarism and all its evils.

They tell us we here were unprepared for this catastrophe. Well, England confesses that she was unprepared. France—through her Foreign Minister—tells us she was unprepared. Russia was unprepared. The world was unprepared. Why then, Sir, should we be considered singular because we had no perfect knowledge of these things that hung over us invisibly. Yet, Sir, we are told here in this House we should have been prepared. We were not prepared—no more than was Australia, Canada, and the rest of the world—and then, at the proclamation of this war, with one united effort, we gathered up all our strength and forces so that England which

means for us freedom and liberty, might maintain her unequalled superiority.

Sorrow! It was a dignified sorrow. One that never will be obliterated from the hearts of men. Our own brothers here at the call of the Empire, did they not go, did not our Legislature make provision for them? Do we not know how some of our men that went forth, some of our bravest and best, lie fifty fathoms deep in alien seas. Sorrow! Is not this a subject for sorrow, and does it not bring us into a wonderful sympathy with the Empire. We know, however, it can only be victory that awaits us. Thus our sorrow is mingled with hope. Victory! The triumph of those principles—the production of ages—for which we have for centuries bled to maintain. Freedom! The freedom born of victory, that makes every man a king in his own home and every woman a queen. Are we not proud to maintain a liberty like that?

As the shades of evening tell the coming of night, so did the signs of events around us warn those who knew that war was to come very soon, and even many months before war actually was declared money was tight, and commerce circumscribed. Men began to economise and the good days of prosperity rapidly were passing away. The ill came imperceptibly, and many months before the war actually was imminent a dark gloom was felt the world over, and we naturally were affected to a great extent, and the difficulties that have resulted in a deficit for us were felt the world over. If we take up the financial statements of France for last year, or even Canada, we see this depression most distinctly for months previous to the war. The war affected the British Empire for more than ten months at least, before actually materializing into the most terrific international life

struggle that has ever been. We can only do as Canada, Australia and England have been doing, maintain our business at home at the same standard as ever, that those at home—those who maintain the homeland, while others go forth to fight for her, in the same position as prior to the war. For we must not think that the bravest alone go. Brave men at home and women also perform indispensable work in keeping the home and its responsibilities as it should be.

We are not singular then in bringing in a deficit, because the country is less prosperous than it may have been. The country is not in a bad state at all if we compare this country with others during this trying time. If you go to any of the larger cities of Canada you will find in many, larger and smaller than St. John's, a state of poverty unknown here, reeking in a much larger measure than we have in this Island. Poverty there is recognized as the natural outcome of the great war. Everyone has in some measure to bear their burden in this struggle, and my advice to the Government would be this, that, in a crisis such as this, every possible industry be maintained to continue business normally, and those who help to do this do as much in a quiet way as those who are prominently identified with the fighting line. It is this that we are proud of in our souls, that England can do this, this quiet kind of patriotism, while our enemies cannot, that our Generals and Admirals in this war have been able to maintain England's prestige in the field and on the sea, and have shown that same courage and skill that we find in Wellington and Nelson and in all our national heroes. The British blood today is as it was in their day when England conquered the world a little less than a century ago. Today England goes forth to conquer

militarism. She stands for honour the honour that she has brought unstained down through the ages. Today she shows Germany the significance of her signature. We are fighting a greater battle than has been ever fought, and on the same principles that we have always fought. And he is a traitor, who has not the courage of his convictions, who finds fault with the Government at a moment such as the present; at this time when England is in such a position, surely, whatever might be proper and befitting in the nature of criticism at other times now is so out of place that it is disloyal and unpatriotic. Nor is Newfoundland in such a bad position as might be imagined. At the time of the bank crash everyone was talking of blue ruin, but the rapidity with which the Colony recovered itself, I am certain will be again repeated when this present time of difficulty shall have passed away. Who can say what the next months may have in store for us. All bad times come to an end. We have given of our best and bravest, blood of our blood, and love of our love. They go forth soldiers to death if need be, because they have taken the oath of allegiance and that means death if King and Country demand it. At a time like this everyone is ready to do all that is possible, to pass unstained the flag (as it was passed down to us,) unto our children's children. As for taxation. We are not singular in this respect. Canada is increasing her tariff, and otherwise taxing herself. But she is prepared to do her utmost to maintain the flag, and is satisfied to tax her people, so that victory be for the Empire. Newfoundland has nothing to be discouraged at and much to be thankful for. But at this crucial moment we are under the capable hand that has guided us the last few years, and a competent and stable executive, without which where

would we be now? I feel sure that when these years are passed anyone examining the records and archives of this Government, say fifty years hence, will immediately perceive that these months through which we now are passing are some of the brightest and most capably conducted periods in the parliamentary annals of the Colony. The records will be a lasting, incontrovertible proof of the worth of our Executive, and with us here with such a strong man, as our present Prime Minister undoubtedly is, at the head of affairs at a time like this there is no room for despondency or dread. I trust the Government will take into consideration that every public work possible shall be carried on, that business must be maintained and kept going 'as usual.' No adverse criticism can be of any avail but will merely stand out vividly as unpatriotic and opposed to the best interests of the Colony. We have no cause for despondency but rather a cause for self-congratulation on our present position.

On motion the debate on the Speech in Reply was adjourned till to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Report of Secretary of Public Works, respecting the establishment of a better system of the Local Administration for the Colony.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Abbott gave Notice of Question.
Mr. Conker gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Kent gave Notice of Question.
Mr. Stone gave Notice of Question.
Mr. Grimes gave Notice of Question.
Mr. Winsor gave Notice of Question.
Mr. Targett gave Notice of Question.

DEATH DUTIES RESOLUTIONS

Hon. Minister Finance gave notice that on to-morrow he would move the

House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in reference to the imposition of duties on the Estates of Deceased Persons.

The other Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 13th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 13th, 1915.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Twillingate Island asking that the law regulating the keeping of dogs be amended. At present a dog owner has to pay a certain tax, and that tax is supposed to be used to pay any person who has lost an animal from dogs. They are paid the value of the animal lost from this sum of money. They want the law changed, so that every man shall chain up his dog every night, and if he is found at large he may be shot on sight. If any cattle are injured, the owner of the dog that is responsible will pay the value. Every dog not chained up should be responsible for the damage done. This petition is signed by 1,500 people, and there are many different opinions on this subject. In any case, they cannot get along in Twillingate without dogs, and I have no doubt that it will be easy to amend the law, and I trust the Government will take the request of the petitioners into their consideration.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition just presented. I do not know anything that is so disturbing the feelings of the people so much as this question of dogs. We have had quite

a lot of trouble for the last two years in connection with these taxes. The law is that a man keeping dogs, pays to the magistrate his proportion of the damage done. In Twillingate these taxes have been paid to the magistrate, but the magistrate will not give any explanation of what he has done with the money. I have written to him and he has refused to give any information in regard to its expenditure. This has caused considerable friction amongst the people. I was hoping that if we had such a thing as municipal boards, this matter might be left to them. It seems a trifling matter to be bringing before the House of Assembly, and if we had properly constituted boards, they could keep dogs or shoot dogs, or pay taxes as they pleased. You cannot get the people of Twillingate to give up their dogs. At Change Islands the dog question is also a live one. They are allowed to keep shepherd dogs, and people are getting these collies for no other purpose than for hauling. I would like to see when we get this Road Board matter in Committee that we should get the question settled.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions here signed by the residents of a number of towns around Trinity in relation to the appointment of Mr. Somerton as magistrate at Trinity. These petitions show the sentiment of these people. At a convention of the F.P.U. they passed resolutions in connection with the same matter. The petitions are to the effect that the people do not wish to have Mr. Somerton as Magistrate over them, as he was so recently a political partizan; and they desire to have him transferred to some other district. The petitions are from Catalina, Clarendville, Elliston, English Hr., Foster's Point, Shoal Hr., British Hr., Durgoyne's Cove, St. Jones Within, Pope's Hr., New Bonaventure, Port Rexton, Trouty. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that

these petitions will have the full attention of the Department to which they will be referred. The people of Trinity, knowing that Mr. Somerton was going to be appointed magistrate, appealed to me, and I sent a letter to the Prime Minister, a copy of which I ask leave to read to this House.

St. John's, Sept. 1.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister,

St. John's.

Dear Sir,—

We desire to call your attention to the feeling which prevails on the north side of Trinity against the appointment of Mr. Somerton as Stipendiary Magistrate in place of Mr. Lilly, who is said to be retiring. This feeling is particularly strong at Catalina. The people there object to Mr. Somerton being appointed Magistrate with jurisdiction of them. They raise no objection to the Government giving Mr. Somerton an appointment elsewhere. We are,

Yours truly,

J. G. STONE,
ARCH. TARGETT.

And this is the copy of the reply received by me:—

Prime Minister's Office,
St. John's, Nfld. 12 Sept.

Dear Sir,—

I have to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 7th of September in relation to the appointment of Mr. Somerton.

The subject matter of your communication with respect to the retiring and pensioning of Magistrate Lilly and the appointment of a successor, has not yet come before the Government in any shape or form up to the present time. When it does, however, I shall be glad to see that every con-

sideration is given your representations.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) E. P. MORRIS.

J. G. Stone, Esq., M.H.A.,
City.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect any consideration from the Executive. Trinity has no representative on that Council. It is true, Sir, that Mr. Squires is there, but he does not represent Trinity. I certainly hope that the Government will harken to the prayers of these petitions and act accordingly. Personally I have not the slightest objection to Mr. Somerton, but it is my duty to carry out the wishes of those I represent.

MR. TARGETT—I rise Mr. Speaker, to support the petitions presented by my friend and colleague, Mr. Stone and would heartily support the same.

MR. COAKER—I would like, Mr. Speaker, to endorse the petitions presented by Mr. Stone. I think, Sir, that it was unfair on the part of the Government to act as they did in spite of the strong protest of the people through their representative, Mr. Stone. We know that Trinity has no representative on the Executive Council, for we do not call Mr. Squires a representative or recognize him as such, but we did expect fair play from the Prime Minister, and thought that he would cater to the wishes of the people. But, Sir, no notice was taken of the people's wishes, and the appointment was made directly contrary to the wishes of the people. Moreover, the Premier said that the Government did not know of any such appointment, and that he would let Mr. Stone know.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Neither of these statements is in my letter.

MR. COAKER—(Re-read letter to the House): "The subject matter with

respect to the retiring and pensioning of Magistrate Lilly and the appointment of a successor to him has not yet come before the Government in any shape or form."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Up to that time the application had not come up before the Government in any shape or form. The question came up subsequently, and was decided not at one meeting, but only after two or three. What is the charge against Mr. Somerton? Is it that he was a supporter of our Party?

MR. COAKER—Mr. Somerton was in the employ of Dr. McKay, but while in that capacity he so grossly offended the people that they joined and prevailed upon Dr. McKay so that for the good of the business Dr. McKay asked Mr. Somerton for his resignation. Now that man, the man whom the people so objected to, is their Magistrate,—the man to interpret their laws. It is a wonder, Sir, that there is no revolt. The people have had absolutely no say at all, the whole matter being in the hands of Mr. Squires. I say, Sir, that the Government has treated Trinity Bay disgracefully. They have had no regard for the people, absolutely none. Do they want the Court House or a few other buildings torn down by the infuriated electors? The way the northern people have been treated, Sir, is disgraceful. It appears that it is the policy of the Government to make the people of the north angry and aggressive, and then to send our volunteers, with their quick-firing machine guns, against them to shoot them down.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like, Mr. Speaker, to support these petitions. I do not think the wishes of the people have been regarded at all by the Government. What the people want is not injury to Mr. Somerton. He had been a true supporter of the Government and deserved some appointment, but why was he not sent somewhere

else? If the people are so overlooked they are likely to become unmanageable, and being easily led, might do untold damage without being accountable for their actions. What makes us feel sore, Sir, is the action of the Government in appointing this man, when the electors of the district asked that he might not be appointed. This seems entirely contrary to the statement made last year in the House to the effect that such appointments were left entirely in the hands of the representatives of the district. This is nothing more or less than a concrete example of the manner in which the members of the Opposition side of the House and the electors of the Opposition districts are treated. We have nothing against Mr. Somerton personally. Our only objection and the only objection of Trinity is his political dealing. Personally, I think he is a very worthy gentleman, who, having served his party well, deserved an appointment, in some other place, and I hope, Sir, the Government will see their way clear to appoint Mr. Somerton to some other place with a good salary.

The petition was by consent of the House referred to the Department of Justice.

QUESTIONS.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary why the Fogota was not permitted to call at Grate's Cove during the past season, as she formerly did.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—This matter has been referred to the Postmaster-General, and I hope to have the required information soon.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House (a) a statement showing the number of trips made by the S.S. Prospero during the season of 1914-15; (b) the number of trips called for by the contract and the amount paid on account of same.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I expect to be in a position to table the answer to this question later to-day or to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House copies of the returns of money expended on the Government wharf at Fogo during the years 1913 and 1914; what amount was granted for the said wharf; what amount has been expended to date.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—This is in course of preparation. On its being ready the information will be tabled. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that such delays as this would not be in evidence if sufficient time were given the clerks to prepare the required information beforehand.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House (a) a statement showing the amount of money given out as relief on the Labrador for Josiah Gosse, the Relieving Officer for Labrador, during the years 1913 and 1914; (b) the names of the parties who received relief and the amounts paid each; (c) the cost to the Government as travelling expenses for the said Josiah Gosse during the years 1913 and 1914; (d) what amount was collected by him for the sale of lumber on Labrador, the names of the parties who purchased any lumber and the quantity purchased by each during the years 1913 and 1914.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—This matter has been referred to the Commissioner of Public Charities, who is preparing the answer. Immediately on receipt of this I will table it.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount of customs' duties collected by Josiah Gosse on Labrador during the years 1913 and 1914; the names of the parties who

paid any duties and the amount paid by each.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—This statement is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House an itemized statement of all expenses in connection with the customs in Bonavista district from 1911 to date.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—This, also, is in course of preparation.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House the report of the Hospital Commission, the evidence taken by that Commission, and the cost of the same to date.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—This report is not yet in the hands of the Government. It is expected soon, however, and will at once be tabled.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier whether the Government intends to place a coastal steamer on the route between St. John's and Cook's Harbor, in the district of St. Barbe, during the coming season.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, this matter is under consideration of the Government, but as yet there is no report to make.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier when the Heart's Content and Grate's Cove branch railways will be completely operated.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Does the hon. member mean completely constructed?

MR. COAKER—No, but operated.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We hope to have it operated as soon as the spring opens.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier whether the Government would object to the introduction of a Bill dealing with a Water Company for Botwood, Bonavista, Catalina, or any other towns, along the same con-

ditions as the Carbonear and Harbour Grace Act.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I don't think there would be any objection if the proper petition was sent in from the proper people. It might be necessary to send the Government Engineer to see if the water supply, etc., were suitable.

MR. COAKER—The Government would have no objection if the proposed company should comply with all the regulations?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—No I don't think so. I think the Government would be satisfied to allow them to do just as Mr. Grace, Carbonear and Placentia have done. I do not know completely about the other two but Placentia made an outlay of \$8,000 on which the Government guaranteed interest; but they have been able to pay this themselves.

MR. COAKER—Botwood would need an outlay of \$30,000 which they are willing to expend and guarantee 5% interest.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The interest on the stock of Placentia was guaranteed. The company was started with \$5,000 capital and after a while it raised it to \$3,000. Interest was guaranteed on this outlay at the rate of 4%. In the case of Carbonear it was 5% interest rates having risen in the meantime.

MR. COAKER asked Rt. Hon. the Premier (a) if any amounts have been paid to Judges of the Supreme Court since the House last met, as payments on account of Election Petitions. If any have been paid, to whom paid, and what amounts?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply, Mr. Speaker, I may say the judges sent in a bill for \$200 (or \$100 each) on certain cases and the Government referred the matter to the Department of Justice. The Attorney General advised that the Government

was liable, basing his views on a judgment of Chief Justice Little, a number of years ago, in a petition in which Mr. Morine was one of the counsel. Finding themselves liable therefore, the Government paid the amounts. I will get a full statement for the House however, and will also table copy of the judgment under which the Government was held responsible.

(b) Whether there is at present before the Court a claim brought against the Colony on account of services rendered by Sir Jas. Winter at the Hague Court of Arbitration. If so, what amount is claimed, who are the counsel representing the claimants, who represents the Colony, and when will the case come before the Court?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In answer to this I may say that there is a case before the Court, between the Estate of Sir Jas. Winter and the Government. I have asked the Department for full particulars and will have them for the next session of the House. The amount claimed is for balance due as Counsel at the Hague Arbitration. The counsels are.—Claimants, Messrs. Furlong, K.C. and Winter; Government, Messrs. Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C., Attorney General, and F. J. Morris, K.C.

(c) Whether Sir E. F. Morris and Mr. Donald Morison have any claim against the Colony for services in connection with the Hague Arbitration Award. If so, what are the amounts of their claims?

In answer to this I may say that I have no claim against the Government in this connection.

As for Mr. Morison I cannot say. I cannot say whether the amount paid him was on account or not. It is now five years since the happening, and Mr. Morison has preferred no claim as

yet, so I hardly think such a step likely. I cannot say definitely. As far as I know at present there is no claim against the Government, and as far as I remember the amount paid was on account. I will have the matter looked up however for the Hon. member.

(d) What progress has been made to date by the Commission appointed to consolidate the Statutes? (e) Who compose the said Commission?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have written the Chairman to ascertain the information for the Hon. member, and will table it as soon as I receive it.

(f) What payments have been made on account of the same? To whom have these payments been made, and do they represent their full claims for services to date, or have they only been paid on account?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This is in course of preparation.

(g) How many days has the Minister of Justice been absent from St. John's from the date of his appointment up to the present time? For what reason was he so absent? (h) How many Crown cases has he personally conducted before the Supreme Court, and how many have been conducted by other counsel? How much has been paid to him since his appointment, distinguishing salary from other payments. To lay on the table a statement showing the amounts and dates of each payment, and on what account?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This is also being prepared.

(i) If any Solicitor has been appointed in connection with the Act passed last Session relating to death duties, and on what terms?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am not aware of any such appointment. I will look the matter up for

the hon. member and will table the information so obtained.

MR. GRIMES asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Justice, if the fine imposed on Joseph Walsh (Lamaline, District of Burin), by Magistrate Benning has been paid.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I may say that on the recommendation of the department of Justice, this fine was refunded. As to the reason I will have this information at the next sitting of this House.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary how many officials are engaged in the Postal Telegraph Office at Brigus, Port de Grave district; also the salary paid to each and the average amount of receipts for telegrams for the past three years.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This information is in course of preparation. I hope to have it for the hon. member to-morrow.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement, in detail, of all monies appropriated to or spent by the Bell Island Local Council, or any officer or member thereof, from January, 1913, to date; also a copy of all returns in relation thereto.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—This information is being prepared.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement, in detail, of all moneys appropriated to or spent by the Bell Island Local Council, or any officer or member thereof, from January, 1913, to date through the following departments: (1) Public Charities; (2) Public Health; (3) Under order of the Governor-in-Council. Also, the returns made by the Council of all such appropriations and expenditures.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—
This is being prepared.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement, in detail, of all moneys appropriated to or spent by the Bell Island Local Council, or any officer or member thereof, from January, 1913, to date, also, a copy of all returns in relation thereto.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—This is being prepared for the Hon. member.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the returns for all moneys expended in connection with the Public Wharf at New Perlican, in the District of Trinity, for the years 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914.

MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—This statement is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amount of duties collected by Thomas O'Brien at West St. Modeste, Straits of Belle Isle, for the past five years. Also, the amounts of salary paid him each year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—This statement is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing (1) The number of Naval Reservists enrolled who have gone abroad for active service since the war opened; (2) the number now on the training ship "Calypso"; (3) To what districts and settlements these men belong; (4) The number of men who have applied for enlistment on the "Calypso" since war was declared; (5) the number accepted; (6) the number rejected and reasons for rejection; (7) the number of volunteers who have gone abroad for active service; (8) the number

now in training here; (9) what districts and settlements they belong to; (10) the total number of applications since enlisting started; (11) the number accepted; (12) the number rejected; (13) the reasons for rejection; (14) the pay and perquisites of Naval Reservists when enrolling; (15) the pay and perquisites of Volunteers when enrolling.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have written the Commander of H. M.S. Calypso for the information desired and also the Captain in charge of our volunteers. Their replies will be tabled.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing all amounts allocated from his department in Botavista District during the years 1911, 1912, and 1913, for which no returns have been received, the purpose and amounts of each allocation, and the names of persons to whom the allocations were granted.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—This statement is being prepared for the Hon. member.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Public Works to give particulars of how much is paid the Electric Company of Carbonear for electric light supplied to settlements in Bay de Verde district; and from what grants such amounts are paid.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—This information is being prepared.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House all the reports of the Government Engineer respecting railway inspection from January 1st, 1914, up to the present time; also a statement as to the condition of the railroad and number of run-offs and accidents.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

These reports and the information requested are being prepared.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, before this House proceeds further with the order of the day, might I suggest that in future the questions be numbered and that you should be spared, Sir, from the labor of reading each and every question through. This is the system in operation in Canada, and it has been found to work very well. I think that by this method the time of this House might be saved to the extent of nearly one hour per day, as in the majority of cases the answer is very much shorter than the question, and to the effect that the information is being prepared. I would suggest this Sir, as a possible improvement on the present method.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—I may say that last session I adopted the very course which the hon. member now suggests, but the House desired me to go back to the old practice and I did so.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

On motion, the bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Respecting the Administration of Local Affairs," was read a second time and was ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say for the information of the House that when we go into Committee to-morrow on this Bill, I propose to have the Bill referred to a Select Committee, largely if not entirely representative of the outport constituencies, with a view of having the most perfect measure possible reported to the House. On yesterday, afternoon the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, asked to have the 1898 Act printed. That has been done, and the Act is now on the desks of hon. members.

SEALING BILL.

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

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I desire to move the second reading of this Bill, the effect of which is to safeguard as far as possible the lives of our people who prosecute the seal fishery. Nearly everyone in this House, I think, at the last session, took occasion to deplore the sad calamity which befell so many of our men at the seal fishery last year—the loss of the crew of the "Southern Cross" and of that of the "Newfoundland." It might appear from some view points that our policy in bringing in this legislation to-day is something like closing the stable door after the horse is stolen—bringing in a remedy after the damage has been done; but I think everyone, both in the House and outside, will appreciate that this is an industry which has been going on for the last hundred years, and that up to the present time we have been content with the legislation which is at present on the Statute book to hedge around our people with every safeguard that was considered necessary. The present Bill contains the recommendations of a Commission which was appointed some months ago, consisting of the gentlemen who constitute the Supreme Court. It is possible that when we get into Committee the House may be satisfied that the recommendations which they have made are wise and should be placed on the statute book alone or together with other recommendations which may be made from time to time. Last year's loss at the seal fishery was, I believe, the worst in the history of the Colony, the one approaching to it being that which occurred in 1898 to the crew of the Greenland, when something like 48 or 50 men lost their lives. Since the fishery has been prosecuted there have been losses from

time to time. Several of the old records show where 20 or 30 or 40 men have been lost, but in those days the danger was minimised to some extent by the men being distributed among the large number of ships that went out. The 13,000 men who at one time went out to the seal fishery were conveyed by three or four hundred vessels; this year the number of ships that went out was I think thirteen; and as the number of vessels have been reduced, so in the same proportion has the danger of a large disaster increased. I don't know that it will serve any good purpose at this date to make any further enquiry as to the causes which brought about this deplorable result. When the accident occurred, a year ago, there was no power to make the enquiry on oath that has since been made. At the last session, it will be remembered, a special Act was passed empowering the Governor in Council to appoint a Commission. That Commission was appointed. Men were selected who could not be said to have any bias whatever in relation to the matter; men who were accustomed to legal enquiries; men who both at the Bar and on the Bench have been identified with sealing matters and the resulting law-suits. All the interests, I think, were represented before them, and we have had a report from them in which they make certain recommendations with a view of safeguarding our people. Both the majority and minority reports were tabled some days ago. I have asked the Clerk to have them printed, so that they may be in the hands of hon. members when we go into Committee. As I have said, it may be found when we discuss this matter in committee that there are points which have not been covered by the Commissioners. There may be other suggestions which may come from members on both sides of

the House which will assist us in putting on the Statute Book a measure which will be of value to our people; and in that spirit I ask the House to receive the second reading of the Bill.

It will be noticed that the first section of the Bill provides that it shall be unlawful for the Master of a steamer to send upon the ice any members of the crew of his steamer a distance greater than that which is reasonable to enable them to perform the work ordered or required of them, and return to the steamer within one hour after sunset on the same day as that on which they are sent. In other words, if any prosecution arises under that section, the onus, as it is termed, or the burden of proof will lie upon the person charging that the men were sent beyond a reasonable distance. That is largely discretionary. I gather from the reports that certain witnesses were in favor of fixing the distances, but eventually the Commissioners thought that it was better to leave that in the hands of the Master, subject, of course, to a very severe penalty. The second section of the Bill provides that it shall be unlawful to kill any seals found upon the ice, or to take any seal pelts, or to remain upon the ice in charge of seal pelts except between the hours of sunrise and sunset; and no person being a member of a crew of any steamer shall, without lawful excuse, be or remain upon the ice or away from the ships after one hour after sunset or before sunrise. Section 3 deals with the property in the seals. Panning shall confer a right of property in seals subject to the following conditions and limitations. Failure to comply strictly with those conditions shall take away such right of property and the right of property shall absolutely cease after 24 hours from the date of panning and flagging.

There shall be one flag for every ten seal pelts, and there shall not be less than ten seal pelts under a flag. The day and hour when seal pelts are panned and flagged shall be marked on each flag pole. No steamer carrying more than 150 men shall be cleared for the seal fishery without a medical officer on board. No wooden steam vessel shall be cleared for the fishery unless she is provided with sufficient sail power to work to windward without the aid of her engines in open water and under ordinary weather conditions. No steamer shall go out without a certificated Master on board. Section 7 provides that in the event of any member of a crew engaged in the seal fishery not having returned to his ship after one hour from sunset, suffering injury from exposure on the ice: (a) If death results from the injury, if he leaves any dependents wholly or partially dependent upon his earnings, the owners of the ship shall pay the sum of \$1,000 as compensation to the dependents, invested and distributed in manner similar to that provided with respect to sums payable under the Workman's Compensation Act, provided that the injury causing death is not attributable to his serious and wilful misconduct, and provided also that the amount of any weekly payments and any lump sum paid in redemption thereof, shall be deducted from such sum.

(b) When total or partial incapacity for work results from the injury, a weekly payment shall be made by the owners of the ship during the incapacity, not exceeding fifty per cent. of his average weekly earnings during the previous twelve months, such weekly payment not to exceed five dollars, provided that in case of partial incapacity the weekly payment shall in no case exceed the difference between the amount of his average

weekly earnings before the accident and the average weekly amount which he is earning or able to earn in some suitable employment or business after the accident. When any weekly payment has continued for not less than six months the liability therefor may, on the application by or on behalf of the owners of the ship, be redeemed by the payment of a lump sum to be settled in default of agreement by the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof, and such lump sum may be ordered to be invested or otherwise applied in manner similar to that provided in respect of sums payable under the Workman's Compensation Act, provided that said weekly payments and lump sum together shall not exceed \$1,000, and provided that the said injury or accident is not attributable to his serious and wilful misconduct.

Sub-section (c) provides that any party suffering injury as aforesaid and, where death results from the injury, his dependents may proceed in the Supreme Court either by personal action agreeable to the owners of the ship or against the ship in an action on the Admiralty side of the said court for the recovery of compensation as aforesaid, and shall have a lien therefor upon the ship and her cargo in like manner and with the same priority as in the case of seamen's wages. Section 8 deals with notice of claims and the effect of failure to give notice. Section 9 provides that if the Governor in Council, after taking steps to ascertain the views of the owners of the steamers and sealing crew, is satisfied that any scheme of compensation, benefit or insurance for the sealing crew of any ship, whether or not such scheme includes other sealing steamers and their crews, provides compensation not less favorable to the sealers and their dependents than the compensation provided in section 7 of this

Act, and that when the scheme provides for contribution by the sealers, confers benefits at least equivalent to those contributions, in addition to the benefits to which sealers would have been entitled under this Act, and that a majority of the sealers to whom the scheme is applicable are in favor of such a scheme, the owner of the steamer may contract with any of the sealers employed by him that the provisions of his scheme shall be substituted for the provisions of this Act and thereupon the ship and its owner, except as hereinafter provided, shall be liable only in accordance with the scheme but save as aforesaid, this Act shall apply notwithstanding any contract to the contrary made after the commencement of this Act. Provided that if any scheme is substituted for the compensation mentioned in Section 7, and a breach of Section 1, has been committed by the Master of a steamer, the owner of such steamer shall thereupon become liable to a penalty of not less than \$1,000, recoverable on summary conviction and payable half to the informer and half to the Treasury. Section 10 provides that every steamer engaged in the seal fishery, whenever any of her crew is or are absent after dark, or in fog, mist or falling or drifting snow, shall make with her steam whistle or otherwise a sound signal, at intervals of not more than two minutes, a prolonged blast.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that many of these suggestions will commend themselves to the House. There may be some that are not practicable, and that may require some amendment; and it may be also that some of those in the House who have had experience may be able to suggest additional safeguards; so that the Bill which we will put on the Statute Book may be such as to prevent

a recurrence of any accident similar to that of last year. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I don't think it would serve any purpose to discuss the Bill at this stage. Everybody is agreed as to the desire of the Bill. We can discuss it in Committee.

MR. MORINE—Will the Premier explain whether the Bill was prepared by the Commissioners?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It has been settled by the Attorney-General and the Solicitor of the House as a result of the recommendations of the Commission. As a matter of fact, many of the sections are verbatim from the recommendations of the Commission, and I think there have been suggestions from the Commissioners during the drafting of the bill.

MR. MORINE—What I want to know is whether the Commissioners are themselves responsible for the verbiage of this bill?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No.

On motion, the Bill was read a second time and ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Respecting the Naturalization of Aliens."

On motion, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of the Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I may say for the information of the House—I am not quite certain whether I stated it at the second reading—this Bill is a verbatim copy of the Imperial Act, which is very carefully drawn. The only alterations are those necessary to make

the Act applicable in this Colony.

MR. MORINE—Why is the Colonial Secretary given these powers which appear in the Bill?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Well, he takes the place of the Secretary of State. Under the Imperial Act certain powers are conferred upon the Secretary of State. These powers are given in this Act to the Colonial Secretary.

MR. MORINE—I presume it is difficult here to know who is the proper official to do that sort of thing. The Colonial Secretary is given tremendous power under this Act. He might almost have the power of life and death over an alien.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Take, for instance, section 2, part 2. That is the first reference. It says: "The Secretary of State may grant a certificate." Well, we have inserted, "The Colonial Secretary of this Colony"; and in all the other sections we have done the same. If you look at our own Naturalization of Aliens Act you will notice it says: "Any alien, not being under any disability, who shall desire to become naturalized as a British subject, may make and sign before a Stipendiary Magistrate, etc." So that in that case it rests upon the Magistrate.

MR. MORINE—However, I have no better suggestion to make. It is the nearest we can get here.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, in Section 8 of this Bill there appears to be some mistake. The section purports to legislate for Great Britain and for other Dominions. We have no power to legislate beyond our own jurisdiction.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In this case we are legislating for them as well as for ourselves.

MR. KENT—No, only for ourselves.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, and for them.

MR. KENT—Excuse me, Under this Act our legislation would apply to other Dominions as well as our own.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—A man may come here and qualify for naturalization in this country after residence of five years in any other part of the Empire.

MR. KENT—Yes, but putting that section in here does not mean anything. Of course, it is doing no harm.

MR. MORINE—That section has no right to be in our local bill at all. It is one of the provisions of the Imperial Act, and has no application here.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think it may have.

MR. MORINE—It does not apply here. It is part of the Imperial Act, but not part of our Act.

MR. KENT—It is Imperial legislation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—But it seems to me that it might be of value. The Imperial Act states that the Government of any British Possession shall have the same power to grant a certificate of naturalization as the Secretary of State has under this Act.

MR. MORINE—Was this bill sent out to be passed in this form?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—This Act has been passed by the Imperial Government and by those of some of the Dominions. When I first read it, I held the same opinion as my learned friend but on further consideration it seems different.

MR. MORINE—There are some words left out in section 8 of the bill, which are very important.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Do you not read that section to mean that the Secretary of State has the power to naturalise. It is giving him the same power as we are giving to the Colonial Secretary.

MR. MORINE—I notice that there

is a very important provision that has not been put in this Act at all. We do not want to put anything in, that would be absurd, for it has to go to the Old Country. I suggest that we might let these sections stand over for further consideration.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this bill, I wish to refer to a class of aliens. The one class in particular to which I wish to refer are the Syrians, who come here as peddlers and small traders. They are non-producers. The country is certainly not deriving any benefit from them whatever. I understand that there is no law interfering with those people. They do not keep the commandment to keep holy the Sabbath Day. There ought to be a law preventing these people from disregarding the sabbath day.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman. I think my hon. friend, the member for Twillingate is confusing two different classes or races of people. The Syrians who come from the locality of Mount Lebanon are a Christian and very religious people, but there are others who come here from the same part of the world who are of a different race and follow different customs. These are Turks, and they and the Syrians have nothing in common at all. They are an entirely different people, with entirely different ideas. These two peoples are violently opposed to one another in manners and customs and particularly in religious teaching, and I think the Syrians—the real Syrians—are not the people who would be referred to in the honorable member's remarks. Now my learned friend the leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend Mr. Dwyer can bear me out in this. We have a number of those people over in Bell Island, and they are a particularly devout people. They not only do not engage in trade on Sunday but

in the observance of the sabbath, they are an improvement on many of us. I only speak now in justice to these people, because later on when the records appear they might be wrongly construed and I am sure it is not the intention of my hon. friend that anything like that should be done.

MR. MORINE—Before we go any further with this bill, Mr. Chairman I call the Premier's attention to sections 8 and 9 for the purpose of asking him after he goes through a little further to let the Committee rise and report progress while the Law Officers of the Crown look a little more carefully into these sections. I think they will find obvious errors, and that both these sections need reconsideration and redrafting. They are manifestly drafted without much consideration of section 8 of the Imperial Act. Naturalization for Imperial purposes is primarily a matter for the Imperial Parliament, and it is quite proper for the Imperial Act to provide that the Secretary of State shall have the power to grant a certificate of naturalization; but for us to provide the same thing and to say the "Secretary of State and the Government of any British possession shall have the power to grant a Certificate of Naturalization" is a manifest absurdity. People would think we did not know what we were talking about. The Secretary of State has the powers given to him by the Imperial Parliament, and the reason the words are used in the Imperial Act is that the Colonies cannot have the power therein conferred unless given them by the Imperial Parliament. All our section 8 should provide for, is that the certificate of Naturalization given by the Secretary of State or Governor of a British possession should have the force and effect of one granted by our Colonial Secretary.

Now I find an error in section 9. The section reads:

(9) Section 8 of this Act shall not apply to any of the Dominions specified in the First Schedule to this Act, unless the Legislature of that Dominion adopts Part II of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914.

Now when I turn up the Imperial Act I find that what it says is that "this part of the Act shall not apply" It does not mean section 8, but that whole part of the Act in reference to the naturalization of aliens.

Then in the first sub-section of section 8, there are two or three lines of the Imperial Act left out which are necessary to make sense. As it stands at present it is not sense. I would therefore suggest that the Committee rise and that the Law Officer of the Crown look into the matter again. Thanks are due to Mr. Kent who brought this matter to our attention. Otherwise it might have slipped through and gone down to the Commission who are consolidating the statutes and given them a great deal of trouble.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

PATENTS BILL.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act respecting Patents and Trade Marks

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

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The debate on the Address in Reply was resumed.

MR. DEVEREUX—Mr. Speaker. In resuming the debate on the Address

in Reply I must observe, Sir, that in my opinion the policy of the present administration should be the same as in the past or as near as it is possible for that policy to be with regard to the different position and different conditions in which we now live. There has been throughout the Colony a cry that we ought to practice economy. I may say, Sir, that economy like pessimism, may be just as ill-judged, just as unwise and just as dangerous in connection with a government as it may be in connection with an individual. As I observed last evening the danger in England to-day is not as much the provisions for its soldiers, the fear that they may not be properly provided for is not within the hearts of the British Empire; but leaders in the Mother of Parliaments to-day are more concerned with the subsidiary regulations that must be made and are in the making with regard to the labourers, the artisans, the man who stays at home and has not only to take the responsibility that otherwise would be his but to maintain as well the responsibilities of those who have given up practically their positions as civilians, in order that they may wear khaki, and maintain the power and prestige of England on the plains of France and Belgium. Therefore, Sir, it has been considered and well considered by the leaders of the Labour Unions, in England and other parts of the British Empire that it is not well that we should all be inclined to an error that may have the ultimate result of creating a monument of pauperism, as a result of the war, that may last not only through the war but may continue for generations to come.

It has been stated in another place that we have to be extraordinarily careful, that we must be more than economical, because it is said, our

staple industry will not be during the course of the war as valuable as it has been prior to the war. The staple industry of this country is our cod fishery and the man that dares to interfere with its value would be just as unfair and just as dishonest as a man that would voluntarily by his position whatever position of responsibility he would occupy, would commute the value of a five dollar bill into the value of a four dollar bill for private gain. Men in public positions and important positions ought not be obsessed by one idea, an idea which associates with itself pessimism and despondency and lack of British courage, lack of that British spirit which makes the citizens of the British Empire envied in every country outside itself. It is a dangerous thing, Sir, to interfere with the people's bread, and I trust that the despondency which has been voiced in this Chamber will not continue. I have no desire to make any reflection upon any individual or anybody in this House. I am assured to-day as I hear my own voice that there is no difference on either side of the House with regard to British citizenship and our ideas of it. I believe that the Opposition has shown its loyalty in every particular. Some of them have given up their dearest and best. Others like my hon. friend Mr. Stone have offered themselves to go to the front. (Not only that but Mr. Stone went around his own district and other parts of the Colony inviting those who are fit to go into the trenches to go and help to maintain practically and personally these ideals of Empire of which we are so proud). The hon. member for Trinity and the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, have in every way shown their loyalty and their desire for Newfoundland to do the part expected of us by the Imperial Government, and so no obser-

vation of mine should be taken, nor was ever meant to be taken as implying any reflection upon any individual in the chamber.

Now, Sir, I should like to make a few remarks in relation to our outport Naval Reservists and Soldiers that have gone and are going to fight for our sovereign lord the King. It has been stated since the war began especially in this city and sometimes through the press that our outport young men were not loyal, that they had not a fitting conception of their position as members of our Royal Naval Reserve; that they were slow in coming forward and that they did not feel, because they did not seem to show, that enthusiasm which was so creditably displayed in the city. That was an unfair reflection upon the outport young men of this country, and upon their fathers and their mothers and their sisters; and these young men have lately given the lie to that monstrously unfair reflection that was made by someone or some body of men in relation to our outport people in connection with this war.

Anyone who has had the opportunity of observing the difference between conditions in the outports and in the city can understand the enthusiasm you had here in the city,—the example of the Boys Brigades—and our noble boys have shown what proper teaching can do—had much to do with it. You have had these brigades for more than twenty years as an example to the young men of the city; and you had in addition the city papers and the city pulpits and all that goes to build up proper ideas of citizenship. While we have some of those things in the outports, it is impossible for us owing to our situation, to be moved to such an extent as the people of St. John's. It is true and I am proud that it is true, that the city

responded nobly. All that the city ever gave to these boys brigades has been returned a thousand fold. We are proud of these three or four hundred sturdy, healthy young men, with their souls filled with the sublime idea of British citizenship. But, some of us have felt the unfair reflection that was thrown upon our outport boys.

I trust now, Sir, that during the war at least this Parliament, this Commons of Newfoundland, will follow the example of the Mother of Parliaments and that it will be filled with the same spirit that has permeated the Parliaments of our sister Dominions. The main idea and object of our deliberations here ought to be the welfare of the Empire, especially while the war is on. Afterwards let us have criticism here, severe though it may be, hyper-criticism though it may sometimes be. It is the duty of the Opposition to punctuate, and puncture if possible, the observations made from this side of the House. But this is not the time for such. This is the time to help, to give help fairly and sympathetically, and the independent electorate outside of this House will judge you and will give you the support you were prepared to give the Empire and the country in its hour of need.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer my congratulations to the honourable member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, upon his return to the House. I was a constituent of his for many years. I had the privilege of hearing him on many a platform, and though I was perhaps most of the time politically opposed to him, yet I never for a moment could but acknowledge his brightness of intellect and that urbanity of his which made the people of Bonavista for nearly thirty years not only consider him highly from a political point of view, but look upon him as their best friend.

I should also like to congratulate the late member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, who not only had the privilege of a seat for Bonavista last session but has now the double honour of taking a seat for a district that has been represented by many great men in the past. I trust that owing to his sincerity and the great amount of work he is able to do, as their representative, he will satisfy the people of that district, and when the years shall pass away and we shall look back upon this period, we shall be able to congratulate both those districts on their selections.

On motion of Mr. Parsons, seconded by Mr. Higgins, the Report of the Select Committee appointed to draft a Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, was adopted.

NOTICES OF QUESTION.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question.
Mr. Dwyer gave notice of question.
Mr. Stone gave notice of question.
Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.
Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

SAW MILLS BILL.

Mr. Jennings gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Saw Mill Act passed March 11th, 1914, in relation to Section 6 of the said Act.

TEMPERANCE RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. Hickman gave notice that he would on Friday ask leave to introduce a Resolution expressing the desirability of the Government bringing in a Bill prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors in the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 14th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 14.

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

PETITIONS.

HON. C. H. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Mr. T. J. Grandy and others of Garnish, Fortune Bay concerning some fishery matters. The petition shows that owing to a fishery rule at present in force, while the people of Grand Bank can haul herring at certain close seasons of the year they cannot, on account of being forbidden to haul in certain localities. I would ask that this be referred to the Marine and Fisheries Department and I trust that something will be done in the way of altering the rules in accordance with the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. E. PARSONS—I beg leave Mr. Speaker to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bishop's Cove, Upper Island Cove and Bryant's Cove, concerning fishery matters. The petition shows that in the opinion of your petitioners trapsetting is detrimental to the hand-line fisheries. Your petitioners beg that traps be not permitted outside 50 fathoms from the shore. The petition is very largely signed, 175 names, and I would ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, where I trust it will receive the attention which such a petition merits.

I also beg, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from the residents of Riverhead Harbor Grace. Your petitioners pray that the platform at the station be extended. At present this extends only 6 or 8 feet beyond the station, and it is consequently dangerous. They also ask that a light be placed near the station, so as to allow the residents to carry on their

business at the station. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition presented by hon. friend, Mr. Parsons.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Point au Gaul, in the District of Burin, praying that that place be made a port of call of the S. S. Argyle. While I recognize that the Argyle is already overworked, and have so written the petitioners, nevertheless I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it refers for consideration.

MR. LEFEUVRE—I beg leave Mr. Speaker, to support the petition of these people just presented by my hon. friend and colleague, Mr. Currie.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Gooseberry Cove with respect to trawl fishing. It is signed by forty odd fishermen, and I would ask that it be received and referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for consideration.

QUESTIONS.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg leave to table the reports of the Bell Island Local Council, asked for yesterday, by Mr. Kent.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg leave to table answers to questions as follows:—Mr. Halfyard's of April 14th; Mr. Coaker's of April 13th; Mr. Kent's and Mr. Stone's of April 13th.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the reply of Inspector-General Sullivan to the report of Constable Cramm re the Russell-Pelley Fox Case as tabled yester-

day, wherein Constable Cramm demands action by the Crown against Messrs. D. F. Piercey and H. D. Reid.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply I may say that I wrote this morning to the Inspector General, and I hope to have that reply to-morrow.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether the Government intends to take over the Harbor Grace Marine Slip and operate it.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The reply to that question has already been tabled.

MR. COAKER—asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the total expenditure by his department for propagation of lobsters during 1914, giving the names to whom payments were made, the amounts of the payments, and what they were paid.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That is in course of preparation.

MR. DWYER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all moneys paid or charged to St. John's East account, from 1st January 1914, to date, giving names and dates and objects of such payments.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The reply to that question has already been tabled.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary the following questions in relation to the Postal Telegraph Department—(a) In relation to Wood's Island Cable: (1) Who were the owners of the schooner Garfield hired by the Government in 1910 to lay the Wood's Island and Bonne Bay cables? Did the \$20 per day hire cover all expenses for schooner's crew, and

food for persons engaged in laying the cable over and above the schooner's crew? (2) Was there any prose was under hire to the Government which were charged to or paid for by the Government? If any, give quantities and amounts paid therefor, and to whom paid? (3) Besides Superintendent Stott who were the men employed by the Government in the laying of the Wood's Island and Bonne Bay cables (exclusive of schooner Garfield's crew)? (4) What amounts were paid them and what service did they give? (5) Give the actual cost of Woods Island Cable and the Bonne Bay cable separately. (6) Under expenses of Bonne Bay and Woods Island Cables as tabled last April the following amounts appear:—D. Stott, \$64.50; A. Read, \$77.00; A. Wheeler, \$20.00; M. E. Boland, \$103.00; A. B. Harding, \$15.00; P. Hagerty, \$14.00; W. Sceans, \$50.00; J. Doyle, \$9.10. For what services were each of these amounts paid, and who is A. Read against whose name \$77.00 appears?

(b) In relation to Exploits Cable:—Under heading of Expenses Exploits Cable tabled last session, the following amounts appear:—(1) 13 men at \$3.00; total, \$65.00; (2) 15 men at \$3.00; total, \$48.00. Were these men paid at the rate of \$3.90 per day? If not, give rate per day paid? (3)—(a) How many hours were the men employed as help laying the Exploits Cable actually engaged at the work; (b) time employed at repairs or relaying; (c) average rate per hour for time actually engaged at such work. (4) D. Stott, \$97.01. For what was this amount paid? George Veitch, \$61.65. For what was this amount paid? Frank Roberts, \$105.00. For what was this amount paid? Frank Roberts, \$275.00 for hire of schooner. Did this amount include all expenses for schooner and men engaged at cable while on board? 5

—(a) How many days was Frank Roberts' schooner employed? (b) How much per day hire? (c) N. F. Pine & Pulp Co., hire S. S. Exploits, \$125.00. How many days engaged and rate per day? Did the charter cover all expenses for crew and men engaged at cable? (7) Were there any supplies for Roberts' schooner and for the S. S. Exploits paid for by the Government? If so, give particulars and amounts so paid? (8) How much per day over and above train, steamer or other conveyance was allowed to Superintendent Stott while laying or doing other work at Exploits Cable? (9) What amount per day was paid George Veitch for board and lodging while engaged at Exploits Cable? (10) How much per day was allowed John Doyle for board and lodging while engaged at Exploits Cable?

(c) In relation to Flat Island, Placentia Bay Cable. (1)—James Dibbin, schooner Rose May, \$110.00. Give the following particulars:—(a) How many days engaged; (b) rate per day; (c) did the charter cover all expenses for crew and men engaged at cable laying; (d) did any employees of the Postal live on board the schooner Rose May or take meals on board while engaged at cable laying? (2) D. Stott, \$50.00; John Doyle, \$18.90. (a) What portion of that \$50.00 was paid D. Stott for board and lodging? What portion for travelling expenses by train and other conveyance? (b) What portion of the \$18.90 was paid John Doyle for board and lodging, and what amount for travelling expenses by train or other conveyance?

(d) In relation to Gaultois Cable:—(1)—Captain James Day, schooner Maggie, \$150.00. (a) How much per day hire was paid schr. Maggie? (b) did the charter embrace all expenses for crew and Government employees engaged at cable? (2)—J. W. Mitch-

ell, \$50.00; John Doyle, \$74.00 How much was paid Mitchell for board and lodging per day on this job? How much was paid John Doyle for board and lodging per day on this job?

(e) In relation to Placentia Bay Cable:—(1)—T. J. Kennedy, \$124.20. What was amount paid for? (2)—Best and Travers, \$114.00. What was amount paid for? (3)—C. F. Lester, \$200.00. What was amount paid for? (4)—D. Stott, \$100.00. What was amount paid for? (5)—George Veitch, \$75.00. What was amount paid for? (6)—John Doyle, \$25.00. What was amount paid for? (7)—What rate per day for board and lodging was paid; (a) D. Stott; (b) George Veitch; (c) John Doyle while engaged at Placentia Bay Cable? (8) Owners S. S. Baleine, \$2,037.40. Did the charter of the Baleine cover all expenses for crew, steamer and Government employees engaged at laying the cable? How many days was steamer engaged on this job?

(f) In relation to Notre Dame Bay Cable:— (1)— John Doyle, \$17.00. What was amount paid for? (2)—Owners S. S. Baleine, \$1,500.00. Did the charter cover all expenses for crew, steamer and Government employees engaged in laying the cable? How many days was steamer engaged at this job? (3)—Capt. George Mercer, \$175.00. What was amount paid for?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— I would like to say that I think the thanks of the House are due to the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, for suggesting to the Speaker to forego the reading of the questions and to ask them by numbers. This question is a pretty good instance of what this suggestion means. Now if he would suggest some abbreviated way in which questions of this sort could be answered, we would be still more grateful to him. This is a very comprehensive question, and

its length is only exceeded by the amount of detailed matter that it requires to be furnished. I hope, however, before the House closes to be able to give the information required.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the questions be numbered on the Order Paper.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the names of all persons receiving Old Age Pensions in the District of Port de Grave, together with the names of the localities to which they belong.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is in course of preparation.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the cost of repairs effected to Brigus post office in the District of Port de Grave, if the amount has been paid, and to whom, and from what grant taken.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The reply to that question has already been tabled.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works for a detailed statement of all moneys sent to Cupids, Port de Grave district, for local, main line, special or other purposes, and the names of persons to whom sent, for the years 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—That is in course of preparation.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of all moneys sent from his department for expenditure in Cupids, District of Port de Grave, and the names of persons to whom sent, for the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISH-

ERIES—I will have that reply to-morrow.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House (a) an itemized statement showing the amount of \$6,000 paid the Reid Newfoundland Company on account Cape Bonavista Fog Alarm; (b) the amount paid the foreman; (c) the total cost of the Fog Alarm at Cape Bonavista.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That is in course of preparation.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the table a statement showing the parties with whom the Government is negotiating as referred to in the last but one paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, the object of such negotiations, and all correspondence, papers and agreements in relation thereto.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER — There are two matters being considered. The first is a contract in relation to the development of water powers on the Humber River, at Bay of Islands, for the purpose of manufacturing fertilizer. The Government has been dealing with Mr. Willson in relation to that. I understand that he is associated with the Reid Newfoundland Co. and with some people in the United States. The other agreement is with Mr. Edward St. John Howley, who resides at New York, and some capitalists there, in relation to cold storage for fresh fish. Neither of these agreements have yet been concluded, but it is hoped that they will be signed during the week. Immediately on their being signed I shall table them and also any correspondence which may have taken place concerning them.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS— I beg to table answer to a question asked by Mr. Dwyer; also a state-

ment asked for by Mr. Stone in reference to affairs at Grand Bank.

SAW MILLS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Mr. Jennings, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend 4 George 5, Cap. 17," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

PATENTS BILL.

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

CUSTOMS BILL.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Customs Act, 1898."

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make just one or two remarks in explanation of this Bill. The need for this change in the Act has been felt for some time, and we had recommendations last year from the Board of Trade asking that the alteration be made. Under section 19 of the Customs Act of 1898 there is no power given to deal with the goods brought into the stores of the several shipping companies from time to time. We have had several communications from Harvey & Co., the Furness Withy Co. and the Reid Newfoundland Co. last year and the year before, to the effect that an enormous amount of goods was left on their premises after the arrival of each ship; in fact, they complained that their premises were being turned into public warehouses. Under the Act as it stands at present, goods are supposed to be removed within ten days after arrival. But what real-

ly happens is this. Goods are brought in and are not promptly removed. Before the expiration of the ten days another cargo arrives, and it is piled on top of these goods; then when the owners of the goods find it convenient to come and take delivery of them they find it impossible to get them. The trade have therefore asked that regulations be made to make it imperative on the importers of goods to remove them within a reasonable time. The change is a very simple one. We are asking that after the expiration of five days after the arrival of a ship or train depositing goods, the Customs may have authority to remove the goods if the owners are not prepared to take delivery of them. That is the principal effect of the amendment. Under Section 19, the Collector or other proper officer may permit the master of any steamboat, under such rules and regulations as the Governor in Council may make, to deposit the cargo in a warehouse to be provided by the owner or agent of the boat and approved of by the Minister of Finance and Customs, the owner or agent of the boat having first given general security by bond, in the form prescribed by the Governor in Council, with two sureties, for the payment of the full duties of importation on all such goods as shall be at any time so warehoused thereon, or for the exportation thereof; and goods so deposited shall be deemed to be on board the importing steamboat, and shall be subject to the same regulations, penalties and forfeitures as if they had not been taken thereout; and the master or owner of the steamboat shall have the same lien on the goods for freight or other charges as if the same had not been deposited in the warehouse, but shall not be entitled to any rents for the goods so deposited. The owner or consignee

of the goods must make due entry thereof within ten days from the time of their being so deposited in the warehouse; provided that in case such entry is not made within the time mentioned the Receiver General may apply the provisions of section 18 of this Act, so far as it may be done to such goods.

Under that section ten days are allowed for the importers to take delivery of their goods. As I have said, the Board of Trade have represented that that period is too long and they ask that it be shortened to five days. At the expiration of five days, if the goods are not taken delivery of, the Customs may remove them to any bonded warehouse in the city, and the owner will be liable for the cost of removal and for the storage of the goods until such time as they are taken. If they are not taken within thirty days, the Customs have authority to sell them. From the amount realized there will first be paid any charges which may be due with respect to them, the balance being paid over to the owner. Now, one or two of the establishments from which representations have come have accommodation for a considerable amount of goods. Take the Furness Withy Co., who built a large premises last year. They have a considerable amount of store room, and if the present system were allowed to go on it would mean that goods would be imported, landed at these premises, and allowed to remain there for ten days; in the meantime another boat would arrive and her cargo would be piled on top of the first; then when the owner came down to take delivery he would find that he could not get his goods until the last cargo had been removed. So this is a necessary alteration. It will facilitate the trade, and if, as I stated before, the goods are not taken delivery of within the

specified time, the Customs are in a position to place them under storage and make a charge for the same. Any other explanation, Mr. Speaker, that may be desired when we are in Committee to-morrow, I will be pleased to give. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

CUSTOMS BILL.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled: 'An Act to amend the Customs Act, 1898,' was read a second time, and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the Law Respecting the Administration of Local Affairs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, when I proposed the second reading of this Bill the other day I went into the matter somewhat fully. I then suggested that I thought the best procedure would be to refer the Bill to a Select Committee that would be thoroughly representative of the outport districts, who were more interested in this matter than any other representatives, in the hope that the report of that Committee would result in placing on the statute book a measure that would be acceptable to the whole country and that would at the same time be simple and inexpensive. As far as the Government is concerned, we are prepared to accept any reasonable suggestion with a view of carrying out the desires of the country in relation to this matter. I don't think there are any two opinions now in the House as to the principle of the Bill. It is only a ques-

tion of deciding on a measure that will be satisfactory and acceptable to the people. One of the principle difficulties is in connection with the boundaries of the various sections. It is not as if we had the whole country divided up. Then we could bring in a bill and apply its provisions to the whole island. It may be said, why not take the boundaries of all the road boards as they are to-day? Well, that might be found very difficult. It is a very easy matter to appoint a road board for a section of a district, with twenty or thirty miles jurisdiction; but it is a very much harder matter to get all the people living in that area to come to a meeting and appoint a board. That is the difficulty. We may be able to get over it, but it can only be got over by consultation with the members for the various districts, who know the nature of the localities and their distance from each other. I tabled a great deal of information here the other day. The Committee will have before them a list of all the outport road boards in the country, the places under the jurisdiction of each board, and the amount of money spent by each board; and with that information before them they may be able to do something in relation to the jurisdiction of the various boards. Now, that is the crucial point, in my opinion, and the most difficult to deal with. You cannot have a board for every settlement, because it would not be worth while having one in a place where there may be only ten or fifteen or twenty people. The grants would not be worth it. You have got to group the places up, but at the same time you must have them reasonable and small, so as to enable all the people living within it to get to any meeting that may be called and get back within a reasonable time. Then you will have to decide who will conduct the meetings. Of course, we

know that proceedings at small meetings of that sort ought to be a very simple matter, but still there ought to be some responsible person there in charge. At present they are conducted under very simple rules drawn up by the Attorney-General some years ago. A message is sent to the locality at which the meeting is to be held. A policeman goes to the place and lets the people know that on a given date the Magistrate is coming down. The Magistrate comes down on the stated date, the meeting is held, and the election takes place. Now, you have got to name some person in the Act to take charge of the election. You cannot leave it to chance, or to any person interested, like the late Chairman of the Board. These are difficulties that have got to be surmounted, and I think that we can get over the most of them. Of course, as I have said before, there is no difficulty whatever in applying this Act as it stands at present to the larger settlements; it is when you come to apply it to the smaller places that the difficulty arises. If it is agreeable to the House, I will move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, and I hope that out of that Committee will come a measure that will be acceptable to all.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I think it would probably be better if the bill were to go into a Committee of the Whole House first and then after members had had an opportunity of expressing their views on it, it might go to a Select Committee. Nobody seems ready to discuss the question yet. It is a very difficult and important matter for a Select Committee to have to deal with, without its being gone over by the Whole House first. I suggest to the Premier to allow the Committee to rise and ask leave to sit on a later date.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That was my intention. I entirely agree

with the hon. member for Bonavista, that it will be a great advantage for the Select Committee to have the benefit of the views of the Whole House before taking up the matter.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on Friday.

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

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Jennings gave notice of question.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

PENITENTIARY ENQUIRY.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Premier to a letter which has recently been received by me. It is in reference to the condition of the Penitentiary. I think the Government ought to investigate that institution immediately, if the conditions are anything like those

revealed in this letter. I ask leave to read the letter for the House. It is from a constituent who was recently in prison:—

Dear Sir,—On the 24th October, 1914, the Grand Jury went down to investigate matters at the Penitentiary and, as a rule, the Superintendent took them through the prison and broomshop. They asked, through their foreman, if there were any complaints to be made. The Supt. said that things were working alright. Now, Sir, where is the Board of Health and why does not Dr. Brehm pay a visit and see the nuisance pit and the two closets right under the north window of the prison? Some time ago Dr. Wakefield was lecturing about germs, which are carried by flies, being the cause of tuberculosis. Now, Sir, in the summer season, when the kitchen windows are open, the nuisance pit is only about a hundred yards away, and when flies are plentiful you can imagine what quantities are on the pans when the prisoners go for their punky. If it is the case that flies carry germs, then there are lots of germs in the oatmeal and molasses, so, Sir, I think this matter should be looked into at once.

Is the Government paying Dr. Keegan \$400.00 per year to look after the health of the prisoners in the Penitentiary? If so, why is it that when prisoners are sick, they cannot have the Doctor's attendance in person? The writer asked for a doctor three times, and the answer he got was "I'll see." On Feb. 26th, 1915, I asked to see the Doctor again. The Supt. said: "You will see the Doctor to-day or to-morrow. He is coming to the prison." But I never saw him. When the doctor does come, it is to the Superintendent's office he goes, and not to the prison, nor does he see one of the prisoners. He only accepts the Superintendent's report. The writer was

sick for three days, and did not eat a mouthful except soaked bread and cold water.

On Jan. 15th Mr. Bonia came to see James McGrath. Now, Sir, why was he not taken in his prison clothes ragged as they were? No, Mr. McGrath was taken to the bathroom and given a good suit of clothes and then taken to see Mr. Bonia in the little office.

On Jan. 21st the Grand Jury came on a visit to the Penitentiary, A. C. Peters, Esq., foreman. All the prisoners were called to No. 1 Ward to see the line. The Supt. introduced the Grand Jury, and asked if there were any complaints to make. The foreman said that the prisoners had on poor clothes. The Supt. said that those were their working clothes, and their Sunday clothes had not arrived yet. What a bluff! Now, Sir, why should some prisoners get good clothes all the time and others get rags when both are serving the same penalty? This is a matter which I do not understand. I should think that prisoners should be treated alike in the clothing line. The prisoners who go to the Hospital and Government House always have good clothes, while the prisoners in the cells and broom shop have to put up with what they can get. There are a few exceptions, and these can get Sunday clothes every day. This thing should not be tolerated. All prisoners should be treated alike in clothing, and all rags should be burnt. There are clothes worn in that prison which are not fit for any human being to wear. The Scripture says that cleanliness is next to Godliness.

Now, Sir, there are three months in the winter when you have to use your slop kettle to scrub your cell every Friday morning, with no water to wash it out and no disinfectant either. For No. 1 Ward and the two top

corridors clean kettles are found, but slop kettles are used for the cell. It is time for the Grand Jury and the Government to look into this matter.

Why should the prisoners who work at Government House and the General Hospital get a pint of tea in the mornings while the prisoners in the broomshop are supposed to work on oatmeal, hard bread and cold water in the morning, and only one pint of tea during the day? According to the scale of board, the six or twelve months men are supposed to get a gill of molasses per day, but the prisoners who work in the broom shop don't get a gill of molasses a day, not by measure. The broom shop is the only part of the institution that pays, and the prisoners who work there should get tea in the mornings as well as those who go outside to work. The prisoners who work at the General Hospital get two meals while they are there, so they fare well, better than the prisoners in the broom shop, which is not "equal rights to prisoners."

It is time in the 20th century for the Government to change things and have a reformatory in the prison, and find manual labour for all instead of half, and thus prevent the prisoners being locked up, which is injurious to health. There are quite a number of vagrants who make the Penitentiary their home, and they get a better show than many of the prisoners who go in there on their first and only term. These vagrants should be reformed and given plenty of work to do, and not encouraged in their laziness, so that they will not be trusting to the Penitentiary as a boardinghouse or a home. The Government of the present day should keep abreast of the times in reform for prisoners, and treat them the same as they are treated in other countries. The Government has plen-

ty of land down there which could be cultivated by the prisoners, the produce of which could go to supply the prison, instead of buying such supplies as potatoes and turnips from outside. The potatoes bought for use in the institution this year were of a bad quality and fit only for cattle. This would mean a save to the Government of quite a few dollars. Under the present arrangement, why does the Supt. reap the benefit of the proceeds?

Why is it that a man who is not convicted of any crime, but is waiting trial, is turned over to the officials to the Penitentiary, and that a police officer is allowed to come to the Penitentiary and make that man take off his winter clothes and put on summer ones? Mind you, it was winter time, and the man was not convicted when this was done, and that man did not get a change of underwear for four months, although he had clothes of his own which he asked for and which could have been given him. He asked for a change of underwear twice during the first month and a half that he was awaiting trial. This same man, although he was not in the Penitentiary for punishment, was punished along with the convicts. Why is it that a man waiting trial is confined in the Penitentiary when the Penitentiary is a place for convicts and criminals? Why is it that a man thus awaiting trial and confined to the Penitentiary is not given just as good as the best the prison can afford? Some of the convicts confined there get better food than he does. The British law says that any one suspected of crime and held for trial should be considered as innocent until found guilty, and that, as far as possible, he shall be treated as such. Why is it that after one is confined in the Penitentiary, if he is sick, he cannot get a doctor

without asking a number of times? I know of one case where a man, who was only awaiting trial, asked five times for a doctor, four times during the month of December, 1914, but he never saw one although the doctor called at the Penitentiary during that time to see other prisoners. On Dec. 24th, 1914, this man was not allowed to see him, and on the morning of Jan. 13th, 1915, this same man was ordered to get out of his bed at 7.15 a.m., when he answered the head warden and said he was sick and wanted to see a doctor. The warden told him that until the doctor said he was sick, he was not sick, and was to get up and make his bed. Later in the same day the Superintendent told the man he would get a doctor for him. On March 17th, 1915, Mr. A. B. Morine came to see the said man, and brought him a shifting of his own inside clothes, and ordered a doctor to see him. The doctor then came, arrangements were made, and he was ordered better food and medicine.

We improve with the improvement of humanity. Without an improvement of the whole, can you hope that our own moral and material conditions will improve? The spirit of liberty is not, as multitudes imagine, a jealousy of our particular rights, but a respect for the rights of others.

Faithful friendship is like the needle which speedily repairs the puncture with the thread in its wake. There is hardly a thing we do which does not require someone else to do something else. The reason why so many people seem as small is because they measure others by their own measure.

My letter is rather long, but the subject is new and ought to be far-reaching in the cause of humanity.

It is said that the Supt. gets a bonus of 4c. per doz. on brooms, and

the Deputy 2c. per doz. Why is this bonus paid?

I trust you will pardon me for the length of my letter.

Yours truly,

PRO AND CON.

It is a very serious thing to my mind, that this man should have to wash up his cell, with the utensils described having no disinfectant. I trust, however that the Government will give this matter immediate attention.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of bringing this matter before the public notice, but, on hearing the letter which has just been read, I feel that I ought to say what I know about it, as I am intimately connected with the case. I ought to have brought this matter before the public earlier perhaps, but refrained from doing so, thinking it might not be wise in the interest of this prisoner. He was brought to St. John's from Bonne Bay on the 3rd of last December, charged with arson and larceny and has not yet been tried. Is that in accordance with British justice? I understand that the excuse was that witnesses could not be brought round, but if he could be brought round, why could not they? This man who was put into gaol without trial, was, in the eyes of the law, innocent. He should have been tried and set free long before Christmas Day. He was by a trick deprived of his clothes in the Penitentiary by the police, who had no authority whatever to act as they did. They took away from him his winter clothing not telling him that they intended to deprive him of it. I tried to get it back, and so did the Superintendent of the Penitentiary, but without avail. He was left exposed to the cold weather of winter, because he had not sufficient clothing to keep him warm. Fin-

ally I had to bring him down a suit of my own underwear. Worse than that, for four months, he was not given a change of underclothing; but had to wear the same thin cotton underwear. He was only able to wash his underclothing in a hand-basin, and then try and get them dry by next morning, very often going with no underclothing on whatever. On several occasions he asked to see the doctor, but no doctor came. He asked to have his underclothing returned to him, but it was not done. He had not a bath for four months. His food was on the poorest scale; though in justice to the Superintendent I must say that this was in accordance with the regulations which prescribe the same food and treatment for persons awaiting trial as for prisoners sentenced to less than six months, which is poorer food and less of it than for convicts who have to perform hard labour. The treatment of this prisoner was disgraceful—a disgrace to any country. I feel that this state of affairs demands an immediate enquiry and a remedy.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER —

Mr. Speaker: It is unnecessary for me to say that this is the first intimation I have had of this, or any other member of the Government so far as I know. We hear it now for the first time, and whilst I would not for a moment doubt any statement that has been made by the hon. member, and by Mr. Coaker in the letter that he read here this evening, I shall feel disappointed indeed if the Superintendent of the Penitentiary is not able to fully explain every statement made here.

MR. MORINE—Every statement I have made was admitted by him.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER — I have known him for years and I know him to be a most humane gentleman.

MR. MORINE—I must say in justice to him that he seemed surprised at the whole thing. As to the clothes which were taken by the police, the Superintendent thought that they had the power to do so.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I shall have enquiries made into the statements made in the letter, and by Mr. Morine.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker announced that His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address in Reply at 2.30 p. m. on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, April 15, at half past two of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 15th, 1915.

The House met at half-past two of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that, in accordance with the intimation received, His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address of Thanks presently.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House, and, being returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency had received the Address of Thanks and had been pleased to reply thereto as follows:—

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

"I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present Session was opened.

(Sgd.) W. E. DAVIDSON,
Governor."

April 15th, 1915.

PETITIONS.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of South Brigus, asking that a sum of money be allocated for the purpose of making an addition to the public wharf at that place. I might say, sir, that this wharf is used by quite a large proportion of the residents who reside in that locality and the adjoining settlements. There are about seven thousand people, I think, interested in that wharf, and who use it considerably during the spring and fall seasons. At the present time the people have no opportunity of bringing a vessel near the wharf, because the depth of water there is not sufficient to permit a vessel of any size to get within fifteen or twenty feet, and they have to go out in boats in order to get what they want, or else they have to go three or four miles distant from the residence, which is a considerable inconvenience, especially when there is a storm on. This grant, if the Government could see its way clear to grant it, would aid considerably also in relieving the distress that prevails around that locality just now, because of the failure of the fishery last year and the closing down of the Hell Island mines, upon which a large number of people depended for their support. As a result many of them are now depending upon the Poor Commissioner for relief, and they are not able to get sufficient to provide themselves and their families with the necessaries of life. I trust the Government will see its way clear to grant the prayer of the petition, and thus relieve the very great distress which at present exists in this locality.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Joseph Moss and others of St. Chads and Squid Tickle, Bonavista Bay, asking for the sum of \$300.00 for the construction of a road over a very difficult hill. I ask that this petition be

received and sent to the Board of Works, in the hope that it may be possible to do something towards acceding to the request of the petitioners during the session.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants Groais Islands, asking that that place be made a port of call for the Prospero. The petitioners set forth that it is a great hardship for them to have to take their wives and children and fishery supplies to the Island in open boat. This is the second time that I have had an opportunity—I was going to say trouble—of presenting a petition on this subject, and nothing has been done in the matter. Now, I have been informed by men who know that the approach to Groais Island is just as good as that of Greenspond and some other places. I had occasion last fall to call upon the Colonial Secretary in connection with the case of two men who, while carrying the mail from Conche to Groais Island, were caught on the Island. The Colonial Secretary was very courteous in the matter and ordered the "Prospero" to go and take these men off, and no difficulty was found in doing it. I think that the Government should make this Island a port of call, or an alternate port of call. If the "Prospero" called there six times during the summer and fall, the petitioners would be perfectly satisfied. I hope that this is the last time that I shall be obliged to present a petition on this subject, and that it will now receive favorable consideration.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the petition just presented by the hon. member for St. Barbe. Last year I supported a similar petition, and I think I had some communication with the Government upon the matter during the ear-

ly part of the Spring. They did, I think, take some steps to bring the matter before Bowring Bros., and I had some communication with them. I was given to understand that the "Prospero" could not call at Groais Island because Captain Kean objected. I then thought to get her to call there one trip in the Spring when the women and children were going down from here, and again in the fall to take them back here but no arrangement could be made. Now, a number of the Groais Island people live up here in winter time. In the spring they go down there with their families, and in the fall they take their families back here again. There are as I say quite a number of them. I should say there would be about a hundred passengers go down there in the spring. These have to be landed at Conche and taken to Groais Island in an open boat with their supplies. It can be readily understood what a great inconvenience this is to these people. Now, Groais Island is not a port that would be called a bold one to approach, and the steamer ought to be ordered to go there a couple of times at any rate, during the spring and fall. It is not really as bad a place as Horse Islands to call at, and I have no doubt that if the "Prospero" goes there she won't strike a rock.

MR. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Whitbourne, Collnet, Haricot, John's Pond and North Harbor, in the electoral districts of Trinity and Placentia and St. Mary's. The petition sets forth the following matters:

"Whereas the settlements of Collnet, Haricot, John's Pond and North Harbour are without means of intercommunication or of communication with the outside world, much hard-

ship and inconvenience are caused thereby.

"In many instances suffering and even death might have been obviated had these settlements been in telephonic or telegraph communication with Whitbourne.

"Without such means of communication it is now impossible to quickly get in touch with clergymen or doctors when emergencies arise.

"The people of the above settlement are also much inconvenienced in ordinary matters of business, besides being almost completely isolated in other regards from the outside world.

"That a large number of the residents of Whitbourne who are employed in the three mills at Colinet during the Summer months would find a telephonic communication between the two places of a great convenience.

"That this unfortunate state of affairs may be remedied, the people of Whitbourne, Colinet, Haricot, John's Pond and North Harbour do hereby humbly request your Honourable House that the necessary steps may be immediately initiated to provide telephonic connection between Colinet and Whitbourne."

This petition, Sir, is signed by some 200 residents of the localities mentioned, and I notice amongst the signatures that of the Right Honourable Sir Robert Bond. Now, I think this is the first time in the history of this Legislature that a petition has been presented signed by Sir Robert Bond, and for that reason I think we ought, in recognition of the valuable services he has rendered the Colony during half of his life time, sanction this petition. This House ought to sanction the request of petitions on such an important matter and \$300 or \$400 should be allocated to the dis-

tricts for the construction of this very necessary work.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition just presented by my hon. friend, Mr. Morris, as these places form a very important part of the district. It has been a great disadvantage to the people that there has been no telephonic communication to these places. The people are always anxious to get news of their ships coming home from Labrador and so forth; but are unable to do so because there is no telephonic office there. Colinet, for instance, is the centre of a large milling business, and the trouble is that those who deal in lumber have to send vessels there on speculation without knowing whether there is any lumber there or not. If there was telephonic communication to these places it would do away with a lot of expense, because they could find out for 20c. before sending their vessels. One feature of this petition is that the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond has signed his name to it. I think that for that reason if no other, it deserves more than ordinary consideration at the hands of this House. I trust that the Government will make some allocations, and make it possible during the present year to have this thing attended to. In North Harbour and in Colinet especially.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Speaker, I am very much pleased to give my support to this petition. North Harbour is the most important of those settlements and is the only good harbour on that side of the bay. The boats coming home to St. John's in the fall often find it necessary to call into North Harbour, and their friends are very anxious to know about them, but are unable. Now, that would be removed by erecting a telephonic system there. There are people from other places in the bay who go over there

to work, and a telephone connection there would greatly facilitate matters. However, I trust that the Government will seriously consider it.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Mr. Devereaux. I have not seen it, but have heard of the necessity for telegraph or telephone communication to these places.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I support the petitions presented by the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's. I hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant what the people are asking for.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I also support the petition just presented. The Government should grant a sum of money for the erection of the much desired telegraph connection.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Hare Bay that that place be made a port of call for the S.S. Dundee.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions from Blackhead, Bay Roberts, Northern Bay, Kitchouse, Bacon Cove and Western Bay, concerning the Bill relating to the current price of Labrador fish.

QUESTIONS.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay upon the table of the House the reply to a question asked by Mr. Halfyard.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table a reply to the question asked by Mr. Grimes on April 14th; and also the reply to a question asked by Mr. Abbott.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence between the Bell Island Local Council or any officer or member thereof, and the Government or the

Department of the Colonial Secretary, from January, 1915, to date.

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

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns, showing the amount of \$500 that was allocated to a Mr. Long, of Tickle Cove, Bonavista District, for a mooring chain, and also who requested that the allocation be granted.

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

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing who are receiving Old Age Pensions at the present time in the District of Twillingate.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—The answer is in course of preparation.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary for a statement giving the names of the couriers employed during the past winter and summer in the District of Twillingate, the amount paid per trip this year and last year, and the estimated cost of each courier for the past winter.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This answer is in course of preparation and I hope to have it to-morrow.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement (a) showing why Walter Brown, mail courier of King's Cove, was dismissed without notice; (b) if he received a month's wage after dismissal; (c) if so, why did he receive it?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The same answer applies.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I should like to know when the Minister of Finance will have that information ready, in connection with the balances on current account in the banks.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—That information is being prepared, and will be ready in about ten days.

MR. LLOYD.—It rather surprises me that this information should still be in the course of preparation. Last year I received the same information and I copied it off in five minutes. Why should it now take over a week to prepare? It should have been ready before the House met, so that it might cause no delay.

MR. KENT.—I may say that we ought to be able to get all answers to questions in connection with finance before the House goes into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

MR. LLOYD.—I cannot see how they can take so long to prepare.

LABRADOR FISHERY BILL.

Second reading of the Bill entitled, "An Act relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador."

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of the Bill relating to the sale of codfish on Labrador, I would say that this is an honest attempt to meet very great difficulties, which have been in existence for many years. I am afraid that even if it becomes law it will not cure all the difficulties, but at least it will be an honest effort in that direction.

My aim in drawing up this bill was to avoid interference with freedom of contract while at the same time producing a measure which would give a reasonable prospect of fairness to both sides. The present practice of the sale of codfish on Labrador without the price being fixed between seller and buyer except by some vague and indefinite phrase in some cases calculatedly indefinite, phrase such as "the current price" is one which easily leads itself to abuses.

This bill deals only with fish sold and shipped on the Labrador. It chiefly affects the interests of the liviers

and the Conception Bay men who go up there and reside in summer. In this trade the custom has almost universally been not to fix the price at the time of the sale, but to give receipts for the fish in which the terms on which the price is to be arrived at are variously set down. On investigation I have found the price set down in the following ways: "The current price," "whatever price is paid on the coast of Labrador," "at general current price," "current price," "the current dealing price;" sometimes at "whatever price is paid by supplying merchants," "current coast price," "\$4.00 and current price," "\$3.00 and the rise." On other occasions I have found that a man promises to pay as much as another man, whom he names, or "as much as other supplying merchants pay," or "as much as highest buyer," or "as much as anyone else." I have not come across any case in which the exact price is named. There is no freedom of contract on the Labrador. The merchant plays with loaded dice because the current price is fixed by the buyers themselves, who meet at the Board of Trade late in the year when they have received enough information to know what is safe for them to pay. They naturally aim to pay as little as they can, and whatever they agree upon is the law for all parties. This has been the assumption up to the present time by all parties. This year the greater number of the merchants paid \$3.00 per quintal for slop fish which was shipped at least two months before the price was fixed. When the fish is at the market they can make a safe calculation. I say that that is playing with loaded dice. Now, I am not attempting to censure the conduct of those who were buying; but it is the logical result of the system in force. The seller has nothing to do with fixing the price he is to get. If the buy-

ers agree amongst themselves and maintain their agreement, they can fix their price according to their own free will. There is only one chance of getting more, that is when some of the merchants break the agreement, when they begin to compete in an underhanded way amongst themselves or make surreptitious bargains. It is only then that the fisherman has any chance of obtaining anything more than these gentlemen are willing to pay. Last year there was an agreement made by a number of merchants who ship from the Labrador to pay \$3.60. This agreement was arrived at early in November. There was no representative of the seller present at that meeting, nor was there any publication of the information on which the price was based. They used loaded dice. There is something to be thankful for; that these merchants have not squeezed the life out of these fishermen altogether. I have a letter here written in September, from one of the most respected supplying merchants to a seller. It is not unfair. With the permission of the House I will read it.

Sept. 8, 1914.

"From a letter received from Mr. Earle by the S.S. Sagona, we understand that ——— has been up and offered you an additional freight of 20 cents on all your fish if you will ship it to him. We can only say that if Mr. ——— actually did make you this offer he has committed a great breach of faith with the rest of the Labrador Exporters. Mr. ——— in talking the outlook over with us not ten days ago strongly advocated, along with us and others, to give you fishermen simply a receipt for your fish with the distinct promise of paying you the highest price possible as soon as ever we were in a position to know the market value of Labrador Cod.

"Now Sir, we would not go back on

our word for Mr. ———, or indeed for all the fish down there; but if you will write us and tell us what ——— actually offered, we will give you the same figure; and you probably know us long enough to know that our promise we regard every time as sacred.

"The actual current price of fish has not been settled, and we have no means, nor has anyone else, to tell you any figure. We would strongly advise you not to allow any price to be mentioned on your receipt, as by so doing you may discover later you are a heavy loser. The French fishermen are occupied to-day with war, and this will make the French fishery almost nothing; and this is bound to help prices when peace is restored.

"We hope you will not give this catch of yours to anyone else, and you can rest assured that we will treat you fairly when the time for settling up comes."

Then he goes on to give his reasons why he thinks the price should go up. Then again, Sir, I am in possession of a letter from the same gentleman to another person, written in September, and this other person the writer thought was a purchaser of fish. He mistook the name and discussed prices in a way he would not have done if he had known the man was a seller of fish and not a purchaser. He goes on to say:

"In confirmation of our reply to you this morning by wire that \$3.60 is all we are giving as the current price of fish shipping to us at Labrador: we may say we are doing this in conjunction with all the St. John's merchants, viz: Winter, Ryan, Munn, Templeman, and McRae and Duff in our own Bay. This seems to have been mutually agreed upon by all of the above, and we believe all are holding firm at this figure.

"As you doubtless are aware, however, Messrs. Baine Johnston & Co.'s

Agent, Mr. Croucher, has settled with his men at \$4 and this is what is causing all the trouble. We are telling our dealers however that this was done merely for a purpose, viz: to get this steamer away quickly and are not forgetting to tell them that when she did get away he then dropped to \$3.60 which we believe is correct.

'Current price' has been defined legally we believe as, "the price paid by the majority of representative men in the trade." (I may say Mr. Speaker, that I have not been able to find any such legal definition, although there are commercial definitions.)—"and accordingly if the rest of us hold firm the fishermen have no legal case against any of us for \$4.00, as Baine Johnston & Co. are only one firm, and there is nothing to prevent any individual firm from paying \$10.00 per quintal if he feels inclined to do so.

"We may say in two cases only we have paid \$4.00, but the receipts which were issued early in the season in these instances, were worded: "as high as any supplying merchant on the coast," and in these instances we feel we were both legally and morally bound to do the same as Baine Johnston & Co.

"All down this way are determined to hold at \$3.60 and we trust you will do the same.

"We are,

Yours truly."

This is a plain acknowledgment of a combination to keep the price at a certain figure and a plain invitation to the man to stick with them to keep it at the same price, and that in the face of the fact, as I believe will be admitted by everybody, that in November the markets warranted much higher prices than these.

I find that the Hon. John Harvey

in speaking in the Legislative Council at the opening of the session said: "We begin the year 1915 with unprecedented prices for our staple products. These values in my opinion are more or less artificial and temporary. They are based upon values ruling in only one of our markets. No other market warranted a price at all approaching the figure at which fish has ruled here for the last three or four months", showing that the price in this market during the past three or four months and at the end of last year were considerably higher than in the early part of the season, and much higher than had been paid for these fish by these people under this combination. I believe I am correct in saying that if the same fish could have been brought to St. John's and sold in the open market, and in open competition, the price would have been a dollar more than these people had been getting it for. But it was not possible to bring it here, and therefore these fishermen had to take any arrangement that was offered to them, and put up with these prices. Now here is the position of affairs. The men who catch this fish on the Labrador have no means to ship it, they cannot bring it away, and very possibly could not conveniently make it if they did bring it home. It must be sent in vessels which come to the Labrador, and therefore the buyer can make his own terms. There is no freedom of contract about that. We have had an urgent request, an earnest request, an invitation in the Speech from the Throne at the beginning of the session that anybody who could should engage in the fishery. Is it conceivable that any sane man who can keep out of it will engage in the fisheries when they are bound hard and fast to the merchant who takes their fish, and must submit to his terms, good if he hap-

pens to be generous, but very bad if he happens not to be very generous. It appears to me that a continuance of this fishery cannot be expected unless we can in some way provide for a fairer system. I look forward, Sir, to the day when either through the Department of Fisheries or some other means to be devised, this Labrador catch will be shipped away to market for the benefit of the people who catch it, and the middleman will be entirely cut out, and the fish will only bear the expense of marketing, and the net proceeds will go back to the fishermen. I believe that will yet come to replace the unsatisfactory methods which obtain at the present moment. Now, I have tried in a very humble way to grapple with this, and the underlying principle of my bill is that where the parties are willing there shall be a tribunal having the character of an arbitrary board. I have provided in section 2 that the Board shall be constituted by the appointment by the President of the Board of Trade of one member; the President of the Fishermen's Union shall appoint another, these two shall choose a third and these three shall constitute the Board. Now, it is quite evident that to fix a price we cannot have a series of arbitrations because that would be too expensive for the fishermen who are interested, and would not result in equality. On the other hand it is quite apparent that what might be called the interest of the buyer is represented by the President of the Newfoundland Board of Trade and the interest of the seller would in the main fairly be said to be represented by the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union. It may be at first very properly objected to that the President of the Fishermen's Union does not in any way represent all the fishermen, and I admit that—neither does the Presi-

dent of the Board of Trade represent all the buyers. But what I want to point out is and I hope it will be received without partizanship, that the President of the Fishermen's Union represents, if not all the fishermen, at least the interest that is common to the fishermen, that is the interest which he does represent is one in common with all the other fishermen, as being opposed or antagonistic to the interest represented by the President of the Board of Trade on the other side; and the Fishermen's Union appears to be the only constituted fishermen's body that deals with trade and commerce to any extent whatever. If there was any other body of that kind I should have adopted it instead of this Fishermen's Protective Union in order to get clear of any charge of that kind. But it seems to me that the President of the Union is the only one that can be said to represent the interest of the fishermen, as opposed to the interest of the fish merchants as represented by the President of the Board of Trade. Then having provided a Board there is some machinery afterwards to provide that there shall be no failure to make the appointments. In section three it is provided that if the appointments or any of them shall not be made on or before the said date (July 1st) the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof shall make such appointment or appointments within ten days after application by any of the persons authorized to make such appointments. Then the appointments having been made the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is notified and the names are published in the Royal Gazette. The Board is then given one month to fix a fair and reasonable price; and it is further provided that if they fail to do that the Supreme Court or a Judge, thereof may do it; and it provides also that for the purpose of fixing that price the Court may summon witnesses and

may appoint counsel. It is provided that the counsel representing the Board of Trade and the Fishermen's Union shall not be paid, and that the witnesses shall not be paid, because we are endeavouring to make this as inexpensive as possible, and all the witnesses can be got here. The only case in which anybody is paid is if the Supreme Court appoints counsel of its own; and in this case they are paid out of the Consolidated Fund of the Colony, but as that is not likely to occur there should be no expense involved in this Bill.

Now the next thing I wish members to notice is that having got a tribunal ready to make a fair price, and having got that price made I do not attempt to impose it on anybody. Section 10 provides that

"In the following events the prices fixed as aforesaid may be recovered, in any action at law for codfish sold on the Labrador Coast in the calendar year during which they were fixed; that is to say:—

- (a) If the buyer and seller do not themselves agree upon and name the precise price, or
- (b) If they agree to pay the "current price."

Or any phrase to that effect.

That leaves anybody perfectly free to make any bargain he likes when buying or selling fish. If one says, "I will give so much for fish," and the other says, "I will take it" that settles the price. But if they do not name the price, or if they agree for the "current price," or by any words of similar meaning, then the price fixed by this Board will apply. How much better is it to have the price fixed by this Board than by a little committee of merchants meeting down in a room in the Board of Trade by themselves and with no representative of the fishermen there, and the fishermen knowing nothing about it at all.

Then sub-section (c) provides that the price fixed by the Board shall apply if the buyer and seller "agree as to the price in words which shall be held to be of like meaning as the words 'current price' or which are of an indefinite meaning." My object in this is to prevent the fooling of fishermen, which goes on by using such words as "the highest price," "as much as is being paid on the coast," etc. All that indefinite language will be swept away, and what the fisherman will get, unless he specifically agrees on a price himself, will be what the Board says is a fair and reasonable price. Now, you will see if you study it, that I have avoided any interference with the liberty of parties or their freedom to contract for themselves. I have simply substituted a Board which is representative for a Committee which is unrepresentative, and I have given this Board power to get all the facts together and fix a reasonable price, instead of allowing the committee of merchants to come together and making up what is the lowest price they can get the fishermen to accept. I can quite see that this Bill may be evaded; that if the buyer and seller have to agree upon a price, the buyer will name a low price. My first answer to that is that you can do that to-day. We are in no worse position under the Bill; and my record is that if it is found inoperative, then we can at the next session of the Legislature deal with the matter again. We know, however, that a combination of buyers has existed this year, and this combination we are now trying to fight in another place.

Now, when you remember, Mr. Speaker, that a very large quantity of fish is shipped from this coast, you will see that this is a very important matter. We find, for instance, that in 1912 there were 195,000 quintals of fish shipped from Labrador; in 1913,

112,000, and in 1914, 91,000—going all the way in value from \$360,000 in 1914 to \$682,000 in 1912. The inference, therefore, is very clear. The thing ought to be dealt with immediately and a remedy provided; and this Bill is an honest and impartial endeavour to find a way out of the difficulty, in the interest, I believe, of the trade of the country; of the merchants on the one hand and of the fishermen on the other, because after all in the long run they go hand in hand and unless something of this sort can be done, as I said before, I see the day is approaching when somebody will have to interfere in the interest of the fishermen and ship the whole of the catch and give him the net proceeds and cut the middleman out altogether.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the Bill that is now before the House on second reading is one that I fancy must of necessity have the sympathy of everyone interested in the great industry of Newfoundland, whether it be the shore fishery or bank fishery or Labrador fishery. The position put here this evening by the introducer was put in a very fair way, and in such a way, I think, as to win over, if it ever existed, any prejudice against such a measure. Speaking personally, and I think on behalf of my friends on this side of the House, we care not from what side a measure comes, what organization or body may be represented on any Board, if there is any reasonable hope that the lot of the people of this country, and especially the fishermen who earn their livelihood so hardly, may be in any way improved or in any way alleviated. The very hardest heart must at times feel for all they suffer and all they go through and the small reward they receive even if they are successful in their avocations. Those of us who have gone around the country and seen the people in their homes and seen their contented condi-

tion even when surrounded by all kinds of misfortune, will I fancy be ever ready when an opportunity offers like this to help them, if that be possible.

Now, the measure here before the House is, as has been pointed out, entirely experimental. There is no compulsion on any one to avail of it, and unless a man shows that he is satisfied with the Board and cares to avail of the provisions and advantages of this Bill, he can go by on the other side and remain outside of the provisions of the Bill and be in no way affected. On the other hand, if this Board can remove some of the confusion that exists and has existed for years in relation to the price of Labrador fish, and not so much the price itself as the possibility of going for a whole season without ascertaining what the price is, and what is "the current price," or "the highest price" or whatever terms are fixed in the contract, something will be accomplished. But there is another point which appeals to me in this matter, and that is that if this Bill is successful, and if it is adopted, it will go a long way towards settling the constant conflict which exists and will continue to exist down on the Labrador in relation to the shipping of fish. The last five or six years this was more apparent than at other times, and strikes have taken place down there and vessels have been held up—rightly so, perhaps, from the men's standpoint—and generally conditions have arisen down there which are not of a desirable character; and it seems to me that if you can devise some means by which an impartial tribunal will be created to fix the price of fish, then that condition of things will no longer continue, because both parties will have to be bound by the price no matter what that price may be. Now, what is the cause of this conflict and confusion on the Labrador? The men that catch

the fish are not able to ship it and they cannot learn or ascertain its true value; and then the only remedy they see is to hold the vessels and not allow the fish to be shipped. The result of this is that shippers of fish find it difficult to get charter parties for vessels, and that creates difficulties with regard to supplying for the fishery. The figures cited by the introducer of the Bill show that the Labrador fishery is going down every year. Why, it amounts to a tragedy if you compare the Labrador fishery to-day with what it was twenty-five years ago in the days of the Donnellys, the Munns, the Dawes, the Rorkes and the Duffs, and all those who were prepared to invest large sums of money in relation to the Labrador fishery, which at the very best was always a highly speculative undertaking. First there is the risk of going down, then the risk of getting the fish, the risk of making it, the risk of shipping it, and then the risk of selling it. Some of these men have lost fortunes, and some have made a few dollars; but the result is that as an industry the Labrador fishery, whether as prosecuted by the "floaters" or the "liv-ers" has been gradually going down; and if this Bill which has just been read a second time will introduce an element of certainty, you may have more people supplied and in that way help this industry along. This is a measure asked for by the people who are interested through their representatives. The fishermen of this country—the Labrador fishermen—who are more interested in this than any other class, have asked for this Bill. Those who do not care to avail of this Bill need not do so; and for these reasons I think, Mr. Speaker, the House will be willing to give the measure a reasonable trial.

We have seen the fisheries of this country declining from time to time; but we have seen them pick up again.

The Bank fishery to-day is in a most flourishing condition, and only a few years ago that was a decaying industry. Now it is coming up again because it is properly attended to and properly looked after, and the men and merchants are satisfied. Take our lobster fishery. That is declining steadily since 1899 when we exported 80,000 cases until last year when we exported only 12,000. Forty or fifty years ago you had 13,000 men going out in 400 vessels carrying on a sealing industry worth nearly two million dollars. To-day it is brought down to fifteen or sixteen ships with probably a thousand men. And the industry is probably not worth a half a million dollars.

If we are not to regret the winding up of the Labrador fishery, it is about time for something to be done to remove some of the objections and some of the defects by which it is surrounded. I think that this measure is worthy of the consideration of the House, and, though I agree with my learned friend the introducer that it is surrounded with difficulties—and some of them very grave difficulties—and that at the most it is experimental, (and as a matter of fact I have no doubt that the reason this has not been dealt with before was the difficulty of dealing with it), that should not frighten us from making an effort, and if anything can be accomplished by this Board, then our work will not have been altogether in vain.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I desire to say one or two words on behalf of the Bill now before the House. For a number of years I was in the habit of going to the Labrador, and more especially in company with those persons who hail from Conception Bay. In former days vessels known as Carrels conveyed from seventy to eighty fishermen and their families to the Coast, but that day is now passed. To-day we find

very few Carrels on the Labrador, and the fishermen of Conception Bay are obliged to avail themselves of the mail boat to convey them to the Labrador in the Spring of the year. This, of course, leaves them without any convenience for the bringing of their fish home, and in consequence they are compelled to sell their fish to the different buyers who visit the coast, and as the hon. introducer of this bill has stated, the fish buyers seem to have many prices generally to suit themselves. The fisherman knows very well that he must dispose of his fish on the Labrador, because he has not the means of getting it home to Newfoundland, and for the last three or four years they have suffered because better prices have been given to, and realized by the fishermen of the Northern Districts who were in a position to bring their voyage to St. John's where they obtained better prices from purchasers on Water St. It has been seen that those who have held on to their fish till very late in the Autumn have got better prices, although the fish was exactly the same grade as that from the Labrador. While it is evident that many difficulties will be met in carrying out the provisions of this Bill, I may say that I consider it a move in the right direction. I do not desire to delay this House, but I must express my approbation by saying that I consider this Bill will be the means in the near future of our men realizing that at last in the history of Newfoundland the Legislature has made an honest move in the direction of helping them in the pursuit of their calling.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the bill presented by Mr. Morine. I must congratulate the Premier, who, on this occasion, has seen eye to eye with us, and while congratulating him on this I must also regret his inability to do this more often; for if he took his information on fishery matters from this

side of the House, I am confident he would make less mistakes. I am glad we are going to pass this Bill, as it appears we shall from this House unanimously I may say that this Bill has been brought in because of certain difficulties with regard to the fishery conducted on the coast of Labrador, and to remedy the causes of the great losses that the people of Conception Bay sustain in connection with these fisheries. They are compelled to get down to the Labrador coast as best they can. Sometimes they get down there by steamer, sometimes by vessel; a few supplies are given them and they catch fish if fish come along. There is great difficulty in getting away if there is no fish, owing to the fact that there is a great scarcity of vessels. The price that they have to take is the price that the men who come down there in vessels have to offer. When he sees that the buyer is in difficulties and that he has the chance of making the price, then naturally the fisherman does all in his power to increase the price as much as he can. In 1913 the price fixed as the "current price" was \$4.35. It was fixed here in St. John's as a minimum price. Later when the true value was discovered they were forced to pay \$4.70, or 50 cents more than was given on the Labrador, simply because the fishermen were acting in the dark in agreeing to \$4.35. No representative of the people had been asked to the meeting. The business men got together in some room and fixed the price. No one can blame the fishermen as acting unreasonably when they are unwilling to repose their confidence in these men. Were they fully acquainted with the true particulars of things as they actually stood; the cost of freight insurance etc. I am sure that these men would not be unreasonable. Can they not be treated with some confidence? But try and mislead them and they at

once get suspicious. It is only in view of the way that they have been treated in the past that they are suspicious. They demand fair play, and this is their right. Let them know the freight and the insurance, let them know the facts as they are, let them see how things are being arranged in St. John's, and they will be found to be most reasonable. These things have been discussed fully at our councils in Conception Bay attended by men from all parts during the winter. These men have awakened to their rights and they say that the day is now come there must be a change. Last year they were led to believe that they would get \$4.00 on the coast, whereas in reality they only received \$3.60 which naturally caused a tremendous wave of indignation to sweep over the districts of Conception Bay. It is for the purpose of removing these difficulties that we now ask that this bill should become law. If something is not done in the direction aimed at by this bill we will find that less men will prosecute the fishery on the Labrador coast. In 1912, 195,000 quintals, in 1913, 125,000 and 1914, 91,000 quintals were shipped from Labrador, which shows a marked falling off from a quarter of a century ago, when the firm of Munns alone shipped about 190,000 qtls., a greater amount than the whole catch on the Labrador in 1912. The men are so disgusted that they will not go to the fishery under existing conditions. We must endeavour to encourage them to prosecute this industry by providing them with motor boats, gill nets, facilities for trawling, and for obtaining bait and they must not be permitted to go to the Labrador solely depending on traps for a voyage. With the proper facilities within their reach, there is no reason why one and a half million could not be caught in-

stead of three hundred and sixty thousand quintals. If the government had spent only one million dollars in assisting the fishermen with motor boats and bait, larger returns would be obtained. It is owing to the fact that no encouragement was given that we find to-day the young men refusing to go to the Labrador. I hope the government will take the matter into consideration and provide the men of Conception Bay with those facilities in order that they may be enabled to catch one million quintals on the Labrador instead of about one-third of that catch. The fishermen are well aware of the value of the fish they catch and to have a representative of their interest in fixing the price in the interest of both parties will be found to considerably facilitate matters on both sides. This matter must receive immediate attention otherwise strikes are liable to occur. In the past personally I have done all I could to minimize the effect of this bad system, and I hope this measure will set things right. I do not intend to delay this House with any further remarks at present, when we get into Committee we can discuss this matter as fully as we desire, and I hope the Legislature will see fit to adopt this measure.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the remarks that have been made in regard to this Bill with a great deal of interest and profit. It appears to me that this Bill provides an excellent remedy for a condition of affairs that requires immediate attention. Now, I do not suppose there is any country in the world that is so dependent upon a single industry as Newfoundland. Our fishery stands out predominant over every other feature of our economic conditions. We have depended upon it ever since Newfoundland was discovered, and we will be depending upon it for

many years to come. When the matter is considered from this point of view one is surprised at the little amount of attention it has received at the hands of the Legislature for its promotion and advancement. It is surprising that the conditions which have existed on the Labrador in the pursuit of the most important of our economic resources have been allowed to remain for such a long time in the state that they have. Of course what happens is this. The voyage having been of necessity disposed of down there at the price given, the fishermen are forced to accept the highest price they can get, and they are not always contented. The remedy proposed in this measure is one which I think is honestly intended in the interest of all concerned. The price will be determined by representatives of all interests. It is of course quite possible that under the Act as it now stands means will be found to evade the objects which Mr. Morine has pointed out this bill is framed to remedy. The principle of this bill is that a reasonable price will be fixed, not as a compulsory price, but as a standard fixed by an impartial umpire, whatever the price may be. Consequently the great step made by this bill will be in the direction of enabling the fishermen to approach the purchasers with intelligent information for the purpose of bargaining. He knows that there will be an arbitrator present representing his interest, and that in the case of no Board being appointed the Supreme Court has the necessary powers under this Act of supplying the position. This act does not interfere with freedom of contract. In the case of special contracts the figure named therein is the figure at which the fish is sold. It merely aims at affecting those cases in which fish is sold at "the current price" or some

other vague or undetermined figure. No doubt this Act will require amendments and additions from year to year as conditions arise. It is my belief that it is a splendid effort to harmonize the relative positions of the purchaser and the seller of fish.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, Representing as I do a constituency largely engaged in the Labrador Fishery, it gives me great pleasure on this occasion to rise and support the introduction of the bill by Mr. Morine. While as yet this bill is more in the nature of an experiment, yet it is immediately apparent that it will do much to remedy the conditions which have prevailed in the operation of the Labrador fishery, in the future. It seems extraordinary that these conditions, which were so detrimental to the interests of the fishermen involved in these undertakings, should so long have existed in that state of imperfection which to-day has resulted in reducing the value of this industry.

The operation of this Act when in operation ought to establish a confidence between Purchaser and Buyer that can never exist until something of this sort is done. In the past it has always been this distrust of the Merchants which has eventually as seen, fostered the growth of conditions totally to the detriment of this industry from an economic point of view.

Right down from the earliest times they have read and heard of the tyranny of the merchants and up to the present nothing of a tangible nature has been done to alter the conditions. In 1804 the same thing prevailed. The same causes were in existence that are in existence to-day. The merchants at that time did not fix the price of fish or of supplies at all. They did not give the fisherman a chance of knowing what the price of fish was

er what goods were going to cost. I have here a history by Judge Prowse in which he relates that the Governor of the day instituted a very drastic remedy to meet these conditions (Hon. member here read the passage).

The bill introduced here this afternoon while not containing so drastic a remedy as was then introduced, contains the same principle and aims at fixing the price of fish so that the people may get confidence as to the prices which they obtain. At the present time there is considerable dissatisfaction prevailing on the part of the fishermen, particularly in Brigus district. The consequence has been that they have taken advantage of every opportunity to take up any other occupation in the place of fishing. The result has been a considerable decline in the Labrador fishery. This bill may offset this decline. Now that the fishermen have some protection in regard to the price they may be encouraged to go into it again. They will know that in the case of dispute their affairs will be handled by an honorable and impartial Board. I hope the bill will receive all the support necessary, and that the effect produced will be such as has been outlined.

HON. MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS

—Mr. Speaker, just one word. This being a fishery bill it appeals to me that I ought to say a few words. I was sent here because I was supposed to know something about the fishery and I am always interested in any measure that is for the improvement of the fishermen.

I congratulate the introducer of this bill. It is a move in the right direction. I know that as it stands it cannot be claimed that it is perfect, but none the less it is a step forward. Personally I cannot say that I know very much about the Labrador fishery. I am more acquainted with the

Bank and Shore fishery. But I know that there are several thousands of people brought down to Labrador every year by the Coastal boats and coasters. These people land along the coast at various points and fit out a small boat or trap boat which perhaps has been left down on the Labrador since the season before. With this small outfit these people prosecute the fishery and at the end of the season their fish is there on their hands and they have to get rid of it while on the Labrador. In the past they have had to take the first offer. The supplier kept a sharp eye on them and when the fish was ready they came round to collect it, but conditions as to prices as in everything else have changed. They have changed considerably in the past twenty years. At that time they had a mail boat once a month and no other connection with Newfoundland. To-day there are several marconi stations along the coast and mail connection is made three times a month. Conditions have changed considerably, but none the less I agree with the introducer of this bill, that the people working on the coast there are in a position where they can be taken advantage of by their merchants and suppliers. The object of this bill is to offset that, and I can see no reason why it should not receive the unanimous support of the whole House. The Labrador fishery is falling short year by year. We as legislators must ask ourselves the reason for this. The answer is plain and easy to find. The Labrador fishermen have found a better, a more lucrative source of livelihood.

We were told here this afternoon that we as a government ought to have done this and that—if we had spent \$1,000,000 on one matter such would have been the result. This is the usual opposition attack. If the government has spent millions of dol-

lars on railroads and other public utilities in the past seven or eight years we have done it with a purpose. We have been told that our policy has been the cause of the falling off in Labrador fishery. That is not so. No sound argument has been adduced to show that at all. The hon. member has said that the men have taken to railroading. That is so. If the fishermen have found railroading more lucrative and more certain than the Labrador fishery then the fault has been in the Labrador fishery itself and those that conduct it. If railroading is more lucrative then the government deserves every praise. The Government has provided a more lucrative and more certain form of employment further than that those who continue to follow the Labrador fishery are better off because if there is less fish caught better prices are realized. I am tired of this kind of attack. No matter what your intentions members of the opposition misconstrue and misstate them and put up the most feeble and most ridiculous arguments for the purpose of discrediting you. We do not know enough about our fisheries to attribute the causes in the proper places. One gentleman referred to a statement made by a member of the Upper House that the price of fish was going down. I was given a similar opinion by as good an authority twenty years ago. I was told that fish would never again be \$4.00. I sold fish to that man within six months at \$4.00. It shows what we know about it. It has always been the history of this country. Last August the fish buyers were flabbergasted by the war. Where were our wise acres then? It looked then as if the fish of the colony would not be marketed at all. But fish went up. Labrador fish rose in price. We have been told by Hon. Mr. Harvey that fish is going down. I do not see why

any more than flour. They are both articles of food and the price of all foods is higher to-day than ever before.

But to return to the question of the Government expenditures. I take it that that expenditure has helped to increase the price of fish. It took a certain number of men from the fishery and those that remained got more for their fish. It further guaranteed those who were working for the railway that they would earn certain money instead of taking the risk consequent on going to Labrador.

I quite agree with this bill because I can understand the feeling of those men on the Labrador. Whether it will entirely settle the question of the price I do not know but one thing is certain that something must be done. I am prepared to back any proposal coming from any side of the House that is for the benefit of the Colony but I am not prepared to sit and listen to all kinds of abuse about what ought to have been done in the past that has not been done. If any member can support his attacks by a concrete proposal and show the benefit that will accrue to the Colony then he has my vote. But I am not prepared as I said before to listen to all kinds of nonsense as to what should or should not have been done from anyone who is not prepared to do something himself.

The Premier referred to the Bank fishery. I have had experience in the Bank fishery and I know that 25 years ago any amount of fish was to be had on the Grand Banks. The same is true of Labrador. What happened? The markets got glutted. There were some merchants in this city who had more fish in their stores than was caught on Labrador last summer. What position were the fishermen in then? They were loaded down with fish and could not get rid of it. There was no discussion about cull then. There is no cull to-day because fish is \$6.00 and

\$7.00 a quintal. But when you have a large catch on the Labrador a large Bank Fishery, a large Shore fishery, and a large French and Nova Scotia catch, then you will have plenty of cull without any law on the point. I am on a fishery commission appointed by both Houses of the Legislature and this question has been before them. It will come up before us in a day or two when their report is tabled and while we all hope it will do something I am afraid it will do nothing.

Twenty years ago 250 vessels prosecuted the Bank fishery. These vessels have disappeared because the price of fish put them out of business. There was nothing done in those days to help the fishermen and I hope that will not happen again. I hope that the catch of fish will never again be a drag on the market.

A gentleman stated this evening that if this Government had spent \$1,000,000 on the fisheries it would have done something and then he sat down. He did not tell us in what way it should have been spent or what result would have been obtained. There are other people who have made that statement before but it has had little effect.

I rose this afternoon to make a few remarks as I thought it was my duty to give my support to this Bill. I am prepared to give an honest opinion on all matters that come before this House but I am not prepared to listen to any remarks by any member who simply wishes to blame the Government for not doing more than was possible.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Speaker, I just wish to say a few words in support of the measure. I do not claim any practical knowledge of fishery matters but I represent a large section of the fishermen in a district that depends for its livelihood largely on the Labrador fishery and

there is an insistent complaint about the unsteadiness in the price of Labrador fish. They have been so disgusted that for the past number of years they have sought employment in other directions. If the bill can renew the confidence of these men by fixing a price upon which they can rely then you will have a revival of this business on the part of those men who had given it up or intended to do so. I trust that the measure will be a success and I am sure that every member of this House will give an unqualified approval to any such measure intended to give such good results to the Colony. We cannot get away from the fact that we depend wholly and solely upon the fisheries of this country. We are not a mining country nor a manufacturing country, nor an agricultural country. This year we should reap a harvest from our fisheries because of the high price. The reports from the West Coast Bank fishery are encouraging and we ought to be satisfied with that.

Fish cannot go down low again because food stuffs all over the world are very high and why not fish? The large populations of Canada and the States are demanding larger supplies of our fish. We have one of the finest fisheries in the world and any measure for their increase and development ought to receive hearty support from this House.

MR. YOUNG.—Mr. Speaker if you would allow me I would like to say a word or two in reference to this fishery bill. It seems queer that mention is made of a Board but no mention as of whom that board shall consist. Who, Sir shall compose this Board? Where are we going to get men for this, and whom are we going to get? In the first place I may say that I am much interested in this bill. I appreciate very much the bill, and will certainly support it. But, Sir, the point is where are we going to get

the men from? Are we going to take this in our own hands against the seven or eight men who supply the fishermen? Are we going to combine against those men as we please? Are they going to have this carried out? I do not think they will. I am not satisfied with it, for I am afraid it will interfere with supplying.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about the Labrador fishery. I would like to know why they are discussing this. In the first place, if a person is going to the Labrador fishery, he must get someone to supply him. Now Sir, who is going to supply him, if this bill goes through? Who is going to send him down there? Is he going to be cut off from his suppliers? He wants to know before he goes where he is going and where his supplies are coming from. That is why Sir, in my opinion the suppliers ought to be consulted.

In this bill Mr. Speaker, when it comes before the House, I trust there will be further sections dealing with the supplies down on Labrador. It is necessary to have supplies there sir, when everything is closed up for we cannot overcome that, sir, even our droughtrights cannot force the ice barriers. I agree with the Hon. Minister of Finance in what he said about this matter. I do not see anything wrong in the bill, but it is hardly full enough as I have said. I do not think men should touch these things they know nothing about. I represent Sir, one of the most intelligent districts in the Colony, or at least I claim I do, and one of the most interested in the Labrador fishery. We never asked for such legislation as is provided for in this bill. We would like to have a price fixed; but where are we going to get supplied and who is going to send us down is the first consideration. There is no mention of this in the bill before us. Send us down with

supplies and then fix a price for our fish. Good prices are of no use unless we can get the fish. Are we to settle on the price of fish, and is it for this that the fishermen have sent us here? Who is to settle the price of fish, someone who knows nothing about it? How will the suppliers treat us if we do this?

I would say Sir, that such a bill as this must be carefully drafted and made to suit the fishermen, because they are the parties interested. You sir, in your own district of Carbonear represent a large number of fishermen, and these like the large number I have the honor to represent are dependent upon the fishery which might be affected by the passage of this bill. We must ask men prepared to supply us now in April, for it is now we want supplies not sometime in July or November; and must not make laws without considering them. To do that would be to risk our supplies. We have to-day firms to supply us, but they will not without some profit in sight.

What about the bank crash; what happened then? The merchants last year were tottering with money, but it was different the time of the bank crash; they were in a different position then. We need the supplies; and we need also the price. We do need the price. We need a reformation but first of all we need to consider what is right irrespective of whether we will be returned or not when next we face the country. I know I will come back if I want to if I vote according to the wishes of those who sent me here. So now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my views be considered. What is wanted is supplies for the people, and having obtained these, and having caught the fish, then it will be the proper time Sir, to fix a price and to deal with the fish.

MR. DOWNEY.—I wish, Mr. Speak-

er, to express my approval of the bill now introduced. I do not claim to have had any considerable experience in fishery matters but think that the objections raised should be removed and remedied. I may also hope that the degree of confidence displayed by the expression of opinions here is likely to assure serious consideration of the bill. Now, Mr. Speaker it is my belief that the price of fish is going to rise and is likely to remain high hereafter. In common with the other necessities of life which have soared in price since the opening of the war, it is highly probable that fish, also being an article of food will soar with the rest.

A few years ago, the United States of America was a large exporter of food stuffs of all classes, but now, owing to the great increase in her population she has become an importer. The loss of such a supplier would be very likely to open up new markets for our fish and consequently the price would rise. During the past year also very large imports have been made for home consumption, and thus green fish, our industry, has become of great importance.

The great war in Europe has shut off many of the sources of supply of fish, and I think I am warranted in saying that this will undoubtedly have a good effect upon the sale and price of our fish; and it is not at all unlikely that fish will become a commodity in more general use. This is a question that directly affects us, and I welcome this bill and sincerely trust and hope that it will be speedily enacted and that great benefits will accrue from the present condition of affairs.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just one remark in answer to what the hon. member for Harbor Grace has said. As far as I can see, the best thing the mem-

ber can do is to leave the rest of us and go on in his own lone way.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, it will be a surprise to some in the House to know that I am going to support this bill. I know that there are a great many difficulties in the way of fixing the price of fish on the Labrador Coast, but there is no doubt a way out of these. I will have an opportunity of further discussing this matter while the bill is in its Committee stage.

There is one point however that I would like to inform this House of and that is why there is a falling off of the Labrador fishery. I have made this statement before in this House, but I think that it is very important and a matter that should be counteracted immediately.

The fact is Sir, that vessels use trawls on the banks which are but a few miles from the shore, and catch large quantities of spawning fish; and at the end of the day I am told you will sometimes see the spawn on the deck of the schooner six inches thick. Now Sir, if these vessels are allowed to kill out the breeders as extensively as this, there can be no other result than the falling off of the fishery as in recent years. The same thing applies to the West Coast fishery. We learn that twenty years ago fish was very plentiful on the Grand Banks. It used to be a common sight to see thousands of quintals of fish stranded on the shore at low tide but now that there are vessels prosecuting this fishery sights like this are never seen. I will have further opportunity to remark more fully on this subject later in the session.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. Morine, the Bill entitled: "An Act relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador Coast," was read a second time, and it was ordered to be

referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

LOGGING BILL.

Second reading of Bill entitled: "An Act to regulate the employment of men engaged in logging."

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the hon. members of this House to several changes made in the logging bill of last year. Section 3 provides for a sleeping compartment and an eating compartment, and it does not make it necessary to have mattresses as did the bill of last year. By this section sleeping berths shall be fitted subject to the approval of the Government Inspector.

Section 4 provides that any complaint against the Inspectors for neglect of duty be signed by one hundred loggers. In last year's bill the number of signatures necessary was but fifty but now the number has been made one hundred to eliminate the possibility of unfounded charges against any Inspector. All signatures moreover must be signed in the presence of a witness who shall prove the same by affidavit. This would make the Inspector careful in the performance of his duties, and leave him to the tender mercies of the loggers in case of trouble. Section 8 of last year's bill has been completely cut out of this year's bill.

In section 12 of last year's bill it provided that all camps shall be covered with board, sheathed with felt and otherwise made watertight. In this year's bill, this applies only to those camps that shall be constructed hereafter.

I have had protests from the companies about section 9. They say that last year the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company lost \$7,000 in expenses connected with the running of the Hospital and Doctors. The men

they say are willing to pay 40 cents per month, and they are willing to keep and operate a Hospital if the men will contribute this much. As the men are willing Mr. Speaker, I see no objection to inserting this section.

Section 10. Last year we overlooked the Government Inspectors. In this bill it is provided that should they be there a night or two the employers are to find them board and lodgings at their own expense; and also the representative of the men when such is requested.

Section 11 deals with the fines to be imposed for breaches of this bill. Of course, it is taken for granted that the employers so liable shall be warned and given notice that what they are doing is incorrect, for it would be unfair to have them committed without having received this; for example, if there should be fault found with the cooking, if such a thing occurred it would certainly be made right when reported.

An attempt is now being made to create a large industry on the West Coast. If that Company matures they are going to manufacture sulphite pulp, and they expect to handle 250 cords of pulpwood a day. To do this they will need 1,200 men. If they employ that number of men it will bring the total number that will be engaged in logging in Newfoundland up to 4,000. That will be a larger number of men than at present prosecute the seal fishery; and if it is necessary for us to pass bills here providing for the health, accommodation and food of the men who go to the seal fishery for a month in the year, then it surely ought to be incumbent upon us to make provision for 4,000 men who go up in the woods and stay there for five months of the year. I believe that the time is com-

ing when the fishermen who go up in the lumber woods must go with their minds made up to remain during the whole season, otherwise they will come out with very little money; and if the camps are comfortable, clean and tidy they will be more likely to be satisfied to remain for the five months, and they will be able to do better work and give better satisfaction. Now, I hope that the bill will become law. If there is any information that is required by any hon. member when we are in Committee, I will be very glad to furnish it.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the Employment of the Men Engaged in Logging" was read a second time, and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

SAWMILLS BILL.

Second Reading of the Bill "An Act to Amend 4 George 5th, Cap. 17, entitled "An Act in relation to Saw Mills."

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, the first section of this Bill refers to clause 6 of the Saw Mills Act. This section is for the purpose of rectifying a difference of interpretation. As the law reads at the present time "The Governor in Council shall have the right to reserve, by proclamation in the Royal Gazette, such sections or areas of Crown Land as may, from time to time, in the public interest, be deemed expedient, and to prohibit the cutting of timber on such lands for milling purposes, and the penalty for cutting timber on such lands shall be fixed and determined in such proclamation; provided, however, that no such reservation shall be made until public notice has been given to those residing in and near the locality in which the land proposed to be reserved is situated." Now, a great many are under the impression that "milling purposes" only applies to milling oper-

ations, and does not prohibit a private individual from going on those reserves, cutting a certain amount of timber, and taking it to a mill to be sawn. Now, as the House will easily see, if the Act were interpreted in that way, and cutting by private individuals permitted, it would in the end bring about the same result as milling operations on any particular reserve. As a case in point, I may say that a certain man in the district of Twillingate had two men and a horse operating on Thwart Islands last year, in spite of the fact that the Island has been reserved for a number of years. The amount of timber cut (I got the figures from the man who scaled the timber while passing through on my way here) was 509 logs of from 20 to 30 feet in length, amounting to a total of 28,000 feet of lumber. We protested against this man's operations, and he replied to the Department of Agriculture and Mines something to this effect, that he was only cutting a small amount of timber for building purposes. Now, I think anyone will quite understand that that amount of timber was not intended for building purposes alone. It is to meet conditions of this kind that I have brought in this amendment. It reads as follows:—

1.—The words "milling purposes" in Section 6 of the Act 4, George V., Cap. 17, shall be held to mean sawing or otherwise manufacturing at a mill. The penalty for cutting timber on any lands reserved under the provisions of said section shall not be less than twice the value of such timber when sawn or manufactured, and shall be recovered in a summary manner from the owner of such mill by any person who shall sue for the same.

Section 2 is an additional clause. It is as follows:

No person shall have any right of property in any timber cut on any Crown Lands except under the pro-

visions of a license, duly issued, unless he shall within one year from the date of cutting remove such timber to a place of safety under his control.

That is for the purpose of meeting conditions of this nature: I am sorry to say that a large amount of timber has been destroyed, in the district of Twillingate at any rate, by men who have cut it and left it where it has fallen and allowed it to stay there and rot, and it is for the purpose of putting a stop to this that I have inserted this clause. I beg to move the second reading of the bill.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. Jennings, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 4 George V., Cap. 17, entitled "An Act Respecting the Operation of Saw Mills" was read a second time, and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Naturalization of Aliens."

On motion, the House resolved it self into Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of the Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER —

Mr. Chairman, when we were in Committee on this bill yesterday I was drawn to my attention by the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, that there was no interpretation clause in the Bill as regards the words "British Possession." The absence of the clause in the English Act may be accounted for by the fact that there is a provision already in the General Interpretation Act of the British Parliament, I think of 1899, in which "British Possession" is defined as follows:—

"British Possession shall mean any part of His Majesty's Dominions exclusive of the United Kingdom. Where parts of such Dominions are under both a central and local Legislature" (such as are all the Dominions now with the exception of ourselves and New Zealand) "all parts under the Central Legislature shall for the purposes of this interpretation be deemed to be one British Possession." I propose to add that in the Bill. We have nothing in our own Act dealing with the matter, and this is broad enough. I think, to take in every possible case that might arise under this Act. I have no doubt that if that were not so, there would have been a special section in the Bill. I move the adoption of that section.

On motion, the section was adopted.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman of the Committee of the whole reported that the Committee had considered the Bill to them referred and had passed the same with some amendment.

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

SUPPLY.

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

PENITENTIARY ENQUIRY.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker: Last night, before the House closed, I made reference to the matter of conditions at the penitentiary. This morning's issue of the Daily News contains some criticisms, alleged to have been made by the Minister of Justice, upon the remarks which I made in the House. I have replied over my own signature in this evening's issue of The Mail, and I don't intend to delay the House now more

than a minute, but as I brought the matter up here last evening I feel that it is due to the House that I should make some reference to the statements attributed to the Minister of Justice. It is probable that the Minister, in a hasty report, has been misrepresented, as I do not think he could have made the statements attributed to him.

In the first place, with reference to the man Snowden, to whom I was referring the Minister is made to say that besides the one act charged against him, and for which he was committed, there are two others which are being investigated. That is not correct. The two others to which he refers come out of and are part of the one transaction. The charge against him is that of burning down a house and stealing money in the house at the time. The man then went to Canada, and returned bringing back some goods with him, and he was charged with smuggling these goods. He was arrested in the month of November, was committed on the 23rd November by Magistrate March, and sent to the penitentiary on the 3rd December. He has been five months in the penitentiary awaiting trial. The remark that I made in this connection last night was that if he could have been brought on here on the 3rd December last, why should not the witnesses against him, who would be coming from the same place, have been brought on at the same time, the case tried, and the witnesses returned to their homes before the close of navigation? That was not done. Later on, after my return from Canada, I was retained. I then made enquiries, but, of course, found that in midwinter it would be a very difficult matter to get a trial. Late in the month of March I approached the Department of Justice a second time, and got Mr. Squires himself. He had

been away. He said that he admitted the hardship of the case, and that if the man could give bail they would accept it. I pointed out to him that the man was a total stranger here and that bail could not be got. There were nobody, except some people in Bonne Bay, who knew anything at all about him, and that consequently it was quite impossible to get bail, and to suggest the thing was absurd. I also pointed out to the Minister of Justice, as I do here now, that the fact that the man could not give bail, was no reason whatever why he should be left in the Penitentiary from the month of December until the month of March without trial.

Then one other point. On yesterday I carefully refrained from blaming any particular person in this matter, and I don't wish yet to charge any person. When I informed Superintendent Parsons that the man's clothes had been taken away; that he had been without warm clothing for four months; that he had been wearing one suit of underclothing literally every day for four months; and that he had not had a bath, the Superintendent in the first place said that he could not believe that it was true, and he was sure the clothes had not been taken away from the man in the Penitentiary. At my request he sent for the man and for the Warden, and then admitted to me that it was true that the Warden had taken the man's clothes away from him under the orders of the Police. I pointed out to Mr. Parsons that when a man was sent to the Penitentiary the Police had no authority over him, and that he should not have allowed that sort of thing to happen. He said that he would certainly not allow it to happen again. He expressed regret for what had occurred, and particularly because of that I made no statement about it in public until

last night, when I felt compelled to do so. To that the Minister of Justice is said to have replied that the Superintendent had stated that no application on the part of the man for clothes had been refused. Now, the contrary is true. The man, through the Warden, sent repeatedly for his clothes. Superintendent Parsons admitted that to me, and told me that he had asked the Superintendent of Police for the clothes and the Superintendent of Police had refused to give them up, and he had sent back word of that fact to the man. He said, however, that the man might have had other prison clothes if he had asked for them. I said: "How was he to know that? Did you offer them to him? Did you take any care to see that he had clothes?" He said "No." Then I said: "What about the man's bath? What about his having a chance to wash?" He said: "He might have had that too, if he had asked for it." "But," I said, "surely Mr. Parsons, you don't allow any person to remain in the Penitentiary for four months without seeing to his cleanliness? And if he won't wash himself you take some means to force him to do it. In the interests of the health of the other prisoners' it is your duty to see that nobody remains unwashed and unbathed in your institution for four months." He admitted frankly that I was right in that. I then asked that the man should be sent for and that the warden should be instructed to allow him the privilege of bathing; and that was granted him.

Now there is one other statement that the Minister is said to have made, namely, that the man was supplied clothes after I had interviewed him. Now, I don't know what happened after I interviewed him, but I know that the man was supplied with no clothes until I took my own clothes down to the Penitentiary and

passed them into him through the gates. But the man should not have had his own clothes taken away from him. He should not have been asked to put on prison clothes that had been worn by other prisoners at other times. I think it is a most glaring instance of inhumanity. I believe that the Minister of Justice and his Department know nothing about this. How could they know? So far as the Superintendent of the Prison is concerned, the worst that can be said of him is that he did not know what was taking place, and because I was satisfied that that was correct, and because he was so very emphatic about it, and so very sorry, I made no mention of the matter in public, and I was quite surprised when the letter was read last night; but as it was read, I felt that it was for me to say something.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Stone, asked for some information in connection with the Naval Reserve, also in connection with the Volunteers. I beg to table that. Also particulars asked for by Mr. Coaker in connection with the case at Lewisporte.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.
Mr. Stone gave notice of question.
Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.
Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

PETITION OF RIGHTS BILL.

Mr. Kent gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled: "An Act respecting Proceedings against the Crown by Petition of Right."

Mr. Jennings gave notice of question.

MR. COAKER—May I ask the Premier if he has any report to make in connection with the Penitentiary.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—This morning I sent your letter and a copy of the statement made by the hon. member for Bonavista, as taken down by the shorthand reporter, to the Department of Justice, and I hope to be able to table the reply to-morrow.

Mr. Woodford tabled answers to certain questions.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled answers to certain questions.

MR. COAKER—May I be permitted before the House adjourns to say a word in connection with the "Terra Nova's" crew at Port aux Basques. They wired me this morning making certain statements, and I wired back asking for full information. I received a reply this afternoon.

Now, I would ask that the Premier (I don't know any person in the House who could, by reason of his position, deal with the matter before) approach Bowring Brothers and ask them to provide these strikers on the Terra Nova with the amount of \$4.00 each, the amount to which they would be entitled if they were being paid off here in St. John's, and let them go to their homes. These men don't want to leave the ship without getting this sum of \$4.00. There are 50 of them on board and the whole crew are in sympathy with them, and won't allow the Captain to land them without trouble. If Bowring Bros. could be induced to pay them the \$4.00, due them under the law, they could go ashore and the whole trouble would be ended.

I have another message from the Erik.

I advised the men three or four days ago to go ahead and prosecute the fishery. They telegraphed me three or four days ago, and I wired back that they should do the best they could, obey the Captain and prose-

cute the voyage, and that in all probability they would not be out very long in any event.

Mr. Morine gave notice of question.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Just one word. I would like to say to the hon. member, Mr. Coaker, that the case he refers to is being very carefully considered both in the interest of the men and of the owners, and the best that can be done will be done. I understand that the Attorney General has had some interviews with Bowring Brothers.

MR. COAKER—Is there anything that I could telegraph them?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Not at present. It will have to stand for a little while.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, April 16th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 16th, 1915.

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

REPORT TABLED.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Government Engineer upon the Government Railways.

MR. SPEAKER—I have been asked to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Order Paper is not in its proper form. Notices of motion should come after, and not before the Order of the Day. It has been customary for years past to have it in this form, but that does not make it the more correct. We shall endeavour to follow the proper form in future.

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker: I have a number of petitions from the District of Trinity, from Catalina, Charleville, Elliston, Petley, English Hr., Foster's Point, Shoal Harbour, Mel-

rose, Waterville, Burgoyne's Cove, St. Jones' Within, Pope's Hr., New Bonaventure, Port Rexton, Trinity, Trinity West and Scilly Cove. These petitions, Mr. Speaker, are all in connection with the timber limits on Bonavista Peninsula. I trust the Government will give the petitions every consideration. At the F.P.U. Convention held in Catalina last Fall we passed resolutions in connection with the same thing; and as these petitions are largely signed, I trust that the Government will accede to their request.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I did not rise immediately, because I thought it possible that the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who is concerned with this petition, might have afforded the House some information in reference to it. It will be within the knowledge of most of the members of the House that last November a strong protest was made in the Press in reference to this matter. That protest was by no means a party protest, because it was voiced by newspapers representing both sides and every section of the House. The protest was against the granting of certain timber lands on the Peninsula between Trinity Bay and Bonavista Bay. A similar question had arisen some years previously, a similar protest had been made, and the Government of that day had revoked the grant. Now, owing to some cause—I don't know what—it may have been through an oversight—a grant of much the same land was made last season by the Executive Government, on an application that was approved by the Department of Agriculture and Mines. It was understood at the time the protest was made that the Premier of the Colony had no knowledge whatever of what had been done, and that he strongly disapproved of what had been done, but up to the present time, as far as I know, there has been no publication

of any action of the Government in reference to the protests; and it was, therefore, Sir, that I kept my seat for a minute or so in order to afford the opportunity to the Premier to state exactly the position to-day of this protest and grant. Now that I have specially drawn his attention to the matter, I have not the faintest doubt that he will give us some information concerning it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: In relation to the petitions which have been presented, it is quite correct as stated by the hon. member, that these protests came before the Government; and I may say in reply, to him, that since then nothing has been done in the way of granting these lands. As a matter of fact, Mr. Stone, one of the members for the District, came and saw me last year, and I think I gave him that information at the time.

MR. LLOYD—Am I to understand from that, that the application that was approved by the Governor in Council, has fallen through?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not know that that is exactly how I would describe it; but as far as the Government is concerned, they do not propose to give a title to that particular piece of land. As a matter of fact, as I explained fully to Mr. Stone, when he called to see me, there was considerable doubt in relation to exactly the land that was covered in the application. It did not appear that these lands that were the subject matter of objection some years ago, were covered by that application, and when that application was approved, that was the way in which the Council understood it. It afterwards transpired on enquiry that a portion of the land that had been the subject of dispute—that is the land lying between the two Bays—had been approved in this application.

MR. LLOYD—Eighty-eight square miles.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am not quite sure; but I think that would be about one-half of the land of the subject matter of dispute some years ago.

MR. LLOYD—A little over half.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Under the land in dispute six or seven years ago there was no land west of the railway track at all; but now a considerable portion of the land comprised in the application was on the other side of the track, on the left hand side of the railway track as you go north—about one quarter of it. Under the application approved some years ago there was none on that side at all. Now I think it will be satisfactory to the hon. member when I say that all the public interest there will be conserved, and none of the land on that side of the railway track granted.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Humbermouth and Corner Brook Bay of Islands, asking for a sum of money sufficient to cover the grading of two miles of road that was projected, surveyed, brushed and stumped in the days of the late Rev. Mr. Curling, thirty-five years ago. The need was apparent in these days, and is much more apparent at the present time, as owing to the development which has taken place since the inception of the railway and other public works, it is impossible to-day to secure a building site in that locality without opening up land remote from the sea shore. For that reason the petitioners ask the allocation of an amount sufficient for this work. I very strongly urge the granting of the request of these people, as I know the necessity for this piece of road. I would respectfully ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Targett gave notice of question, and drew attention to the fact that some questions asked by him on the 13th inst. had not yet been answered.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—These answers are being prepared, and you will have them very soon.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

QUESTIONS.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table the last annual return to the Governor in Council by the Commissioner of Pilots, under Section 19 of Cap. 24 George 5.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is being prepared and I shall table it on Monday.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier what part of the general expenses of the Hague Tribunal of Arbitration, 1919, this Colony is liable for; how much that liability is expected to be; if any part of it has yet been paid by the Colony; if not, why not; how much has been paid for obligations locally incurred in the matter; what claims are outstanding and unsettled; why have they not been settled?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am having the information prepared. There are some portions of it I can answer now or you can have it all together.

MR. MORINE—Let us have it all together.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing (a) how much was paid yearly for the maintenance of the agricultural bull at Wesleyville; (b) if any money received from the sale of the bull by the party in charge was forwarded to the Government; if so, how much?

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

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the number of Elective Road Boards in the District of Trinity for 1914 and 1915; also, the appointed Boards for same years giving name of each place where said Boards are in operation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I shall have that on Monday.

MR. STONE asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House (1) the date of Magistrate Lilly's retirement; (2) if Mr. Lilly asked the Government to be pensioned; (3) at what date did Mr. Somerton come under the pay of the Government; (4) at what date did Mr. Somerton make application for Mr. Lilly's position, and when the Government considered the application, and what date his commission was issued?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I shall table that next day.

MR. STONE—I may say that I think some of these questions could have been answered right off, as there were vouchers for the expenditures and the vouchers were locked up last year, and should be in the Accountant's Department now. I do not think the answers would have been much trouble, and I know some of the answers could have been forthcoming.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think the hon. member has misunderstood the question. The question I was referring to was in connection with Magistrate Lilly. That has nothing to do with vouchers. I have given instructions to the Deputy Colonial Secretary to have the minutes of Council looked up, and I shall have the information on the next day.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House answers to the following

questions viz: (G) In relation to Ramea Cable. 1—Duchess of Cornwall \$600.00; Duchess of Cornwall, \$280; (a) From whom was the Duchess of Cornwall chartered; (b) what rate per day; (c) did the charter include all expenses for crew, steamer and Government employees engaged at cable; (d) what amount, if any, charged the Government for supplies for Duchess of Cornwall; (e) how many days engaged at cable laying. 2—Schooners at \$45.00 per day, \$855.00 (a) From whom were schooners hired; (b) what were they employed at? How many schooners were engaged. 3—Capt. J. Keeping's schooner, ten days, \$90.00. What was schooner employed at? 4—Rope, labor and provisions, \$718.00. (a) what amount paid for rope, (b) what amount paid for provisions; (d) what amount paid for labor included in above \$718.00. (e) what was the provision for; (f) what was the rope for; (g) what was the labor engaged at; (h) what disposition was made of the rope and left over supplies. 5—John Penney and Sons, \$418.14. Give particulars of this payment. If it was for supplies to what use were such supplies put? 6—James Abbott, \$105.00. What was amount paid for? Thos. Moulton, \$195.00. What was amount paid for? 7—For what was the amount of \$120 paid Captain E. English of the Fiona? Was the amount paid over and above his regular monthly salary as Captain of the Fiona? 8—Were the amounts paid the members of the Fiona's crew and charged to Ramea Cable over and above their regular salary? 9—By whose authority were these amounts paid? On whose recommendation? 10—D. Stott, \$220.00. (a) What portion of this amount was paid to D. Stott for board and lodging while engaged at Ramea Cable; (b) what rate per day for board and lodging; (c) how many days engaged at the work? 11—George Veitch, \$95.00. What por-

tion of this amount was paid for board and lodging? 12—Did D. Stott and George Veitch live and board on board the steamer Fiona while engaged at Ramea Cable? If so, how many days each lived and took their meals on board that ship? 13—Did D. Stott and John Doyle and George Veitch live and take their meals on board the S.S. Baleine when the steamer was engaged laying cables in Placentia Bay? If so, give number of days of each on board said steamer? 14—Have D. Stott and George Veitch and John Doyle submitted vouchers for actual expenses when engaged at Postal Telegraph work during the past ten years? Have they submitted separate vouchers for board and lodging, and for train, steamer and other conveyances.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say I asked Mr. LeMessurier about this, and he told me it would take some time to prepare the answer. As soon as it is prepared I shall table it.

MR. STONE—That is the question I was referring to just now.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement of all moneys spent on the public wharf at Kitchues West, in Harbour Main District, by David Costello, during 1911 and 1912.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement of all moneys spent on the Central Wharf at Conception Harbour, Harbour Main District, during 1913, and the names of those to whom sent?

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement of moneys spent on main roads between Concep-

tion Harbour and Bacon Cove, and the names of the persons to whom sent.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I shall have that statement on Monday.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House any reports of the Lunacy Commission, made to the Executive Council during the last sixteen months, and a copy of all minutes of the Executive Council in reference to the Lunatic Asylum since January 1st, 1914, to date.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. member I beg to table the information.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the cost to date of the public buildings at Harbour Grace, Spaniard's Bay, Bay Roberts, Channel and Freshwater; the cost of the buildings at each place to be given separately.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I may have that statement at any moment this afternoon.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copy of returns of expenditure of two grants of \$50.00 each allocated in 1913 to Mark Rideout, of Whale's Gulch, for the purpose of making a public well in that locality.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That is being prepared.

MR. LLOYD—I beg leave to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to a question I asked.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I have that information and also information in relation to another question, which I beg to table.

MR. LLOYD—Yesterday the Minister of Finance said that these were replies to two other questions that would take considerable time. I can quite appreciate that; but what I would like to ask now is if any portion of the information has been prepared yet.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I left the question with the Clerk, and asked him to attend to it and told him to send it to the House when it was prepared.

MR. LLOYD—May I ask if, at the next session of the House we can get any portion that is ready.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes.

TEMPERANCE RESOLUTIONS.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I beg to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider this Resolution with reference to Prohibition of Liquors.

MR. MORINE—I second the motion.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker: Before this motion is carried I would suggest to the hon. member, the introducer of this measure, that it is hardly fair to ask this House to consider to-day such an important and far-reaching question as that of total prohibition. In view of its importance, Sir, and far-reaching consequences, I would suggest to the hon. member that he consent to one day next week being set down as a fit and proper time for this House to consider that important question. It must be remembered that as yet there are hon. members in this House who are not aware of these Resolutions being printed—they certainly have not been distributed—and I think myself that it is in the recollection of every hon. member of this House that when the Opposition during the past week asked for the postponement of a certain matter on the grounds that they had not yet read the Bill and that the Bill was not distributed, we on this side of the House very readily acquiesced in the suggestion and consented to the postponement. In view of these facts, and particularly as we have not seen the Resolutions, I now throw out the suggestion to the hon. member that he consent to a day next

week—say Tuesday or Wednesday being set down for the House to consider this Resolution.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: In reply to the hon. member I beg to say that I have no objection whatever to having the matter come up some day next week. Wednesday would suit very well. My only object in moving the Resolution to-day was to get through with it, but I am willing to consent to some day next week.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker: I would suggest that it be placed first on the Order of the Day for Wednesday, and that in the meantime fuller Resolutions be printed and circulated amongst the members.

On motion, it was ordered accordingly.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

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

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the law respecting the Administration of Local Affairs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Chairman. It will be remembered that when this matter was before the House the last day, I explained it as fully as the information then in my possession enabled me to do and I intimated that I proposed to ask

the House to send the bill to a Select Committee in order that we might discuss the various amendments that may be necessary to make this measure as perfect as possible. It was then suggested that instead of sending it to a Committee then we might have a day set for a discussion of the Bill in Committee of the whole House and that way elicit the opinions of members—particularly those representing outport constituencies—so that when the bill goes to a Select Committee it should go there with practically the instructions from this Committee, at least to some extent, as to the form the Bill should take. Now the present bill before the Committee is really a bill of one section, and that is providing a means by which the Governor-in-Council can ascertain whether a settlement or a number of settlements require to elect a Road Board. At present there is no way I take it of doing that except by the arbitrary fixing of a division.

I have already explained the principle of this bill, and it is not my intention to add anything further now to the remarks which I made on its second reading; as I have already pointed out, this bill repeals the fourth section of the Act now on the statute book, as follows:—"The Governor-in-Council may from time to time by proclamation prescribe sectional divisions in this Colony to which this Act shall apply, and shall by such proclamation define such limits and boundaries of each sectional division, which sectional division is in this Act described as a section," and the following substituted therefor:

(4) The Governor-in-Council may upon petition signed by a majority of the duly qualified electors of any town or settlement having within a radius of three miles not less than One

Hundred electors, from time to time, by proclamation prescribe sectional divisions in this Colony, to which this Act shall apply; and shall by such proclamation define the limits and boundaries of each sectional division: which sectional divisions are in this Act described as a Section:

(a) For the purpose of determining the validity of the signatures to such petition, and the fact that the number of signatures constitutes a majority of the electors living in the town or settlement within the radius aforesaid, such petition shall before presentation to the Governor-in-Council be taken to the nearest Stipendiary Magistrate and be by him examined, and after examination, if the Magistrate is satisfied with the number of the signatures and the qualification of the persons so signing, he shall upon said petition certify such is the fact, and such certificate shall be conclusive evidence that the persons signing are qualified electors, and that the number constitutes a majority of the electors as aforesaid.

I trust that the deliberations of the Select Committee will result in a bill which will be found to be workable and remove the difficulties which surround us under our present system of expenditure of public moneys.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman. It is hardly to be expected that we can give mature criticism on the bill now before us at the present time. I feel bound to express my regret at what I consider a mistake, that this subject has not been brought down to more defined lines during the year, that has elapsed since the resolution was brought in here last year dealing with local affairs. However, I think it will be a much greater mistake for us to allow this present session to go by without some substantial effort be-

ing made on our part to reform in some measure the system by which is governed the local affairs of the colony. For I do not think that the present system is a system at all. I am surprised that it has worked along for so many years. It has been a subject of universal complaint. For the money expended, the returns have been small. There seems no sense of responsibility in those controlling, the expenditure, and I think that if a greater measure of local responsibility is adopted in the elective system, the results will be considerably better. There are several reasons making this imperative, one of the first of which is that if the people themselves in the localities affected by these local boards have control of their own affairs, they will take an interest in their affairs. This will totally annihilate the system of what are commonly called "family grants" Our system ought to be if possible so arranged that the management of local affairs should be entirely removed from political influence, by which I mean from being affected by the party politics then prevalent in the country.

I think these matters should be fully discussed in the House in order that the special committee which the Prime Minister is about to appoint should have the full benefit of our argument, which should develop the salient features and important details of the scheme, as I believe nothing else can, but the whole House, where we have the opinions of representatives from all over the country. We must at least evolve a measure which will be workable until a more lasting measure will be produced, and first of all I think we ought to adopt an election system whereby members of the Board should be elected by duly certified electors. As regards the ac-

tual working of this bill, I think it would considerably facilitate matters were the following method adopted; that there be two classes of settlements, large settlements and smaller settlements. If the smaller settlements so desire they can amalgamate with and come under the jurisdiction of the larger settlements. If they are not desirous of such co-operation they may be granted local boards or councils of their own. Now, of course a minimum size must be arrived at, and I would suggest that instead of a hundred electors as suggested in the Bill, that say, eighty electors might petition the Governor-in-Council, describing the area which they desire comprised under the jurisdiction of a Board and that, if that petition is signed by say 40% of the people in that area or district, the Governor-in-Council should issue a proclamation making that section an area; and if the petition is so signed it ought to be acted upon unless reasonable argument lies against it to the contrary. Take for instance the case of one large settlement with several smaller settlements under its proposed jurisdiction. In that case I do not think the petition ought to be acted upon unless signed by say fifty per cent of the electors of the smaller area.

Then of course we have the difficulty of deciding the manner in which the election will take place. In default of proper machinery for this I would suggest, that a meeting of electors, of which due notice should have been given, should be arranged. This meeting should be presided over by a Justice of the Peace, or some person in authority. The candidates will then be elected in the usual way. It would be desirable that as far as possible these elections should be held at the same time, or on the same day all over the country ev-

ery second year, say in the month of January, so that the elective council will come into existence on the first of February or thereabouts. This Mr. Chairman deals with what might be termed the larger settlements. This system might be found feasible throughout the country. I have not however had much opportunity of thinking these things out at great length.

A variety of matters of course will come under the jurisdiction of this Board such as questions in connection with roads and Marine affairs in their respective district; I think also that questions relating to the keeping of dogs, should be placed under local control. Then, of course, there are other questions which we discussed last year here, such as the question of special grants and so forth, main line and others. These are subjects which would have to be considered in connection with each locality individually, for you will have to be acquainted with the conditions prevalent there before anything definite can be decided upon. Of course the question of special grants is different. These are intended to provide for special needs which arise during the year in every locality. Cases of exceptional necessity involving the allocation of extra money may be considered in the same way, but in any case, when the money is allotted, the responsibility of all disbursements should devolve on the shoulders of the representatives of each locality. In Saint John's of course it is different, and I need not go into that. I merely offer these as suggestions, and my mind is open to argument on both sides. Many matters relative to the working out of the machinery relative to these affairs will have to be decided upon later. The Act of 1898 which was, I think, introduced by Mr. Morine

solves many technical difficulties and likewise the later bills brought in by the Prime Minister will I think throw light on these questions. I have no fixed opinion on these matters and my mind is open on the whole subject, and I merely state the ideas I have evolved from general knowledge and the discussions on these points that I have had lately with various people for the purpose of getting such information and opinions as may assist me in the perusal of this bill. I am confident of this one thing that no fixed or everlasting form of local government can be settled during this present session. It is a matter that ought to be taken up seriously by the members interested during recess but I would suggest that this elective system be adopted as far as possible as soon as can be conveniently done. The total elimination of parties and politics will be the first step necessary for success and the results which are expected to accrue from its adoption, and then Mr. Speaker, I believe that we will at last begin to realize satisfactory returns for the time and money that these matters have involved, and immediate attention will be able to be given to the very unsatisfactory state of affairs prevalent at the present time.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that no further attempt to proceed with this Bill ought to be made during this present session, for I am convinced that it is a subject demanding the special attention of all members whom this bill immediately concerns, attention which will demand the time afforded by recess. I am confident that if this bill is adopted we shall obtain much better returns for our money, than we ever can under prevailing conditions which are, of course, as all are well

aware most imperfect and unsatisfactory.

The law relating to the Government of local affairs is one of the most extensive and difficult that has ever engaged the legislature of other countries and, I think, it is a subject that will have to be dealt with most thoroughly to have the effect desired. A full and general measure of local government will first have to be elaborated, outlining the respective requirements of the various localities, all on an elective basis. I think the time has arrived when these matters should be fully and comprehensively dealt with because the population of the country is growing and business is on the increase to such an extent that the present system is totally inadequate. This elective system, if carried out on politically impartial lines ought to bring in very much better returns for the money spent, and would in every way be more beneficial for those concerned. We cannot prevent the present deficits now, and indeed, I am afraid that it is almost certain to increase, if present conditions continue much longer, and it is only adopting a saving system efficiently, that we can curtail our internal expenditures. Our present source of revenue, the customs duties, cannot long be sufficient to meet our constantly increasing public expenditure. It is certain that our system of government of local affairs must be placed in the hands of the people themselves.

You must remember that about the most expensive way to raise money for public expenditure is by increasing customs duties because the merchant who pays customs duties expects a profit on the money he so expends and for every dollar he pays in such a way the consumer will pay a dollar and a half. It would be much better that he should pay the dollar

to some local institution which he controls himself. The money he will pay will be less and the return will be far greater.

Another reason why I would expect great benefit to accrue to this colony from local incorporation is this, You have only to look around this House and perhaps more particularly on this side of the House and you will find a class of men who are well fitted to control our affairs. I look upon municipal incorporation as a means of education in every sense of the word. If we had country, town or village councils the natural adaptability in the people to public affairs would show itself. We have in this House at present and more particularly on this side example of the stamp of men who would undertake this work. They would get to know the value of public money. They would not over expend a dollar of it. There is no country in which it is not apparent that municipal incorporation is the best stroke in the direction of education that has been attempted for many years.

I wish to say as I have said many times before that I am an avowed confederate. I am strongly in favor of the confederation of this country with Canada, but I can say that the greatest safeguard that you who disbelieve in confederation can have against it is Municipal Incorporation, because by incorporating the country you give people control of their own affairs. You control expenditure of public money and take the very best steps to safeguard yourselves against confederation. So that I am offering this to you despite my own convictions upon another question.

Now, Sir, the difficulties which the Prime Minister talked about to-day are there in some measure, but not nearly in so great a measure as he thinks. If it were not that the meas-

ure is so difficult it would not be worth our consideration. I know of nothing that is worth getting for which we have not to work. You cannot change the whole fundamental fabric of a country, you cannot incorporate a whole island without putting your shoulder to the wheel for once and making an effort, but it is better that that effort should be made for something large and tangible than for something small and unsatisfactory. If you pass this amendment you leave it with the Governor-in-Council to define the areas. How can he do it without sending a surveyor round the country? You have got to get a survey to lay down the villages and settlements and towns. You have got to get a survey to define the limits of the roads of each town. Then you have to determine what powers they shall exercise. What control they shall have of main roads, the question of poor relief. I find that the Municipal act of Ontario, which has been copied in Manitoba, and British Columbia, covers 250 pages all of which were found necessary in order to cover the large field and convey the necessary powers upon every kind of body. When you get into the Act you may be able to cut some of it out, but very little because as my friend Mr. Kent has said there are many powers which you will have to convey. But when you come to look at the Act you will find that it covers all the powers which you need here. For instance in this act you have provisions for the incorporation of counties, districts, cities, towns, villages, townships, and rural districts; all in the same act, all by the same machinery and it is a question of local choice whether they will become a town or village and so on. In Bonavista for example they would have a town Council. The town would be divided up into wards and

each ward would elect its representative and in that way you would get over the necessity of people having to travel a long way to cast a vote. In the case of a rural community each settlement would elect its own representative and these representatives would meet at some central point and form a rural Council—town like Hr. Grace and Carbonear would have a town council. Small villages would have a village council. A number of small places would have a rural council and every little town elect its own representative. In this way you would get clear of all your difficulties. When we see how important a matter this is it is quite apparent that we should not deal with it in a slipshod fashion. Look at some of the powers conferred by this Act. They have power over the erection of buildings, powers to make regulations about public health, power over traffic, dogs, telephones, statute labour, street lighting, tree planting, public parks, all of these are covered by a Municipal Council in a general act and we should cover the same things. Then the act goes on to provide for the division up of places, how to make wards, who may vote. This act has been introduced in nearly all the provinces of Canada and has been found workable and to great advantage. It takes a lot of small trivial matters from this House and takes away the political and partisan aspect from the matters. It would relieve a number of our institutions and give local control to the people. I will give you an instance. In Toronto they have put up a hospital at a cost of \$4,000,000. Toronto city contributed \$1,000,000 as its share and yet anyone who goes into that hospital has to be paid for either by himself or by the city that sends him there with the result that the hospital has only cases that are necessary to be treated there, and at

the same time it gets a revenue. Now, what is taking place here. It is one of the scandals of the country. We have a good hospital, but everyday it is costing more and it has now about reached almost all the cost it can bear and there is a demand for more. What has happened is this that whereas a few years ago the people were afraid to go to the hospital to-day everyone in the country desires to go there. The result is that people are coming into the hospital from the outports who can afford to pay and do not. I have seen striking cases in my own knowledge where people who could afford it have paid nothing because no one else did; what is going to be the next development? Outport doctors who have a tedious case will send it in to the hospital so as to avoid the trouble that it would give them. I have seen chronic cases taking up beds in the hospital while forty or fifty patients outside are provided with boarding houses waiting to get in. They cannot be put out of doors and they ought not to be occupying beds, that perhaps 20 emergency cases might require to occupy, people who are sent to the hospital because they have bad health and require to be built up. The result is that the cost is constantly increasing and the purpose for which it is in existence is being destroyed. And, I say to-day that there is only one cure for that and that is the incorporation of your constituencies in the country and make each corporation responsible financially for every case that comes from that town and everyone who comes from that town must get a certificate from the proper officer that he cannot afford to pay, and if he cannot pay then the town becomes responsible. To-day everyone is sent along because it is the rule, but if the local community had to pay for every case that went

to the hospital they would be extremely careful whom they sent along. Besides it would engender a proper spirit of British pride. The family pride would make people look after their relatives. You have an open house. Everyone comes—and why not? If everyone comes why should anyone pay if no one else is paying. You cannot draw the line as to who shall or who shall not pay. If you make the incorporation liable the neighbours would enquire into every case. It would be a proper fillip to local pride and the hospital would be relieved of the cost. What is true of the hospital is true of the poor asylum and the lunatic asylum. If you incorporate local committees there would be many cases now not receiving relief that would be attended to and many cases that ought not to be attended to, but which now are, would not be under our government institutions because of local knowledge.

Wherever we look we see the same thing. The cure for it is local incorporation all round the country. There is not an inch of it that is not capable of governing itself if it is given the opportunity. That opportunity can be given by one general measure which will provide for every contingency. That measure will have to be drawn up by statesmen and lawyers with the advice of practical men. It cannot be drawn up by this House or a select committee or anything in that way. It must be a commission sitting out of session taking time to do it and doing it right. You have from now until next session in which to perfect it. Give this country all over a certain measure of control. Give control to them that will pay for it. Representation and taxation go together, but when you tax and spend it as you do, it is no wonder that local affairs are going to the dogs.

MR. CURRIE—This matter has come before the Committee that there might be a full discussion on it before being sent to a Select Committee, and as it primarily interests the Outports it is well that representatives of Outport constituencies should have something to say on it. I have already voiced my opinion regarding elective boards, and while I agree with the principal that the people should have a voice in the selection of those who are to superintend the upkeep of their roads, etc., I am not prepared to admit that the Elective Boards are going to be the panacea for all our ills. Criticism will not be stopped, grumbling will not end and there will not be complete satisfaction everywhere, for my experience of the past year is that the elective board comes in for as much criticism as the appointed one. There are people who are never satisfied and these are the ones who are always creating the trouble. Now, sir, in the district of Burin we have several elective boards, at St. Lawrence, Lawn, Grand Bank, and generally speaking they are giving satisfaction. In these places it was easy to apply the elective system, as the people are compact, living within a small area. There are other places where we will find it very difficult to work out the contemplated Act. Burin is one of those. Hon. members might not be aware that the section of the country known as Burin comprises thirty-two small settlements, only five of which, according to the census, have a population of over 200 inhabitants. At the present time this section is governed by two Councils and a Board and while there may be grievances against individual members there is no fault found with the system, which I believe was inaugurated by my predecessor, Mr. Gear. To apply the elective system to Burin would mean that entirely new

areas would have to be defined and that where there are now three Boards we should have possibly ten, increasing the work of division and also lessening the amounts, that would go to the roads, for there would be ten chairmen drawing commissions, of five per cent. I think probably that before the bill finally passes we shall have to ask for exemption of these Councils from the bill until there is time to define proper areas for the boards. There is one matter that will require attention in the new bill and that is a provision for re-election. The act now on the statute book provides for an election every two years, but there is no machinery governing it. The Act does not say whether the Board are to resign at that date for a new election, or whether the Magistrate has the power to call the election or whether it must be done at the request of the people by petition, or whether it is a matter for the Governor-in-Council. In other words there is nothing to say who is to take the initiative. We have boards in our district that have been elected for four or five years and it is really a question as to whether or no their acts now are legal. There is one thing that recommends the new idea and that is it should remove a good deal of the responsibility regarding matters from the shoulders of the representatives, and I am sure there is not an hon. member in this House but would be glad to be relieved of that.

I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine. He has been dealing with ideals. One would view with some satisfaction the establishment of incorporated communities all over the Colony, wherein the people would control entirely their own local affairs. There is one great obstacle to such a condition of affairs, it would mean that

the people would have to tax themselves directly and largely to cover all their needs, and I fear our people would not appreciate that. The value of direct taxation is one it would take them some time to learn. There can be no doubt that the more the people realize their responsibility the better will be the community in which they live; and the best way to drive home responsibility is through taxation. I think here is to be found one of the troubles with St. John's, one of the reasons why conditions municipally are not better than they are. For nobody can say we are taxed here, certainly not so that we feel it. The collector comes around once or twice a year and we pay our one, two or three dollars, as the case might be, and then we forget all about it. If our rates were heavier we might be more inclined to take more interest in what becomes of them; see that we get proper returns for them. The hon. member for Bonavista has suggested that the bill be held over for another year, so the greater consideration might be given it and so that provision could be made for larger powers for incorporated communities. Personally I should like to see that done, though I have no doubt that the matter will receive every consideration from the Select Committee. I note, Mr. Chairman, that the District of St. John's is to be exempt from the operations of the bill, and I must confess I do not see why that should be. Why should not the people of the outport sections of St. John's districts come within the privilege of the bill. I know that at present the work is being done by inspectors and well done, but that is no reason for the distinction. I wish we had inspectors for every district—it would be a good investment for the Colony. That this is a matter affecting the outport constituencies is my only

reason, Mr. Chairman, for delaying the Committee with these few observations.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker: I would just like to add one remark, but I might have been misunderstood. I did not mean that if these suggestions made by me were adopted and such councils appointed that they would have to raise the money necessary for their works; they would have their share of the monies appropriated for such purposes, and if they felt that they needed more, they could get it by taxing their own people.

MR. CURRIE—That is exactly the position as I understood it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I think that the position as regards this motion has been accentuated by the way in which the members have handled it. Last year the hon. members of that side of the House expressed as their opinion that these matters could be remedied, and the evils overcome by suitable legislation. A great deal of discussion took place upon that question, and the Government undertook, if it was found at all possible, to hold during the interval between this and last session, an enquiry, and to introduce some measure as was asked for on that occasion. Accordingly the Department of Public Works was asked to make the necessary enquiries during the past summer, and to solicit such information as in their opinion would be beneficial for this purpose. Accordingly, the necessary circulars were sent around to the Magistrates and Justices of the Peace. From the Secretary's report it appears that utter indifference marked the attention given to this, and few answered at all. Out of the 36 representatives who sit in this House only one took the trouble to reply. I take it that those who did not reply, did not because they had not the required information.

MR. KENT—I got no such circular.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I was merely referring to the report as the Secretary has given it.

MR. KENT—I received no such circular.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Then they must have been sent to the outport members; but one out of the thirty replied. In reference to the allocation of monies to these, I think it has been pointed out that it would be absolutely impossible in certain sections for such to be done, and certain things would have to be done in this respect. In Canada these councils also have to allocate the Educational monies.

MR. MORINE—These councils have nothing to do with Educational allocations; they would only have to look after monies for their own works.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

This country is entirely different from Canada. There they have nothing to do with marine grants. Here the local councils would want control of the marine grants. Then again the various districts are different, and would want different grants proportionately from the rest. This distinction is great and would have to be reckoned with very cautiously. My only reason for rising was to call attention to this bill during this stage. I can speak for the Government when I say that they are most desirous of correcting the ideas of some people and assuring them that it is their desire to improve this system as much as possible, for the distribution of district monies is the greatest curse here. We would soon remedy it if we could. I hope that the words of my hon. friend, Mr. Morine, will be remembered, and acted upon, because I agree with him in his remarks about the Hospital. We all look not only with interest, but with pride, at the

General Hospital which we have to-day. Great and critical work is daily being done there. There was a time when people wanted to avoid the hospital, and would not go there; but to-day all this is changed, and everyone, rich and poor alike, are desirous of getting in there and await their turn. As yet there has been no discrimination, and everyone can go and come as he wishes. I hope that this condition of things will be remedied ere long. The staff there is of the highest order, yet the Government are called upon to pay for those who are well able to pay for their own treatment. I do not think that it is in any way because of the moral standard of the people, but just that no charges have been made. So popular has the Hospital become that Mr. Whiteway, a very capable official and a better one could be found nowhere, is always at his wits' end to know where to place the many cases that come in from the outports by every train. Although doctors are told not to send their patients along, nevertheless they come in, and fill up every place that Mr. Whiteway has at his disposal for them. That things are in such a state as this is simply deplorable. It seems that there can be no moral tone to our people at all. That they are willing to be pauperized to such an extent is certainly pitiful in the extreme.

With regard to the other institutions the same conditions exist. This is notably so in the Lunatic Asylum. Here there are many cases which ought to be kept by their relatives. There are many there who are well worth keeping, but they are not kept because they can be kept at the Asylum free.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that as this is an important matter, the Government would be willing to have it referred to a Select Committee and so left till next year, for they

realize that in matters like these it is of the utmost importance that the wishes of the people should be carried into effect.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman: I would just like to make one or two remarks to correct some of the statements made by the Colonial Secretary. The method of dealing with Educational monies in Canada is this: The school boards meet and make estimates as to the amount of money they will need to carry on their work. They then notify the councils of the amount of money required. The government is then asked to and does vote the required amount. That is the council's share of the educational work.

The great benefit of these local councils is that they can do what they like with their own money. They receive their portion from the Government and spend it as they think best. For example: If a council were appointed for King's Cove, and a wharf had just been built there, it would be the duty of that board to take over and look after that wharf and keep it in good condition. They can do this much better when they have the power to do so without petitioning the Government first.

The poor grant should also be handed over to these councils. Although there is a very capable and excellent officer at St. John's, yet a poor officer should know every district under his grant. These monies ought to be handed over to these councils, each council getting a certain amount per capita of the population. Having their own money in their own hands for distribution the councils would be very likely to expend as little as they could help, and would probably do what they could to save it from unnecessary expenditure.

I will just read for the benefit of the members a few of the headings from this volume, the control of which

are vested in these local councils. They are these: "Dogs at large and taxes on dogs"—a petition dealing with this question was presented to this House this afternoon from Twillingate. With this system this question would be handled by the Twillingate local council. "Children running loosely around the streets"; "Cruelty to Animals," regulations about erecting houses, fences, etc., wooden structures, snow fences, protection of trees, etc. There are many things which are now handled by the Legislature which ought to be handled by these councils. These people, living at the places where the trouble is, know how to remedy it best, and they could do it with less than half the trouble that is taken to set right such trivial matters as are sometimes settled in St. John's. These are just a few of the things that would fall upon the shoulders of such councils when these councils belong to the smaller districts. For larger districts, such as Hr. Grace and Placentia, many extra powers would be given. In such districts provision would be possible for railway work, electric light and other such like things not needed so much in the smaller places. Only this afternoon Mr. Coaker asked questions as to the possibility of installing electric lighting plants at Botwood and other places. This would then be a matter for the local councils to deal with, acting under a general bill which would have been passed. Another thing these councils would have control of is the care of cemeteries. In many cases these are under the management of the various churches; such would be also under the direction of the local council. Some time ago, while at Channel, I noticed an old cemetery there. There was a monument erected to some person, and that was situated in the midst of a neglected cemetery. There were no fences around the place and old graves were

exposed to view. This deplorable condition of affairs would be soon remedied if a local council had the necessary authority to act at will. After 10 years of such town government I think the change would be very manifest, and would result in great benefit to the whole country.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I may say that I am very much interested in this matter. The plan as suggested by Mr. Morine is in my opinion a very good one, and I am sure would eliminate many of the difficulties which confront the Government to-day. If we could only get this system working satisfactorily, and then adopt some other such system to look after the fishery out in our outports, I think, Sir, that the country would soon be in a prosperous condition. What we want, Sir, is to grasp the possibilities of this system, and to take hold of this subject with all our might and secure the benefits which we have been told are possible.

Now, I do not think that any man will advocate the present system of Road Boards. This question was thoroughly discussed last year. I don't agree with the Hon. Colonial Secretary that the members of this House are indifferent about this question. Very few got these enquiries from the Board of Works Department, and there are members who could not give the information asked for. For myself, I let the matter stand over for the Catalina Convention, and fully intended to have them looked into, but when this came off, there was so much work of the highest importance to be done that they were overlooked and crowded out. But there is a great interest being taken in these matters in the outports. In the northern districts I believe that seven-eighths of the people are strongly in favour of a change. Now, I would be quite satisfied that this matter should go to a sub-committee of the

House sitting out of session for consideration and the elaboration of some plan on the lines suggested here this afternoon, if something were done in the meantime to enable those places who wished to spend their money under an elective Road Board to have the right to do so. Last year resolutions were passed through the House, and we were led to believe that we were to have elective Road Boards wherever the people desired to have them; but I am sorry to say that it has been very difficult to get those boards elected because of the regulations laid down by the Government during the past year. Many places have been most anxious to have elective boards, but have found it impossible; and the reasons, many of them, are political. Political supporters of the party on the other side of the House who have been running the affairs of the districts that the Union now represent, felt that their friends ought to have some say with regard to what was going on; and the friends themselves were very interested, no doubt, and used their influence as much as possible to try and keep the old system in force so as to enable them to have a say with regard to how money should be expended. Now, we know of a lot of instances of that, but we thought the matter too trivial to bother the Governmen about. We do not want to be continually chasing the Government in connection with matters of this sort, and we permitted them to pass in the hope that at this session something would be done to adjust the whole matter and end the trouble. Now, if the Government will take our recommendations in relation to our own districts, I see no harm in letting things go on for another year, and let the sub-committee see if they cannot elaborate some machinery that will be acceptable to the whole people. But certainly something might be done so that those places

who wish to spend their moneys under elective road boards might have that right.

Now, there is a great deal to be said in favour of elective road boards. Money has been foolishly expended in the past through commissioners and through the road boards as appointed by the Government from time to time. We had an instance last year of the case at a little place near Lamaline. Lamaline Council of the F.P.U. thought that something was wrong with regard to some grant; returns were asked for, the matter was investigated, and it was found that there was something wrong—that the Chairman of the Board did do wrong. He was brought before the Court and was punished. He was fined \$20, and was given three months in which to pay it. Subsequently the fine was refunded. Now, that is not fair, and it is not any encouragement to go on and try to make things right. I don't want to see a man put in prison for six months for a wrong that does not deserve that punishment, but at the same time I think that when persons do wrong they should be punished, and some encouragement should be given to those who are trying to correct things that are wrong. Of course, what happened was that the thing was made a political matter. The Government sustained the man and took the matter up against him. Now, these things should not be, and it is time to put an end to them. If the hon. member for Burin thinks that elective road boards are not satisfactory, if he thinks that the old system suits his district best, why let him have the old system; let every member, under the present circumstances, have the system which he thinks will best suit his own district; but in our districts, north, we certainly do want road boards elected by the people. The hon. member for Burin, Mr. Currie, stated that he thought that elec-

tive road boards in his district did not give any great satisfaction. Well, in Bonavista Bay I don't think there are half a dozen boards that are not elected by the people. This system was inaugurated three or four years ago by our predecessors, Mr. Blandford and Mr. Morison, who were always strong advocates of elective road boards. The people were given full power, and the result is that things are running as smoothly down there as in any part of the country, and there is no trouble. The Boards were elected in a very simple way. A meeting was called, presided over by the Chairman of the old Board or some other man of repute, and four or five men were elected; their names were sent on here and gazetted, and the whole matter was at an end. Every sum of money that is being expended is known to the public and there does not seem any chance whatever of covering up any wrongdoing.

I don't agree with Mr. Currie when he says that elective road boards do not produce the best talent. The elective boards that we have in the north, I am very glad to say, have secured the very best men available in the different places, and the very best men have been glad to come forward and do the work.

Now, in relation to the suggestion of Mr. Morine with regard to the powers that might be given these boards, I notice in some of our larger settlements that there is a growing desire for outport hospitals. This, of course, is a matter which is surrounded with a great many difficulties. The people of Twillingate at the present time desire to have a hospital, and they don't know how to go to work to get it. They don't want a hospital put there by government money, and they don't want one put there by charity. They have been discussing this matter for a number of years, but they don't seem at the present time

to know just how to move or what to do. If we had a board with power to regulate such things as outport hospitals, it would be a great advantage to some of those larger towns. Some persons do not wish to send their friends, or their wives or their children here for treatment. A person needing treatment at Twillingate, for instance, has to be shipped on the steamer to Lewisporte, and from there on to St. John's, and then put in an ambulance and taken to the hospital. And even then, in pressing cases, patients obtain admittance into the hospital, and they have to be attended to by local doctors. There is a great need of central hospitals in places like Twillingate. The people realize it but they don't know how to go to work out ways and means to meet an expenditure of perhaps four or five thousand dollars a year. But the question should be faced. It has got to be faced in the future. The people are not going to put up with the conditions as they have existed in the past. They want to have control of matters of this sort. Then again take regulations dealing with the question of dogs and matters of that sort. We had a petition the other day signed by nearly 600 persons, asking for alterations in the dog law. Well, that is too frivolous a matter to bring before the Legislature; it merely means a loss of valuable time; but there ought to be some local board which would have power to deal with such a thing as that.

Now, if you are going to appoint a sub-committee of the lower House to draft a bill that may be presented here at another session, let that committee be representative of all parties in the House. Don't make it a partizan matter; don't mix up politics with it; we are just as desirous of having this matter adjusted as the Liberals; the Liberals are just as de-

sirous as you are; and you are probably just as desirous as we are; so let us get down to business and see whether all the talent in the house co-operating cannot produce something that will give satisfaction.

Now, the matter of the Hospital Commission has been brought up. I am not going to say very much about that, but I will say this. That commission has been sitting for twelve months, and it ought to be able to give information about hospital affairs. Up to the present time I have not seen any report. It seems to be taking a very long time to get together a report on such a small thing as the domestic affairs of the Hospital. If the Government had taken the suggestion which I made here last year when the matter came up, the trouble would have ended in 24 hours. All that is necessary is to say to the Superintendent: You are boss of this concern, and all the others are subordinates and must obey you; and you end the whole matter. The trouble is caused by the fact that there are three or four bosses to run one institution and there is constant friction. What you want is one man in charge. So far as the report of the Commissioners is concerned, I do not suppose that the publication of it will do any harm to the institution. That is the institution will not suffer, but public confidence in the institution will be shaken. When people find out the little foolish things that are going on down there, lots of them will think that it is hardly the place to send people for serious treatment. As I said before, the remedy is to put one man in charge and let the others understand that they have got to obey him, and then you will have no further trouble at the hospital.

Now, coming back to the matter of Local Affairs, if the Premier could see

his way to according to our request that something be done now to meet the wishes of any community who may desire to have an elective road board, then we are satisfied that this whole matter should go to a sub-committee, and some Bill be drafted and brought in here next session.

MR. CURRIE.—Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down apparently misunderstood the remarks made by me. He states that I said that elective Road Boards were not doing any good. I did not say that. I said that they were not any improvement, in my opinion, on the old boards. He also said that I stated that elective Road Boards do not secure the best talent. I said that they did not always secure the best people. I qualified both statements. He must have misunderstood me.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the discussion now before the House, and I propose to say a word or two. When we were discussing this matter here last year I pointed out some of the grievances connected with the old system, at any rate in the district of Twillingate. I believe a conscientious effort was made on the part of the Government to try and remedy those conditions, seeing that early last summer I received a circular from the Department of Public Works, with some forms enclosed which I was asked to fill in. This meant dividing up the district into sections, and a number of other things which I cannot remember just now. However, I replied to the Department saying that it was impossible for me, with the knowledge which I had of the district, to do this without a copy of the census and a chart. It may be about two months or so afterwards that I received from the Department a copy of the census and I procured a chart, and during the winter I set to work to try as far as lay in my power to meet

the wishes of the Department. They sent me 19 forms. I used up the 19—really I wanted 50. I don't know whether my work satisfied the Department or not. I sent it on through the mail, but I received no intimation at all as to whether they got it or not. However, I think I conscientiously tried to meet their wishes in that respect.

The difficulty in the district of Twillingate is that there are so many little settlements, and lots of those are divided by water making it impossible to group them, because they would find it impossible to send a representative either to take part in an election in some centre or to act under any board that might be elected; but there are a number of large settlements that it would be quite possible, I think, to bring under the measures that were set out in those forms.

Now, I think the two principal grievances brought before the House last year respecting road management were: First, that road boards should be made elective, and in that way responsible to the people who elected them; the second, and perhaps the chief grievance was that those boards should have the expenditure of all public moneys which were sent to the locality over which they had jurisdiction. The evils which had arisen and which came under my notice, came particularly from those special grants which were sent to private individuals, who managed them just as they pleased, and generally to the dissatisfaction of the locality to which they were sent. This is, in fact, the great grievance, and I think that any measure which would meet those conditions and remedy that evil should receive our support. I don't suppose we are going to get perfection at the start; there will probably be mistakes, but I have read somewhere that those who never make mistakes never make

anything. Now, I hope, as Mr. Coaker said a little while ago, that some effort will be made to deal with this matter pending the consideration of the more elaborate Act to meet those other conditions which the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, has referred to. In Twillingate, which is one of the largest sections of the country—Twillingate Island, north and south—the people have always managed their road affairs under one Board. I don't remember exactly the population of Twillingate Island, but it would be between three and four thousand, I think. They have 14 members on their board, and the money that comes under their control is managed alright. Now, I have grown up in the district. I have had practical experience both in making roads and in acting on road boards, and I believe I know as much about the conditions in that respect in Twillingate district as a commission could find out in ten years—I don't see why I should not because I have lived there for fifty years—and those little matters that I have just mentioned are the great grievances at the present time. I think that something should be done towards dealing with those now and satisfying the people in that respect, and the more elaborate measures referred to might be dealt with later on.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to accord my support to the principle of the bill that has been introduced this afternoon. I might state, Sir, that in listening to the remarks which have been thrown out by all the hon. members who have spoken on this matter I have acquired a great deal of information that I think is very valuable and well worth consideration. I listened with interest to what the Hon. the Colonial Secretary had to say with regard to deploring the low tone of our people as regards their responsibilities. Now,

I think one of the causes of that is the fact that we have upon our shoulders their responsibilities; they know that, and they have no interest whatever in taking a more healthy view of their affairs than they are doing at the present time.

Reference has been made to the hospital as an illustration to show how our citizens look upon the Government and its work. We have men who come here from the outports, and men living in the town itself, who look upon the hospital merely as a place for recuperating their health, and when they leave the institution they expect—even men of means—that the Government will pay their carriage fare home, or, in the cases of outport men, to the train and their train fare to the place where they reside. This is simply because we have allowed this condition of things to prevail, and until we make the people shoulder their own responsibilities we cannot expect any improvement in that direction.

Last year the Government agreed to permit the various districts to elect their own Road Boards. The district of Port de Grave has availed of that privilege very largely, in fact out of 13 boards that are in operation there at present ten have been elected. The interest that has been taken by the people in that matter has been very marked. In most of the settlements a majority of the qualified electors took part in the election; in fact in some of the places fully seventy-five per cent. of the voters went to the meetings in order to take part in the choice of members for their boards, and as high as 25 candidates were nominated at some of these meetings. This shows the great interest that the people are taking in this matter at the present time. These elective boards have been found to be a marked improvement on the old system, because the members understand that they have been elected by the people, that

they have to do faithful work, that they have to properly expend the moneys that come under their control, and that they are responsible to the people that have elected them. The consequence has been that for nearly every cent of money that has been sent out to that district returns have been sent in. There are only one or two cases in which returns for allocations have not been sent in, and that was due to the fact that because of the nature of the work it could not be done in the short time that the people had at their disposal. Now, Sir, I merely want to point this out in order to show that if the people are given an opportunity to take an interest in their affairs the greater part of them will avail of it.

Mr. Morine in discussing this question this afternoon referred to our present method of taxation. He stated that we cannot go along as we are doing now. We are constantly piling up the debt of the country and increasing taxation. By putting local boards, such as those to which reference has been made, in charge of district affairs, you will allow the people of the various localities to raise the money themselves for any improvements which they may desire. That is, if they want improvements which will cost more than the amount which will be sent them from the general revenue of the country, they will have to raise the extra amount themselves, if they want to carry on the work. That will relieve the revenue and it will also cut down somewhat the present system of collecting taxation. As has been pointed out, the present system deals most unfairly in the distribution of the taxes. What I mean by that, Sir, is this: That our present system of collecting the taxes of the country bears more heavily upon the poor man than upon the rich man. If a man is getting an income of \$10,000 a year and is only spending \$7,000 he

is not paying as much into the revenue in proportion as the man who is receiving \$600 a year and is spending the whole of it. In other words, if the sum which goes into the revenue represents 30 per cent. of the amount expended, the man who is earning \$600 a year pays 30% of his entire income, while the man who is earning \$10,000 a year and is only spending \$7,000, only pays 30% of \$7,000; and on that basis the wealthier man is not contributing the same proportion towards the upkeep of the state as the poor man.

While, Sir, I don't pretend to have the knowledge which is necessary in order to give a complete idea of what could be done towards great improvement in the conduct of the affairs of the various districts by these boards, yet from the experience and knowledge which I have gained from what has been done by these elective road boards during the past year, I believe that if you give the people the responsibility of managing their own local affairs that they will take a healthier view of things than they are doing at the present time. It is well known to members of this House that in the general elections in this country, local affairs have more to do with deciding an election in the various districts than the general issues of the country have, and I think this could be remedied if a policy such as that under discussion were adopted and the people were given charge of their own affairs.

MR. COAKER.—I ask that this bill be deferred and that it be put before a select committee.

MR. JENNINGS.—I suggest that this bill be deferred until Monday next.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and recom-

mended that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, and that the Committee have leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the following Select Committee be appointed:—Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Mr. Kent, Mr. Piccott, Mr. LeFevre, Mr. Currie, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Jennings, Mr. Stone, Mr. Grimes.

LOGGING BILL.

On motion a Select Committee was appointed to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the employment of men engaged in Logging," as follows:—Mr. Coaker, Mr. Morine, Mr. Jennings, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Piccott, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Moulton.

PETITION OF RIGHT BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Mr. Kent, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting Proceedings against the Crown by Petition of Right" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PENITENTIARY ENQUIRY.

Mr. Coaker gave notice that on to-morrow he would move the following Resolution:—

Resolved,—That a Special Committee of five members of this House be appointed to enquire into and consider the condition and management of the Penitentiary with special reference to recent complaints made in the House, and report thereon within ten days to this House.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, April 19th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 19th, 1915.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Winterton in the District of Trinity, asking for the appointment of a local constable and a sub Collector at that place. They are quite a distance from a sub Collector and I do not think they are treated fairly. The petition points out that they have to travel twelve miles to get to the constable or Magistrate. There are about a thousand inhabitants in Winterton and I trust that the Government will accede to the request of this petition. I ask that it be referred to the proper Department.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Island Cove in the District of Fogo, asking that Island Cove be made a port of call either for the S.S. Clyde or the S.S. Fogota. These steamers pass in halting distance of Island Cove, and still the inhabitants if they want to do any business with the outside world have to travel nine miles to Fogo. It is a great hardship they have to undergo by not having a steamer to call. To show that it can be done, in the fall of 1913, preceding the General Election, the S.S. Clyde called at Island Harbor. It goes to prove that if she could make connections then without any inconvenience it should be continued. These people have no Doctor and in case of accident they have to go to Fogo. The sick person may be in such a condition that his or her life may be lost by not having a steamer calling there at that time. Then in the fall of the year and in the spring a great many people in that place have to go elsewhere to seek employment, and they have to take their luggage and travel to Fogo. I trust that the Government will accede to this petition and that the reasonableness of the request will be seen and that they will have the Clyde or Fogota call at this place.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Badgers Quay and Safe Hr. asking that the S.S. Dundee call at the public wharf at Valleyfield. I understand that the Fogota calls at this wharf and it would be a great convenience to the people, if the Reid boat did the same.

MR. WINSOR.—I beg to support the prayer of the petition and to endorse the remarks made by my colleague, Mr. Morine.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I also beg to support the prayer of the petition. I am well acquainted with the place in question and can appreciate the difficulties under which the people labour, owing to the Dundee not going alongside of the wharf. Every rock in the vicinity is buoyed and there is a light in position which removes any difficulties for navigation. I see no reason why the Dundee should not call at the wharf as well as the Fogota.

MR. PARSONS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Riverhead, Harbor Grace, asking for the sum of one hundred dollars to be expended upon a road at that place. I beg to move that the petition be referred to the Department of Public Works and I trust that later on, when the moneys are being allocated, the Department will favourably consider the prayer of this petition.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to support the prayer of this petition.

MR. STONE.—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Trinity and Port Rexton, asking that the settlement of Crouche on the French Shore be made a port of call for the coastal boat. This petition is largely and influentially signed and sets out the fact that a large number of fishermen from Conception Bay, Trinity Bay and Notre Dame Bay, vis-

it that place during the spring and summer seasons. Even if the coastal boat only called at that place once a month, the people would be greatly benefitted. I trust the Government will give this matter their earnest consideration.

MR. CLAPP.—I beg to support the prayer of the petition.

MR. JENNINGS.—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. I know that a large number of fishermen go to that harbour to fish and suffer great inconvenience owing to the steamer not calling there.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—A number of fishermen around Conception Bay fish in that locality and they would be greatly inconvenienced if this settlement was made a port of call as asked for in this petition. These people are very often obliged to remain there until late in the autumn and sometimes experience great difficulty in conveying themselves and their belongings to a port of call of the coastal boat. If the wishes of the petitioners were acceded to those difficulties would be removed. The fishermen referred to would be greatly benefitted if the steamer only called at Crouche alternately, either going or returning.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Petty Hr. and the Goulds on the subject of the prohibition of the setting of trawls on that part of the coast between Long Point and Heart's Point. I will now read the petition which explains itself. (Here hon. member reads petition). The petitioners understand that a petition signed by the inhabitants of Bay Bulls has been forwarded asking that the setting of trawls be allowed along that section of the coast. The petitioners belong to Petty Harbor and the Goulds, are hook and line

men and they protest against trawls being used between the two points I have named on the ground that they will be seriously interfered with in the pursuit of their fishery avocations. I suggest that this petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to support the prayer of this petition.

REPORTS TABLED.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS tabled Report of the Auditor General on the Revenue and Appropriation Accounts for the fiscal year ending June the 30th, 1914—also Report of Auditor General under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, 1899, for the period ending February 28th, 1915.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the following Reports and Returns of the Department of Agriculture and Mines for the year 1913-14, viz.:—

1. Report of the Department of Agriculture and Mines.
2. Report of First Surveyor.
3. Report of Second Surveyor.
4. Report of Chief Woods Ranger.
5. Report of Timber Inspector.
6. Return of Crown Land Grants issued.
7. Return of Timber Licenses issued.
8. Return of Mining Licenses issued.
9. Return of 99-year Mining Licenses issued.
10. Return of Fee Simple Mining Grants issued.
11. Return of Water Power Leases issued.
12. Return of Leases of Quarries issued.

QUESTIONS.

MR. JENNINGS gave notice of question.

MR. STONE gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

MR. WINSOR gave notice of question.

MR. COAKER gave notice of question.

MR. MORINE gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copies of the returns of all local grants and special grants, spent in Victoria Village, Carbonear, during the years 1913 and 1914.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—This is in course of preparation.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of all local road grants for Bay Roberts for 1914; also a copy of the returns of the main line grants for Harbor Grace District for 1914.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—This is in course of preparation.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. the Premier to state whether one Charlie McCarthy, of Carbonear, is now receiving a salary from the Government; if so, for what services is he being paid, what amount is he paid, and how long has he been receiving a salary.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—When Mr. McCarthy was appointed to this position in 1909 he received a salary of \$20.00 which has since increased to \$30.00. He is a tidewaiter.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the cost of the public wharf at Cape Broyle.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—This is in course of preparation.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House (a) copies of all correspondence asking for changes of mail couriers in Bonavista District, 1914;

(b) how many applications were received. (c) names of applicants; (d) how many new appointments were made; (e) who recommended the appointments; (f) and names of places where changes were made.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The answer is in course of preparation.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, before we proceed may I ask when the Minister intends to commence Supply?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—To-morrow.

MR. MORINE.—In reference to that Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest that in view of the extraordinary financial conditions and other circumstances this year, we should make a slight departure from the usual course of proceedings, and that before we go into supply the Minister should give, if not his Budget Speech, at least such a general financial statement of the affairs of the Colony as he is in a position to give without anticipating his Budget, so that before we proceed with the Estimates we may have some idea as to what the financial outlook is and to what deficit is in prospect. I do not think it right that we should now proceed to vote large amounts of money until we have had an opportunity of considering where we are and where the money is to come from. I make the suggestion in view of the extraordinary circumstances which exist at the present time.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Bonavista, I may say that I think he will find the Estimates which we shall bring down, will be entirely satisfactory, and I do not think there is any reason to depart from the usual practice in this matter.

SEAL FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Com-

mittee of the Whole to consider the Bill "An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: with regard to the Sealing Bill now before the House, there are some changes in some of the clauses which we would like to make. The first section, which provides that the men be sent only a certain distance from the ship, we consider utterly impracticable, for it is impossible for anyone to fix the distance which men may travel from the ship on the ice. We would therefore ask that this clause be erased from the Bill when it goes into Committee.

The second clause, which provides that the right of property in panned seals shall cease after twenty-four hours, that for each ten seals there shall be a flag, and that upon each pole shall be marked the date and hour of killing, it will be absolutely impossible to carry out at the seal fishery. It is useless to expect men to mark upon the pole the day and hour of the killing of the seals. The Catalina Convention decided to ask the Government to pass a bill dealing with the right of property in panned seals and their wish is that the right of property should cease after 6 o'clock on the morning following the day of killing. If such a provision as this were made we believe that seven-eighths of the trouble incurred through men being exposed on the ice would be done away with. If this bill is submitted to a Select Committee, as has been proposed, I trust we shall be able to induce this Committee to insert a provision to this effect.

As to the men not leaving the ship before an hour before sunrise and arriving on board the ship within an hour after sunset, we believe that this

is a step in the right direction, and we hope it will be possible to carry out such a provision. The only thing to do is to test the possibilities, and if the regulation meets a need, it can be continued. I do not think the men themselves could have any objection to such a provision in the Bill.

We must object to any restrictions being placed on the taking on board of panned seals at any hour during the night. If we were to debar the ships from loading seals from the ice after sunset, it would spell ruination to the voyage. We must permit the ships to take on board all the seals they possibly can during the night.

To the clause providing sails for the wooden ships we have no objection. The sails can do no good, neither can they do any harm. They should not be depended on to accomplish much, for, as a rule, sails are so seldom used that they are not to be relied upon in case the engine does give out.

One clause of the Bill provides that the Mate or Captain shall be a certificated man. This section we consider rather severe, as many of the best sealing captains have been almost illiterate and have known nothing whatever about the rules of navigation. I quite agree with the suggestion that there should be a certified man on board, holding either a Master's or Mate's certificate, but it should not be compulsory that such a man be Master or Mate on board of the sealing steamer.

The F. P. U. at Catalina Convention decided to ask for a Board of Examiners to examine all officers in charge of sealing steamers, the Board to consist of three experienced Sealing Captains, so that before a sealer could be appointed to the position of Second Hand or Master Watch, it would be necessary for him

to secure a certificate of competency from this Examining Board. This we consider essential, in view of the excuses made in connection with the Newfoundland Disaster last year, as it has been thought that some of the officers in charge of the men at that time were not as competent as they might have been. I do not think the Committee could object to this proposal as its only object is to place competent officers in charge of the men while they are on the ice, and the only means of judging their competence is by examination.

With regard to the clause resulting from the Sealing Commission's Report, providing a thousand dollars compensation for the loss of life from exposure or through injuries sustained by exposure on the ice, I would say that this clause fully covers the recommendations made at the Catalina Convention of the F. P. U., and we give it our hearty support. By the enactment of this clause, you will find that in the future Captains will be much more careful of their men, and will value their lives more than they have done in the past. When the Captains realise that for each man who dies on the icefloes, or who is injured through exposure, the owner of the ship will have to pay a thousand dollars, they will think twice before they send the men on journeys entailing a large amount of risk. If the right of property in seals is done away with, as has already been suggested, it will mean that the men will not be sent so far away from their ships to pan seals. Consequently the incidental risks of storms and blizzards overtaking the men will be avoided, and the danger to life diminished.

Respecting the food on board the sealing steamers, it has been found that one pound of bread three times a week is not sufficient. It is desir-

able that the law be amended to provide one pound per day. There are some ships which now provide that amount, and on the larger ships it is quite possible to supply that quantity. There should be no reason why the men should not be supplied with sufficient soft bread for their use. With regard to fresh beef, we hoped to have the law amended to insure the serving of fresh meat on Sundays. The law at present states that it shall be served once a week. From the experiences of this Spring, we find that this law was not carried out in every case, and that in some cases, even canned meat was not served once a week. This treatment is not good enough and unless a remedy is applied by the owners and an effort is made to live up to the law, some stringent regulations will have to be inserted in the Sealing Act.

The clause put out of last year's Sealing Bill by the Upper House, which provided that the wooden ships could return to port and land a portion of their crew by the 10th of April, will have to be inserted in the new Bill this year as present conditions cannot be permitted to continue. Under the clause to which I refer the Captains would have the right to take the crew in two parts, one portion for the long voyage and one portion for the short voyage, and the men would sign accordingly. Then if the young seals were missed, the Captain would be able to make for a port and discharge the short voyage men, while those shipped for the long voyage would continue. The long voyage men would then know that they had shipped for the long voyage, and if any trouble ensued, they could be punished for refusing duty. It would be advisable for the younger men to ship for the longer voyage as they would be able to remain out,

while the family men, if they missed the seals in March, would require to get home as soon as possible to prepare for the season's cod fishery. Had this clause not been cut out by the Upper House last year, some of the trouble which has existed on board of the wooden ships during the past two Springs would have been avoided. Unless some arrangement of this sort is made, the same trouble will occur from year to year until, eventually, there will be a riot and probably loss of life on board of these ships. My chief desire in this matter is to prevent strikes and unpleasantness on board of the ships which miss the young fat, and the intention of the clause cut out of last year's Bill by the Upper House was solely to that end. I very much regret the action of that Body in interfering in a matter which it was neither qualified nor competent to understand. We had given much consideration to this clause, and had discussed it at several of our Annual Conventions, and the outcome of our deliberations was formulated in that section which provided that steamers be allowed to come to port to land a portion of the crew on April 10th.

I trust, therefore, that when this Bill is considered by a Select Committee, the ousted clause of last year's Bill will be again inserted, and that the Upper House will this time be able to see eye to eye with this Chamber in this connection.

We object to the Government's procedure in arresting the six sealers of the Terra Nova's crew on the charge of refusing to perform duty. We consider that these men have been badly treated. There is no reason why six men should suffer for the doings of one hundred. The Government ought to have seen that these men were tried here in St. John's, and have offered them an opportunity to be de-

fended by Counsel. The Government should not have permitted the Captain or the owners of the ship to proceed against these men at Channel. They were sentenced to two week's imprisonment, a punishment which they have to endure on behalf of all the strikers in the wooden ships this spring, the object in punishing them being to have an effect in the future upon all strikers in wooden ships. We only want them to get fair play and that they are entitled to, and it is the Government's place to see that they receive it. We do not intend to excuse or defend any sealers who do wrong, but we believe that they were justified in refusing to prosecute the seal fishery in pursuit of old seals under the circumstances which prevailed this Spring, and under the conditions which existed on board the Terra Nova. They were only sentenced for two weeks, and it was fortunate for the Government that the term was not longer, for had it been longer, huge petitions would have been presented to this House asking for their release.

With regard to the disasters of last year, it is a sad reflection upon Justice to say that 78 lives can be lost without anyone being held responsible. As well as the 78 lives lost, there were 21 or 22 maimed for life, and yet, so far as the Government is concerned, there is no one to blame. It has been shown that these men were taken on board after travelling five or six hours on the ice to the "Stephano." They were then put on the icefloe in the face of a brewing storm, and no further effort was made to ascertain whether they had reached the ship or not. They were misled by the information given them by the Captain of the "Stephano," when they were leaving that ship, with regard to the course which they had come from their own ship. The course

which he advised they travelled, and it took them a mile and a half or two miles out of the proper course, and that much farther away from their ship. It is a strange thing how Captain Kean, after he had put the men on the ice on that occasion to be followed by a tremendous blizzard, could satisfy himself that they were out of harm's way, and had reached their ship in the face of such a storm. He does not seem to have worried very much about them during that night. How a man in his position or under those circumstances could have contented himself that night by believing that the men had reached their ship, is what I cannot understand. With his vast experience as a sealing captain, it is still harder to understand how he could justify himself in the belief that these men had reached their ship. I am satisfied to believe that on the evening of the blizzard Captain Kean must have been insane, for had he possessed his ordinary faculties, he could not have arrived at the conclusion that these men were absolutely safe on board their ship. He did not even heed the murmurings and complaints among his own crew.

The F. P. U. had been more than justified in keeping up this agitation in connection with this Disaster for the last twelve months. The demand made for the punishment of Captain Kean has been endorsed by a large proportion of our population. The 10,000 who signed the petition asking for Capt. Kean's arrest knew full well what they were doing. They knew that they would be marked men in so far as securing sealing berths in the future was concerned. They knew that their names would appear in the paper. They knew that the business men with whom they had dealings would not agree with their action, and they knew that the business interest wanted Kean to go to the

ice. Yet, with all these facts staring them in the face, they voluntarily came forward and signed the petitions demanding that the Government should arrest Kean, charge him with the crime of man-slaughter, and prevent him from any longer sailing to the ice as a sealing captain. This petition asking for Captain Kean's arrest was the spontaneous feeling of the Spaniard's Bay Convention, and was not a premeditated action. That Convention believed that Capt. Kean deserved to be punished, although they knew that the Government had made up their minds to permit him to escape that punishment. We believed that the only way to draw the public attention to the Government's intention to defy justice in Kean's case was to sign petitions and send them to the Governor, thereby doing all that legally remained for the people to do in the matter. I often wonder how it was that the men did not commit some overt act. That peace was secure and unbroken is a matter for which the Government can take to itself no credit. They did nothing whatever to preserve the peace and they did nothing to carry out or comply with the wishes of the people. On the contrary, they did all in their power to defy the people's wishes. They disregarded entirely the actions of the friends of the men who had lost their lives and of those who had been maimed for life. I hope we shall never experience a similar occurrence in this country.

As far as I am concerned, I have no personal enmity against Captain Kean. My opposition to him is based solely upon the fact that he was chiefly to blame for the loss of these men, and that being so, that he should be punished in order to impress upon all sealing masters the necessity of taking every safeguard and doing all in their power, under similar circum-

stances, to protect the lives of the men under their care. The Government and Captain Kean defied the people's wishes this Spring, and Kean went to the ice in spite of the protest of 10,000 electors. It now looks as if he did the very best thing after all to secure his own reputation as a sealing captain. Had he been kept ashore, his friends would have said that the failure of the seal fishery was occasioned by that action, and that if Kean had been permitted to sail as master of the "Florizel" he would have led the ships into the seals. This being so, the people would have claimed that the action of the F. P. U. in keeping Kean ashore resulted in a failure of the seal fishery. He went, and got as near to the land as he possibly could, and there he spent his Spring. His ship, being the leading one, was followed by the others, and they were all caught like mice in a trap. The result was that they secured in all 20,000 seals. Capt. Kean's going to the icefields as Captain of the "Florizel" was the very best thing that could have happened for the F. P. U., for he himself has accomplished this Spring what could not have been accomplished in twenty years by an F. P. U. agitation, as far as showing what knowledge he possesses as a sealing captain is concerned. To the ordinary man it would appear that what the F. P. U. does not succeed in accomplishing is accomplished for us by Providence. To me personally, it would not make any difference whether Kean went to the ice for fifty years as a sealing master, or whether he never went. I have a duty to perform and whether it is pleasing or displeasing to Capt. Kean or anyone else, it has to be performed.

The Bill before us provides for a Board of Examiners consisting of three sealing captains. I presume the

Government will appoint Capt. Kean as one of those examiners. I believe him fully capable of performing such a duty, and I trust that two other equally capable men will be selected with him to form the Board.

The report of one of the Commissioners who investigated the Sealing Disaster claimed that Captain Kean was innocent of any wrong-doing, and that the loss of 78 men, and the maiming of 21 others was an act of God. That Commissioner had made up his mind to defend Kean's conduct from the very first, and so he regarded very lightly the loss of the 78 men and the manner in which they were sent to their death on the evening of the 31st of March, 1914. That same Judge last year sent up to this House a Bill to be passed which would punish anyone who ill-treated a cat or a dog. That Bill became law, and today if I were to be found striking a dog or a cat with a stick, I would be open to a fine or imprisonment for three months. Yet, this same Judge knew that these men had been enticed on board the "Stephano," had been received as guests, and then were placed on the icefloe in a blizzard to die, there being no possibility of their ever reaching their own ship. In view of these facts, it would appear that this Judge has a great deal more consideration for a cat or a dog than he had for the lives of those hundred men who were so treated by the Captain of the "Stephano." That Judge did not certainly do justice to his feelings or to his conscience when he decided that Kean was blameless. When he is dying, he may confess by what method he arrived at the conclusion that Abraham Kean was guilty of no wrong in connection with the Newfoundland disaster. If he expects to get to Heaven he will certainly have to make a full confession or there will be no hope for him.

We therefore expect some day to hear how Judge Johnson arrived at the conclusion that the loss of life in connection with the 'Newfoundland' Disaster was simply and solely an Act of God.

When this Bill comes before a Special Committee, we shall endeavour to place before that Committee our wishes with regard to any amendments thereto, in order to make sure that the men who prosecute the seal-fishery are safeguarded in every way that it is possible for the legislators of this Colony to safe guard them.

MR. HIGGINS.—The hon. member ought to admit that his bill of last year was discussed very fully and exhaustively and passed by this Chamber, and now that the Government have decided that such a bill is necessary, and have brought it in, it certainly ought to have the unprejudiced support of that gentleman.

I do not know or for a moment admit that anyone of our captains in the past was so grossly negligent of his duties as now to be any more careful of his men because of this fine of \$1,000; but he should admit that if this disaster were the divine work of Providence, no legislation we could pass here would stop it from happening. I am tempted to say this because, like the great war-lord of Europe, our friend on the Opposition seems to have some understanding between himself as President of the Union and Providence by which the Union is to accomplish its work.

I think frankly that the hon. member on the other side of this House will admit, that whatever happened to his bill after it passed from this Chamber, while here it received the attention such a measure demanded, and this Chamber did its part.

I do not think that it is right that the country or the people should be told through the medium of the press

or by any hon. member of this House that a conspiracy had been entered into by the Government and the Commissioners. Nothing can justify his saying that. Accidents have happened in the past under other captains than Capt. Kean, and are always possible. It is because they are always likely to happen that I in common with all other Newfoundlanders am always prepared to vote for anything that can in any way lessen the dangers of this industry. But another aspect of the question is that in making these laws, by some error of judgment, by doing much in the way of tying up this industry, greater injury may accrue than will be averted. The cure may be worse than the disease.

Now with regard to shipping men on for two different seasons, I would just like to suggest that you cannot compel a captain to ship on men for a limited season only. The captain may want and usually does want his full time out, and may not take kindly to coming back to land part of his crew. In my opinion the captains would immediately object, and not without some reason. There is a lot to be said in regard to the wisdom of having these sections in the bill, but we must remember that they are the result of an extraordinary occurrence, and whatever sections are adopted must be suitable for dealing with ordinary conditions as they will be in the future, not as they have happened to be in a particular case of the past.

References have been made to the food, and the manner in which it is served. There will be found here ideas respecting this; for myself, I may say I desire that every improvement possible should be made and carried into effect; and I readily acquiesce in any such movement and will give it my hearty support.

There is just one other thing I would

like to point out, and that is found in Section 5. This section was placed in this bill through the suggestion of the Commissioners who investigated the sealing disasters, and was recommended by them. The hon. member said that these would be good only under ordinary weather conditions; well, Mr. Chairman, while personally I cannot say whether the suggestions are valuable or not, yet sir, if these are good in normal times, these are the times they are wanted for. Preparations cannot be made for abnormal times, unless specific knowledge is had of such; and these cannot generally be foreseen.

I would say finally, that in my opinion this bill ought to command discussion without undue reference to that sad happening of last year, for when we come to think about it we find that such cases of error of judgment or whatever they may be have nothing to do with this House but are matters for the Courts. No legislation can deal with them; they are purely matters of law. As far as these petitions against Capt. Kean go, the hon. member knows that with his tremendous influence he can easily get 10,000 signatories to a petition on anything. Why as far as a petition is concerned he could have us all arrested tomorrow; he can easily get the necessary number of names. But I do think, that now, while honestly considering this Bill, he ought to confine himself to it, without considering where the recommendations came from; as long as they are for the benefit of the fishermen, and the good of the country. I say these few words because last year the hon. member advocated such a bill as this, without knowing as much as he does now of the circumstances. Last year I knew nearly as much as he did about the seal fishery, but since then he has had the benefit of a spring's experience at that fishery, and I think

he might use this knowledge judiciously for the benefit of this bill.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to take exception to one of the remarks made by the last speaker, Mr. Higgins. The remark was made in reference to the manner in which the members of the Union signed the Kean petitions. As far as the district of Twillingate is concerned, and as far as it was connected with the petitions mentioned, I may say that before signing any petition, these men want to be convinced in their own minds that there are reasons to justify their demands. The hon. member is very far astray if he means what he has said in reference to these petitions. I may say, Sir, that the people had made up their minds long before these petitions were planned, as to rights and wrongs of this disaster, and that they signed the petitions only after having read over carefully the report of the evidence as given at the first enquiry and having made up their minds, neither the president of the F.P.U. nor any other person could make them change their convictions.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a remark or two in reply to what the hon. member for St. John's East has said. I did not think that this debate would take the turn it has, but of course the Sealing Disaster has been of such importance that it has occupied the minds of the people of this Colony from the 31st of March last to the present time. In regard to what has been done to keep the Captain of the "Stephano" from going to the ice this spring, I may say, that like my friend Mr. Jennings, I have no intention of expressing my opinions. It was not done at the request of one man, but of many men. We know that disasters have happened in the past and we know that losses have occurred, but an error of judgment on the

part of any man always leads that man into trouble. Whether the captain is responsible for an accident or not, the general result is that that man loses his commission.

You look into Europe today, and what do you see? If it is the misfortune of any officer there to lose a regiment there by an error of judgment, what is the result. Does he still command men? No Sir. You find that that officer is suspended and loses his stripes. This is what the men wanted who signed these petitions against the Captain of the "Stephano." They thought that a man who had had the misfortune to lose such a body of men as were lost last year should be suspended. I do not even say that it was his fault; it was certainly his misfortune. In either case he certainly ought to have been kept ashore, and this is what the fishermen of the country asked for and signed petitions for.

Now, with regard to this bill. We hold that if the clause to which Mr. Coaker referred, and which this House had passed and sent up to the Upper House, had been accepted, I do not believe that there would be the trouble that we have today at Channel on board of the "Terra Nova." That clause was inserted by those who had a knowledge of the facts as the result of years of practical experience in dealing with men who prosecute the voyage. We think, Sir, that if men won't sign for a full voyage that there should be nothing to compel a captain to sign them on. If a man won't go for the full voyage, let him stay home, and let his place be taken by those who will stay out.

If they had signed this agreement it would have been no good for them to strike, but with the conditions which they sign under now the matter is left entirely in the hands of the men, and the only way they can carry out

their wishes is to strike. There must be some such clause inserted before there can be a satisfactory settlement.

I would just like to say a word about what Mr. Higgins said about the F. P. U. petitions.

These were signed by the fishermen because they meant it, and they believe that the Captain of the "Stephano" ought not to have gone to the ice, and if he had been kept back at their request, there would have been no further trouble.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the different speakers and their remarks about this bill, and what happened last year. As far as that is concerned I would just point out to the members that as far as the disaster is concerned, they have the report of the commissioners, embodied in this bill. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this bill be referred to a select committee. There are quite a number of things here printed that I am sure are not worth the time that was spent in setting the type and printing them. A select committee could sift out such clauses as these without delaying the House unduly.

I think that such a bill concerning as it does the people should be very carefully prepared, because while a bill cannot be made perfect at once, yet it is our desire to have that bill as perfect as it is possible to have it. Every bill must be continually amended to make it suitable to varying conditions. You take up the British Merchant Shipping Act. Every year they are amending this act, and they have not got it perfect yet; and every session they are making certain alterations, due to the advancing of shipping, and interfering in clauses that would be applicable to the difficulties that arise today upon the sea. Why today we

have 25 knot steamers crossing the Atlantic; we have 75 knot airships patrolling our lines in Europe. Conditions have changed and are changing. Our great grandfathers went to the seal fishery in 20 ton boats. Our grandfathers went there in brigantines. Our fathers went out and secured large catches in barques, and we of the present day go out in steel dreadnoughts.

I believe as occasions are changing that in the near future aeroplanes and Zeppelins will go to the seal fishery before the ships and locate the seals for the rest, as they are in Europe to-day locating the enemy. Not only that but perhaps the submarine will be utilized to go in under the water and come up through the holes in the ice. We cannot, Mr. Chairman, tell what the future has in store for us. I would recommend, Mr. Chairman, that this bill be referred to a select committee, and I think that when they have considered it and return the revised bill to this House, the hon. members will pass it willingly with smiling countenances.

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 recommended that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee for further consideration and report.

SELECT COMMITTEE

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that a Select Committee be appointed as follows:—Minister of Marine & Fisheries, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Young, Mr. Jennings and Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister.

LABRADOR FISH BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Marine the House resolved itself into Committee of the whole to con-

sider the bill "An Act Relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador Coast."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman: I move as an amendment to the first line of that section (section 5) "within two months," instead of "one month." And it has been suggested to me by a member of the Upper House, a Merchant, that even with the two months proviso it might be advisable to add a clause to this effect:

Provided that upon sufficient reasons appearing for believing that delay in fixing the said price is desirable in the public interest, the Board, or a majority thereof, may, by order postpone the fixing thereof beyond the said two months, but not later than the first day of October then ensuing.

The suggestion made to me was that the conditions of the markets might be such as to make it advisable in the interests of everybody concerned to delay in fixing the price beyond the two months, and that it should be left to the discretion of the Board to postpone the time for, say, thirty days. It seems to me, on the whole, that there can be no objection, and if the Committee is satisfied I will move that clause.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: I think that the time for fixing the price is when the first ship is being shipped from the Labrador. Some years a cargo or two goes off very early in September, and it is sold and a price realized; other years no cargoes go until late in September. Last year, I think, the first cargo left Labrador on the 17th September. It was sold for \$4.00. I think that is the best time to fix the price—when the first cargo is shipped.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman:

With regard to the amendment suggested by the hon. member in charge of the bill for extending the time by one month, I don't think there would be any harm in that. Last year the price of fish was fixed here in town at \$3.68. If the price had not been fixed until the 1st September, it certainly would have been \$4.00. As long as the Board is acting in the interests of all concerned, I see no objection to their postponing their decision until the 1st October, if that course is thought necessary. They should not be compelled to fix the price on the 1st August if they have reason to think that there is a good chance of things brightening up a little later; and the fishermen would feel satisfied, when the price was fixed, that it was not altogether the merchants' price but the value of the fish, and they would not hesitate to ship their fish for the price that was fixed. There are objections to fixing the price too early, as well as to fixing it too late. Supposing we laid down the rule here that the price was to be fixed within two months after the 1st July, and we were to get up against the same conditions as applied last year, we would find that we were making a mistake. The men down on the shore would say: We are going to sell our fish at the current price; and they would agree with the merchants to sell at that figure. The current price as fixed in August might be \$4.00, and by and by, in the month of September or October, they would find that the price would have gone up to \$4.20 or \$4.40, because in the meantime things would have brightened up in the markets. So that I don't see any harm in extending the time within which the Board has to make a decision. I quite agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the men ought to know the price when their fish is ready, but if you tell them; Now, boys, we are not going to fix the price now because later on

the markets may be looking better, and the conditions, which are now gloomy, may brighten up later on, and you may get 20c. or 40c. more a quintal for your fish, I don't think they will object.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.

I would not object to three or four months, but I think the history of the Labrador fishery is (and if you ask the merchants of Water Street to give you the information, they will tell you, I think, that what I am stating is correct) that seven times out of ten the first cargo of fish that goes from the Labrador gets the best price; and I think that if the time were based on the first cargo, and the price decided by that, the fishermen would get a better figure than they have been getting and they would be quite satisfied. I am quite satisfied with whatever the hon. member who is introducing this bill suggests; but at the same time, as a representative of the Harbour Grace fishermen, I could not let the matter pass without making these suggestions. These men go to the Labrador; they are put ashore down there; if the fish come where they are, they get their share; if it doesn't come, they have to remain there, and get home as best they can with very little; and these are the men—the Conception Bay fishermen—who are really going to benefit most by a price settled at the right time. The men who fish in their schooners, who can go from Blanc Sablon right down to Cape Chidley in their search for fish, it is their luck if they don't get it; but the poor men who are taken down in the spring, who bring down their wives and families and gear down there, and then after working and toiling all summer come home with nothing—those are the men you have got to look after and see that when they get the fish they get as good price for it as it is possible for them to get. That is the reason why

I suggest that as soon as the first vessel leaves the Labrador, this Board should meet and make their decision on the basis of the price that is paid for that cargo. If you wait until all the fish is shipped on board vessels, and some of it on its way across the water, I am afraid that the price is not as likely to be satisfactory to the fishermen.

MR. CURRIE.—Mr. Chairman: It occurs to me that probably the Bill is not going to reach the end which it has in view. It seems to me that if the Board is going to be of any use at all, it will have to sit every week—that is, if it is going to take care of the interests of both the merchants and the fishermen. Prices cannot be fixed at one period, to govern the whole season. Prices fluctuate with supply and demand.

MR. MORINE.—The hon. member for Burin misunderstands the object of the Bill. It is not intended to fix the price which has to apply between vendors and purchasers at all. It does not affect contracts. It is merely intended to meet the practice which has prevailed, I understand, for many years on the Labrador of fish being bought and sold upon a receipt which expresses that it is to be paid for at "the current price" when there is in fact no current price, and the real meaning is that it shall be paid for at the price which shall later on be settled by the merchants themselves. That is the position. Nine-tenths of the men who sell fish on the Labrador and have it shipped away have not the slightest idea of what they are going to get for it until late in the fall, when the buyers meet and announce what they are going to pay. The object of the bill, as I explained the other day, is not to prevent buyers and sellers from fixing a price which they state themselves, but is merely to provide for those cases where the parties fail to fix the price themselves.

and where the price was ultimately fixed by the buyers themselves without the sellers being in any way represented. Under this bill the price is fixed by representatives of both parties. If, should this bill pass, men want to deal in fish on the Labrador coast, and the buyer says: I will give you so much for it, and names the exact figure, as is done in other parts of the world, and the seller agrees to that figure, then that is alright. We don't desire to interfere in the making of contracts, at least not in any experimental bill. We merely want to meet the cases of buying in the dark, which takes place at present. That is as far as we desire to go this year. When we meet again, at another session of the House, it may be found necessary to change the bill somewhat.

With regard to the Minister's statements, I would point out that with this amendment the bill will not work out very differently from what he desires. If the Board is appointed on the 1st of July, it will take a few days to give notice, and they then have two months within which to fix the price. I presume they will be only too glad to do that, as nearly as possible, and so get the matter off their hands; but if they find, for good and sufficient reasons, as, for instance, the conditions of the markets, that it is desirable to postpone their decision, then they can do so for a certain number of days, but not in any case later than the 1st October. Then, if they don't perform their duty, an application can be made to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court must, within thirty days, make a ruling. That, however, is only a precaution, as in all probability we will never have a Board that will refuse to act in this matter. I am satisfied that the little amendment that has been proposed by the member of the Legislative Council will facilitate the

passage of the Bill, practically without further amendment, through the Upper House, and I think that is very important.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

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

SAWMILLS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Jennings the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill "An Act to Amend 4 George V., Cap. 17, entitled 'An Act Respecting the operation of Saw Mills.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

PETITION OF RIGHT BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Kent, the Bill "An Act Respecting Proceedings against the Crown by Petition of Right," was read a second time, and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

ESTATE DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in reference to the imposition of duties on the estates of deceased persons.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MIN. FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, in moving these resolutions, I beg to make some explanations. Last year, when this Estate Duties bill was before the House, it was gone through hurriedly, and there were some provisions that were not made in a satisfactory form. Now the object of the first section is to include in the estate of deceased persons, all property owned during their life time. All property disposed of as gifts at the time of death of the person. This means that if the property is disposed of within two years before the person's death on condition that this shall not operate until after a person's death, duties will be collected thereon; and any interest on this property may be included. Also that any person residing outside of this colony, and who is holding shares in a company in Newfoundland, shall pay duty, to the colony, on these shares.

MR. MORINE—I think that this Act was copied from Canadian Legislation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No, it was not.

MR. MORINE—It was not drawn up here. It is evident that this section is intended to apply only to a company in the colony. We are not going to make companies in Australia responsible for conforming with the laws in this colony. Then again it refers to the agent of a colony. Would you make an agent down on Water Street responsible for non-compliance with our law by a company in Canada? If you are dealing with companies in the colony, or if shares are held in the colony, then you can deal with them. But if both the company and the deceased were domiciled outside the colony, it would deprive you of

any right to deal with it. A company in this colony may be under our jurisdiction, but we cannot say that a company in Ontario shall also be under our jurisdiction. It seems to me that it puts the agents in Newfoundland of Companies outside the colony, in a very bad position.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations on the last point which has been under consideration. This section is a verbatim copy of that of the Death Duties Act framed in the Transvaal which is considered a model piece of legislation and specially recommended to this colony. There is no reason why a person, domiciled outside this colony should not pay duty. I want my learned friend to have that point made clear to him.

MR. MORINE—Surely the Premier does not mean to say that a man would have to pay duty in Newfoundland, who had property outside of the country and also who lived outside of the country? You are imposing duties upon companies that are not within our jurisdiction. How can we enforce it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—This act was prepared by the solicitor of the House, who has followed verbatim the provisions of the Transvaal Act. This Act was passed in 1909 and was assented to on the 7th of July in that year.

MR. LLOYD—The point is this, that if the interest is within the colony, then the duty should be paid.

MR. MORINE—If you put in an interpretation clause you make sense of it. The Transvaal Act says "Company" shall mean "A Company incorporated in this Country." If you put in an interpretation clause like that in the Bill it would make sense; at present there is no sense in it.

MR. LLOYD—I would suggest that

the Committee rise so that we can give this Bill further consideration.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

PENITENTIARY ENQUIRY.

Pursuant to order, Mr. Coaker moved the following resolutions:

RESOLVED—"That a special committee of five members of this House be appointed to enquire into, and consider the condition and management of the Penitentiary, with special reference to recent complaints made in this House, and report thereon within ten days to this House."

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, In view of the communication that has been read here from a prisoner it seems to us on this side of the House that matters in the Penitentiary ought to be investigated. If you hold an investigation in the way that investigations have been held during the past year it seems to take a matter of twelve months before you can find out what's wrong. If things are going wrong as pointed out in these letters steps should be taken to set them right and if it is not as represented it is an easy matter for a Committee of this House to come together and see what these conditions are. If they are wrong they should be made right, and the easiest way to investigate them is for some committee of this House to call some of the authorities, some of the prisoners and the Superintendent and find out what the conditions are. I do not think there is any necessity for an elaborate commission like we had in connection with the Hospital. A couple of days consideration by a few business men,

the asking of some questions and finding out exactly what the prisoners have to say and what the Superintendent has to say and we can find out whether these complaints are right or wrong without further delay. I think ten days ought to be ample time to work the examination, because if things are being done wrong down there the longer the investigation takes the longer will these conditions prevail, and if conditions prevail as pointed out by LeDrew who is just out of prison they ought to be set right at once.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the resolution.

The Resolution was agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

It was ordered that the following be the Committee—Mr. Kent, Mr. Lloyd, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Devereaux.

Mr. Morine gave notice of question.

MR. KENT—There are some questions I asked the Colonial Secretary and Minister of Public Works with reference to the Bell Island Council which have not yet been answered. I asked for returns from the Council of moneys spent since their appointment; also for correspondence etc. I would like to ask whether these returns have yet been secured.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Our clerks are getting them ready.

MR. KENT—I think the Minister informed me that these returns had not been sent in except a general statement. The Minister has already promised me that he would procure them immediately.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— I will get them right away.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— We have not got the returns, but we have written for them. The other information will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I asked the Premier to furnish me with the Inspector General's reply to Constable Cramm's report in December. I presume there is a reply to the report sent by the Constable.

RT HON. PREMIER—I do not think there was any reply. I sent you the answer to your question.

MR. COAKER—That had reference to the Gillingham case. I also asked for the Inspector General's reply to Constable's Cramm's Report.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will make enquiries. My impression is that they were waiting for some event to take further proceedings. There may be a reply that it may not be in the public interest to publish at present. I shall however make enquiries and if there is a reply that can be furnished I will obtain it.

The other orders of the day were deferred.

It was moved that when the House rises it adjourn until half past three of the clock on to-morrow, Tuesday, afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 20th, 1915

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

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the Public Accounts for year ending June 30th, 1914.

PETITIONS.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Flat Island, Bonavista Bay, asking that the mails be delivered there twice a week in winter as they have it in the summer time. The mail, I believe, goes a few miles distant and the expense of sending it in the winter would not be great; I beg leave to ask that the petition be re-

ceived and sent to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

MR. JENNINGS—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Comfort Cove, asking that this place be made a port of call for the Clyde. I think if it is not an unnecessary expense that the Clyde might call there in the summer months. They are cut off from any connection with the railway. I trust the matter will be given the fullest consideration.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support my hon. friend Mr. Jennings that Comfort Cove be made a port of call for the Clyde. The town has a population of 250, and it is an important centre. It is about 10 or 12 miles from this cove that the steamer calls. The Clyde has not got a great deal of work to do now that two steamers have been put on Green Bay. If this matter be taken up a schedule could be easily arranged satisfactory to the Company; very little is required to make it successful.

MR. CLIFT—I wish to support the petition that Comfort Cove be made a port of call; it is a very important centre, and I think necessary arrangements could be easily brought about.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The hon. member suggested that a schedule could be easily arranged in connection with this service; well it is the contractor who attends to the people's wishes in that connection, and if any arrangements can be arrived at I should be only too glad to do it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from inhabitants of Fox Head Cove, Change Islands, asking for two wells. This petition is signed by upwards of 44 men including some of the most prominent in the place. The petition as set forth is an appeal to the Govern-

ment. The public health is in danger. They have to use river water because there is no well in the place. I suppose they have not had the good fortune of getting in favour with the Government and getting a grant for a well. In certain districts they would not have to do this for a well, but it would be done by the Government beforehand.

I trust that the Government will take this matter into consideration because the health of the public is at stake. I ask that this be referred to the Department of Public Works.

Also another petition from Fox Head Cove asking for the same thing. As in Change Islands, the residents there have no good drinking water, what they have being contaminated because of drainage. This petition is signed by upwards of 30 residents of the place. I have much pleasure in presenting these petitions, and hope that they will have the earnest consideration of the Government.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present petitions from Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Within, asking for \$100 to repair the main line roads, between these two places, \$90 to repair it between Lockburn and St. Jones Within, and \$150 to repair it between Hatchet Cove and Hillview. These roads are now in a rocky and hilly condition, and being main roads are much used. The people have petitioned because they have not enough money from their grant to pay the necessary cost. I hope that the Government will give this petition its hearty consideration. I ask that this be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. TARGETT.—I have great pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Stone.

MR. WINSOR.—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Squid Tickle, with regard to telephone extension. I ask that this peti-

tion be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. ABBOTT.—I have great pleasure in supporting the petition just presented by my friend and colleague, Mr. Winsor.

MR. ABBOTT.—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Broad Cove, B.B., asking for the sum of \$100 to repair the bridge there with. It is signed by 75 electors. The bridge at present is in an impassable condition, and I hope the Government will see what can be done in this matter.

QUESTIONS

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I beg to table answer to question of hon. member for Port de Grave, and also an answer to member for District of Twillingate—Mr. Jennings.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to table information asked for by Mr. Kent. It is the correspondence between the Bell Island Local Council and the Government.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg leave Mr. Speaker, to table answers to the following questions: Mr. Targett's of April 19th, and Mr. Coaker's of April 14th, and Mr. Jennings of April 29th.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the following information: What amount was paid Mr. George Clark, of Springdale, Hall's Bay, for investigation and estimate of cost to build a bridge connecting Bawl Island (site of Light-house) with the shore, and what was the estimated cost as given by Mr. Clark.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—This has been tabled.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for copy of returns of expenditure of an allocation of \$200, made in 1913 to Edward Woolfrey, for the construction of a public wharf at Black Island in the District of Twillingate.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—This is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the number of new engines built by the Reid Newfoundland Co., under the Railway Contract of 1909, and to specify separately the cost paid to or asked by the Company for each engine; also a statement as to whether the Company has installed any, and, if so, what improved appurtenances, and, if so, what these appurtenances consist of and the cost of each.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary, in relation to Ramea and Burgeo Cable:—(1) Is the Burgeo-Ramea cable in operation now, if not working, how long since it failed, how long has it been working satisfactorily since it was laid; (2) are there any other cables of the Postal Telegraph out of working order, if so, how long have they been out of order, and what has been done or is now being done to put such cables in working order, and by whom is such work being done; (3) what disposition was made of the seventy miles of wire between Grand Lake and Southwest Arm of Green Bay when this line was abandoned; (4) how many miles of cable have the Government put in use for the Ramea-Burgeo cable to date to cover a distance of 12 geographical miles from landing to landing; (5) what is the total cost of cable used for the Ramea-Burgeo connection to date.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This is also being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to state if it is the intention of the Government to extend the telegraph wires from Gambo via Fredericton, Carmanville, and Ladle Cove to Musgrave Harbor, if the telegraph wire for making these

connections was sent to Carmanville in the summer of 1913, preceding the general election; if so, where is that wire now, and what reason has the Government for not carrying out their intentions to give the people of these localities the ordinary facilities to do their business and keep in touch with twentieth century civilization.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This has been tabled.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House copies of returns for all moneys allocated from his department to Japhet Winsor for the public wharf at Westeyville.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—This is being prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing what Customs receipts were paid at Glenwood from January 1st 1912, to March 31st, 1915; and, if any give dates when the same were received at St. John's.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—The answer is being prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement, showing (a) the amount paid out for relief from Oct. 1st, 1914, to March 31st last, in each electoral district; (b) the amount paid out by each relieving officer during the above period; (c) the amount paid by each officer as casual relief; (d) the amount paid as permanent relief; (e) the amounts paid from the Public Charities vote by Relieving Officers in each electoral district during the fiscal year 1908-9 to 1913-14 and the per capita cost for these years for each district.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This is a large answer and will take time to prepare. I have instructed the Department to get it ready.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Min-

ister of Finance to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement, with requisitions and vouchers, showing what monies were paid the Governor for travelling expenses from July 1st, 1914 to March 31st, 1915, out of the vote of \$4,000 granted by this House at last winter's session.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I beg to table this statement.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence in relation to the crew of the S.S. *Terre Nova*, recently landed in port at Port aux Basques, and for a statement of instructions, verbal or otherwise, given by or on behalf of the Minister of Justice to the Police in relation to the arrest of members of the crew.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In relation to that I may say that the only correspondence that took place was from the Department of Justice. I have to-day written for it, however, and hope to have it for the next sitting.

LABRADOR FISH BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Morine the Bill "An Act Relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador Coast" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Counsel with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply. Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.— Mr. Chairman, every member will find on his desk

a copy of the complete Estimates, which, as will be seen by the table on page 3, represent a total of \$3,963,536.37, to be voted by this House, for the fiscal year 1915-16 as against \$3,936,622.85 voted by this House last year. There are increases of \$27,756 in interest on Public Debt; \$2,751 in pensions; \$24,110 in Public Charities; a total of, say, \$84,800; while there are decreases of \$21,115 in Civil Government; \$2,015 in Administration of Justice; \$17,000 in Agriculture and Mines; \$2,000 in Marine and Fisheries; and \$11,253 in Roads and Bridges, a total decrease of \$53,400.

I propose to go through the Estimates and explain the changes, where such have been made; and to supply such information as seems to me essential to your securing a fair idea of why these alterations have occurred, and if any further particulars are desired, I shall be very glad to furnish them either now or at the next sitting.

On page 4 will be found a statement of the Public Debt and the interest thereon. The interest and charges we will require to vote at this session will amount to \$1,261,719.53. We have to provide in reference to the increased interest, payments on the Public Debt for a sum of, roundly, \$10,000 to raise the rate of interest on the two-million-dollar loan passed last year, from three and a half to four per cent. On the \$250,000 of local loan for extension of telephone system and for light-house extensions, etc., which was estimated at four per cent., we have to pay 5½ per cent., this making an increase of \$3,750. Then we raised a loan of \$360,000 for extension of telegraphs and for the building of light-houses and fog alarms, and the construction and improvement of public buildings. This was figured at 4 per cent., but 4½ had to be paid, making an increase of \$1,800 more. We have also raised a loan of a million dollars in England for the war, and got a

quarter of this from the Bank of Montreal, temporarily, at $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. On the whole, we estimate that we will have to pay \$40,000, so that, as stated, we will require \$1,261,719.53 in all, for the next fiscal year.

Turning now to the General Estimates, the first change will be found on page 7—an increase of \$100 to the Assistant Inspector of Lighthouses, Mr. Cornick, who is raised from \$300 to \$1,000; and \$100 to the stenographer in the same Department, who is advanced from \$300 to \$400.

On page 8 we cut out a vote of \$1,000 for Museum requirements, and \$500 for maps and advertising abroad. Further down, on the same page, we reduce the vote for travelling expenses and assistance under the Department of Public Works from \$2,000 to \$1,000.

On page 9, the vote for fuel and light for public buildings is increased from \$18,900 to \$21,750, making a total of \$2,850.

On page 9 also it will be seen that there is provision for caretaker for the departmental building at Harbour Grace at \$150; a fireman at \$135; requisites \$40, and clock attendance \$50; total \$375. There is also provision for the departmental building at Grand Falls, a keeper at \$350, and requisites at \$40; similarly at Bay Roberts, a keeper at \$400, and requisites \$40. In the Museum Building the salary of the fireman, Mr. Woods, is increased from \$420 to \$540, making a total increase under this head of \$1,335.

On page 9, again, we reduce the vote for repairs to public buildings from \$33,000 to \$10,000, thus cutting out \$23,000.

On page 10 there will be found a statement of the existing pension list. The decreases are Terence MacNamara, one-time keeper at the Lunatic Asylum, \$350; William Reeves, light-

keeper, Garnish, \$100; A. J. Crocker, sub-collector, Catalina, \$300; Edward Walsh, St. Lawrence, \$87; E. Dicka, lightkeeper, Boar Island, \$240; Mark Rowsell, lightkeeper, Cape John, \$240; Mooney, \$10. These deaths represent a total decrease of \$1,327, but there is an increase of \$4,058 for new pensions. New pensioners begin with Kate Ronan, attendant Departmental Building, \$80; John Barnes, warden, Lunatic Asylum, \$350; James Denief, Lunatic Asylum, \$400; Pat Houlihan, lightkeeper, St. Mary's, \$400; Thos. Ryan and Tim. Brien, of Agricultural Farm, \$500 and \$400; George A. Moulton, postmaster, Carbonear, \$500; George Lilly, Magistrate, Trinity, \$700; J. Elliott, lightkeeper, Change Islands, \$300; and Patrick Christopher, late mate S.S. Fiona, \$520. The total pensions for next year will, therefore, be \$22,617.31, against \$19,866.31 last year, an increase of, say, \$2,351.

Under the heading of Administration of Justice, on page 13, we reduce the travelling and other expenses of Circuit Court by \$1,500; the cleaning of offices, etc., and the cost of other attendants, coal, etc., by \$1,000, making a reduction of \$2,500.

On page 15, Constabulary, we decrease the total vote by \$1200.13. The vote for salaries is decreased \$70 owing to re-arrangements. As hon. members doubtless know, the constables are paid on a sliding scale, their wages increasing with their years of service. Some of the older men drop out and younger ones take their places. In annuities there is a reduction of, say, \$1,190. The Head Constables on the Active list are reduced to five by the retirement of Mr. Patten, of Twillingate, and he gets a pension at \$450, but five pensioners have died during the year—officers Corbett, at \$375; Grant, at \$342; Farrell, at \$342; March, at \$300; and

Winslow, at \$289, reducing the total for annuities by \$1,189.38.

On page 17, Fire Department, there is an increase in the vote for firemen's salaries of, say, \$1,050.00. Last year, it may be recalled, the Municipal Council offered an extra \$1,000 a year to enable the salaries of the firemen to be increased somewhat, and the sliding scale operative regarding the constables also applies to these men. For uniforms and accoutrements we add \$431.00 to provide them with new rubber coats and overcoats, the last supply having been given them five years ago. These are the only changes and the effect is to increase the total vote by, say, roundly, \$1,500.00.

On page 30, Lunatic Asylum, \$350 is provided for an extra male attendant, which is found very necessary; \$2,000 more is added to the vote for supplies and rations; \$400 to the vote for clothing; \$300 for incidentals and medicine, while for fuel and light there is \$1,000, making a total increase for the Lunatic Asylum of \$4,050.

For the General Hospital, same page, \$1,200 is provided for a house physician; \$180 as against \$150 for a kitchen helper, formerly a boy, but now a man; \$480 for a laundry foreman, previously paid out of maintenance; and \$180 more for firemen. The vote for rations has to be increased \$8000, from \$25,500 to \$33,500; that for medicines, wines, spirits, etc., is increased \$200; that for clothing and bedding, etc., \$100, and sundries \$150; and the fuel and light vote also has increased \$3,000, making a total increase of \$18,340 for that institution. I might say that the very large increase in the size of the Hospital and the new buildings that have been added and the improved equipment have all involved a steadily growing increase in the cost of this institution; and this has been specially noteworthy in regard to the heating and lighting.

The amount now provided for this purpose is only what has actually been spent for the past year or two, the vote being \$5,000, and the annual outlay some \$12,000, and the amount cannot be reduced, especially in view of the increased cost of coal of late years.

On page 31 we next turn to the Poor Asylum, where \$110 is provided to increase the pay of the male attendants, one being raised from \$350 to \$400, and the other from \$270 to \$320. The maintenance also calls for an addition of \$850 to the vote for rations; \$80 for clothing and bedding; and \$100 for sundries, etc., while fuel and light calls for \$300 more, making a total increase of \$1,440 for that institution.

The lazaretto at St. John's calls for \$150 more for maintenance and supplies; \$50.00 for medicines and disinfectants; and \$50 for clothing, a total increase of \$250, arising from the increased cost of requisites of late years.

We next turn to Agriculture and Mines, page 42, where we reduce the supplies for surveyors from \$8,000 to \$5,000, and strike out entirely the vote of \$15,000 for exploration of coal areas, thus reducing the total vote by \$17,000.

On page 43, Marine and Fisheries, we reduce the vote for dredging from \$15,000 to \$13,000, having found that only the latter amount was spent last year.

Under Roads and Bridges, page 47, we reduce the vote for main roads, bridges, engineering and inspection by \$10,000, and that for winter coastal roads and camps from \$3,000 to \$1,500, making a total reduction there of \$11,500, but there is an increase in ferries of \$247, which makes the net reductions \$11,253, the increase being due to alterations in ferries and new ferries being provided. I will not go into details of the ferry votes, but if

any hon. member desires such information, I shall be glad to furnish him with it.

On page 52 we deal with Postal and Telegraphs. Under General Post Office and Money Order Office, there is no increase in the total. Junior hands are replacing older men and \$150 deducted from the new clerk, now a boy, is distributed between the assistant secretary and the stenographer. In St. John's Post Office distribution branch, there is no change in the total, but owing to the death of Mr. Collins, three salaries are re-arranged.

On the next page will be found the votes for travelling post offices. There are now two additional junior clerks in the cross-country service; that is, there are now seven where there were only five, making two mail clerks on each train. All the juniors receive only \$400 each. In the case of Bonavista, too, one is a senior, and one a junior. On the Trepassey and Heart's Content branches, juniors only are provided for. As to trip allowances, twelve clerks receive \$3.25 per week each. Under Outport Postmasters, page 54, it will be seen that Bay Roberts is raised from \$240 to \$600. The town is now a cable centre, a new public building has been provided, the post office has been installed there, and an official appointed whose sole duty it is to deal with postal matters. At Bell Island, the assistant at the mine, a girl has been increased from \$160 to \$144. In some cases it will be seen, as members go through the following pages, that offices are increased by \$12.00. This occurs where the postmaster has also to attend to a telephone.

Carbonear has a re-distribution of salaries by which part of the former Postmaster's salary is divided among three officials. Ferryland gets an assistant at \$40.00, this being necessitated by the fact that Ferryland is now the crossing point for the Southern

Shore trains. Rose Blanche is increased from \$70 to \$140, owing to increased business as a result of its being a centre for the bank fishing vessels.

On Labrador, page 56, Emily Harbour and Smokey Tickle show an increase of \$2.00 each, due to an error in the past. Makovik is a new port of call, and Red Bay is used in summer and winter both. Hence the increase from \$10 to \$20.

The votes for courier routes contain alterations in some 30 or 40 of these, making a total increase, as can be seen on page 74, of about \$2,000, which is a very small amount in view of the number of changes that have had to be made. These have been rendered necessary by the alterations in the steamer and train routes and increased services. I am not dealing with them in detail, but will be glad to supply any member with full particulars regarding any route he may wish to be informed upon.

Under the heading of Steam Subsidies on page 75, we strike out altogether the vote of \$800 for a steamer on Hamilton Inlet, and we reduce the vote for Labrador steamers from \$58,000 to \$45,000, making a total reduction in the Steam Subsidy vote of \$13,800.

On page 76 begins the vote for the Telegraph Department, and in the central staff at St. John's there are some re-arrangements, older officers being replaced by juniors, and there is one new official at \$450, while the typist receives an extra \$50 and the office tenders \$200 extra. As to operators outside St. John's, I will deal with the more important, Aguathuna, or the lime quarry at Port au Port, has an operator at \$240, this being an important station, as the D.I.S. Co. does a lot of business there. Bay Roberts is re-arranged under two votes. Brigus gets \$60 for an assistant. Brookfield office is closed, and the

vote formerly paid two assistants at Clarendville, \$120, is transferred to Hillview. The Grand Falls votes are now arranged for four officials instead of three. In Hillview the apparent increase of \$120 is really only transferred from Clarendville assistant. The office at Jersey Side, Placentia, now only carries \$240 instead of \$360, the difference going to the operator on the Placentia townside, both of whom are now paid alike. King's Point is now reduced \$40, as a lady operator is employed. At Lamaline an assistant is provided. At Norris' Point there is an apparent increase of \$120, but for years this has been paid as a board allowance. Placentia is covered by the remarks as to Jersey side. Point Leamington is decreased from \$360 to \$180, as the operator is now a young girl instead of a man. Prowseton is now a repeating office, Ramea is now a repeating office, and the vote is \$426. Spanlard's Bay is increased \$150, being an important office. At Springdale the operator is now a man instead of a girl.

Turning now to page 84 we find the Customs vote, which is the same as last year. There are, however, some re-arrangements, entirely in the provision for outport collectors and in the vote for gaugers, tidewaiters, and boat men. Bay L'Argent becomes a new Customs port, having been Gazetted on January 27th past, but no salary except five per cent. on duties is allowed. Change Islands was also made a port of entry on the 13th of January with a salary of \$360, this being, however, transferred from the vote for tidewaiters to sub-collectors. At Greenspond the limit is raised from \$600 to \$800, while Codroy is reduced to the original fee of \$240 against \$360 voted last year. Harbour Buffett is now included as a Customs port, though previously not mentioned, although an entry port since 1897. Lit-

the Bay Island is now substituted for Pilley's Island. The limit at Marys-town is increased from \$650 to \$800. Millertown is transferred from the gauger class to sub-collector class. Presque is included, though heretofore not mentioned. Rose Blanche limit is raised from \$500 to \$600, and St. George's from \$600 to \$700; while Spanlard's Bay, Gazetted on second of June last, gets a salary of \$420. The total vote for sub-collectors is thus increased by \$1,050.

The sub-vote for gaugers, etc., shows Bonaviata with two men at \$240 instead of one man, thus placing the two on the pay list, one being previously paid out of supernumerary vote. Change Islands to \$360 is transferred to sub-collectors as stated already. Fogo, one man is placed on the pay roll, transferred from supernumeraries. At Lamaline two men, one at \$350 and another at \$40, both being \$390, are now placed on the pay roll, the transfer being made from supernumeraries. Millertown, as already stated, is transferred from sub-collectors. The sub-vote for gaugers, tidewaiters and boatmen is decreased by \$630, and that for outport supernumeraries is reduced from \$2,000 to \$1,580. There are changes in the percentage on duties, the vote being reduced from \$17,000 to \$16,580, in view of possible decreases in imports of dutiable articles, and this squares the vote for this Department.

I do not propose to ask hon. members to further consider these estimates this afternoon. I have arranged for my explanation to be published in the newspapers to-morrow and thus give the House an opportunity to consider them more intelligently than would otherwise be possible, and I therefore move that the House rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again on Thursday afternoon, if that date will suit my hon. friends opposite

MR. COAKER.—Last year the Government promised that there should be a re-arrangement in connection with Postmasters' salaries and a commission or an inspector was appointed to go into the matter. Is there any report to table in that connection?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In answer to the hon. member I might say that in compliance with the promise given last year, the Government appointed Mr. Mercer to classify the different post offices all over the Island, and he has been engaged in that work since, I think, July last. The work has been materially delayed owing to the failure of certain outport post offices to send in information asked for, but on enquiry from Mr. LeMessurier the other day as to what position the matter was in, he told me that Mr. Mercer was now about completing his work; that he had all the returns in except very few, and hoped within a week or two to have the whole thing finished. When the report is ready I will have very much pleasure in laying it on the table of the House. As to the nature of the recommendations which will be made I cannot speak at the present time, but we realize that to deal with this matter thoroughly will probably mean considerable research, even after we get the report, and also a considerable expenditure. I feel sure that the report will show that it won't be a question of reduction; on the other hand, we will probably be asked to increase salaries in a great many cases. I am not in a position to say whether the Government will be in a position to deal with this matter during this session or not, but it is being attended to, and as soon as Mr. Mercer's report is finished it will be tabled.

MR. COAKER.—I am very glad to accept the explanation of the Colonial Secretary, but I would like to have some sort of report before us by the time we get down to the Postal Es-

timates. I don't wish to suggest that any increases or alterations should be made this year. I would merely like to have the report. Now, when are we to have the report of the Hospital Commission?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the report of the Hospital Commission is in the hands of the Government. It is being printed, and I hope to-morrow to be in a position to lay a copy on the table of the House, for each member. It is a very important report, and the Government desire that the utmost publicity be given it, and for that reason it was thought best to have it printed so that each member have a copy.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on Friday.

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

CUSTOMS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Customs Act, 1898."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, at the second reading of this Bill a few days ago I explained its object. We were asked to make the amendment by the Board of Trade. It was found, particularly by the importers of goods, that goods were brought in from time to time, put in sufferance warehouses, and allowed to remain there for weeks, and in some cases months. What is asked in this Bill is to give the Cus-

toms power to remove the goods after a certain number of days. What happens is this: A steamer arrives and lands goods, which are put in a sufferance warehouse. After five days, if the goods have not been taken possession of by the owner, the Customs can go down, take charge of the goods and have them removed to a bond store. The cost of removing the goods will be charged to the owner. Then if they are not removed within a certain time after having been placed in the bond store, the Customs are empowered to sell them, deduct from the proceeds the charges, cost of removal, storing, &c., and pay the balance over to the owner.

At the present time the goods are allowed to remain in the sufferance warehouse ten days. The result of that is that a steamer arrives and lands certain goods. The goods are allowed to remain in the warehouse for ten days. In the meantime, say after eight days, another steamer arrives, and her cargo is piled on top of the other. Then when the owner of goods which arrived by steamer No. 1 comes down to take delivery of them he finds that the cargo of steamer No. 2 has been piled on top of them, and he cannot get them; and this has meant a lot of inconvenience and trouble. This amendment was particularly recommended by the Board of Trade, and it seems to me to be reasonable.

MR. LLOYD.—I would like a little more information. Is this change likely to affect a large quantity of goods? Is it possible that the Government will be called upon to store in warehouses large quantities of goods?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Well, even if they are—

MR. LLOYD.—I want to know if it is likely?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—It may be.

MR. LLOYD.—Have you warehouse space to do that?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—We have.

MR. LLOYD.—Will there be any expense in the way of providing warehouses or in any other way?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No. The expenses of all goods that may be removed will be charged to the owner.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to give the Furness Withy people and Harvey & Co. and the others the chance to fleece Water Street. These men find that they cannot make enough money off the trade now, and they simply say, we will reduce the time within which goods must be taken from ten days to five, and after five days, if goods are not taken, we will put them in a warehouse and charge hire on them; and then we can sell after thirty days, if they are not taken within that time. Suppose I had a thousand barrels of flour arriving. That would cost a lot of money, and I might have to make arrangements with the banks to get that flour from the wharf. A thousand barrels of flour cost a lot of money, and it must be paid for before I can get it from the wharf. I have a bill here from Harvey & Co. for 100 barrels of beef imported for ourselves. We had a bill from them for no less than \$6 for removing the stuff and \$2 for storage. The total wharfage that Harvey and Co. gets amounts to about \$30,000. Why do these people charge for storage when they have abundant room? The smaller man cannot draw on the bank to get delivery of his goods as soon as the men with bigger means. It should not be tolerated. The Board of Trade is composed of such people as Harvey & Co. You have not consulted the business men of Water Street in this matter but the men of the Board of Trade, who do it all.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, there may be a little in what the hon. member for Twillingate has said. But I do not see if Harvey & Co. have asked us to see what we can do, so that people will not keep their freight in their premises. When one cargo is dumped out on top of another cargo which has previously arrived, it is very hard to get the cargo which arrived first. Seven days is what we allow.

MR. COAKER—I say it is not a sensible proposition. It ought to be eight.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to criticise this bill, but I agree with a great deal that the member of Twillingate has said. When a steamer comes in with a load of goods she also has a cargo to take on board, and there is a lot of trouble if the cargoes are not so arranged that there may be no trouble. Some of these people who represent steamship companies have their own goods, and crowd out the goods of other people. So I think that the time should be extended to meet the requirements of the trade.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is not correct when he states that this bill is meant to accommodate two or three men. We have been asked for the last two or three years by the Board of Trade to bring in this bill, and it is only after some years that such a bill was brought in. The matter has nothing to do with any request on the part of Harvey & Co., or Shea & Co. The trouble is this, that when a cargo of a steamer is landed at Shea & Co.'s people who leave their goods there block the way, and other people, because the way is obstructed, cannot get theirs in turn. This has been represented to the Government again and again by the Board of

Trade which represents the whole country, and the trouble affects every class of importer and exporter in Newfoundland. What interest has the Minister of Finance in introducing this bill? We have no interest in serving the Board of Trade. Under this bill a man is given five days to take his goods away. But I think that it would be right that if he could not get his goods out within that time he might have twenty days. But when his goods are there for months and he will not take them out, and obstructs the man who is trying to get his goods, that is another matter. This bill was recommended by Mr. LeMessurier the Assistant Collector of Customs, who has no interest in hurting any man rich or poor. We have to look at the other side where the whole trade may be held up by the man on the outside; now is not this a simple way out of it? His goods are conveyed away and he is charged a moderate rate for storage.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, the Premier says that some remedy must be found, but he does not know anything about it. You are giving the monopoly to these few men. It seems that we, on this side of the House, don't know anything, but you know it all. What do you know about it? You are not an importer.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think that I know as much about the matter as my hon. friend.

MR. COAKER—You go down there along the street and get fifty men and say that to them, and I will withdraw what I have said. Harvey & Co. are all right, but they must not have complete charge of it all. Make it eight days or don't make it anything.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I think that I know as much about this bill as any man here, although I am not an importer, for I do not think that it is necessary to be an importer

in order to know anything about the matter. In a recent meeting of a sub-committee of the Board of Trade, composed of Messrs. Charles Ayre, Monroe, McKay and Gosling, who was the only representative of Harvey & Co., a request of Mr. Gosling, relating to this bill was refused. He thought that if goods remained in their store more than five days, Harvey & Co. should be entitled to charge storage. But the Board of Trade thought that that would tend to induce Harvey's to keep the stuff in the warehouse. That will show that Harvey & Co. had no undue influence in the matter. The sub-committee sent that report up to the general committee of the Board of Trade, and it was considered up there. When goods were piled in these sufferance warehouses, people did not trouble to take their stuff away from it, not because they had not the money, but because they were too lazy or did not want the goods immediately, and the result was that another steamer came in and piled its cargo on top of what was already there. Consequently much trouble ensued from the piling up of these goods, one on top of the other, and the owners of the earlier cargo could not get their goods. It was pointed out that it was the duty of the importer to take their goods out of the warehouses within a reasonable time. It was not an unfair thing on the part of the steamer owners. With reference to the statements that have been made here about wharfage, and which do not come into this bill, I do not think that wharfage is a legal charge. By what right can they charge wharfage when the law does not permit them to make warehouse charges? When goods are placed in sufferance warehouses it is as if they were still on board the ship; you are only as if were transferring goods from one hold of one vessel to

another. It is a mere conduit. It is said that the Furness Withy people and the Harvey people have other stores upon their premises in which they can put their goods. If there is sufficient room for the cargo, then why is there any need of piling one cargo on top of another? And if the Furness Withy Co. provided a store, why should they not be paid. I think that this point ought to be made clear.

The warehouse ought to be always large enough for at least one cargo. It may be true that goods flow through all the time, but nevertheless there should be sufficient room for the goods.

The trouble is not caused by the small men, but by the big men, and I believe that it is these bigger men who block it up rather than the smaller men; thus hindering the whole trade. I wish it to be remembered that when I speak, I do so from the standpoint of a man who has no personal interest in this matter at all.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY-

Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to know very much about the matter before the Chair, but I have a certain interest in the bill. I occasionally import in a small way.

It appears to me that in the past the great difficulty has been not with the man that removed his goods in five or seven or ten days, but with the man that left them there for three or four months and caused a great deal more trouble than all the rest put together. It is a well known fact in this country, I think, that certain people import articles such as flour and tea and sugar, and have no means of storing them whatever, and they take advantage of these steamship warehouses and let those goods remain there until they can dispose of them thereby hindering the proper circulation of trade when it comes in.

Now, I think, that whilst this Bill will obviate a great deal of unfairness and unfair advantage that these people may have had over ordinary traders by providing facilities whereby some authority can come in and move these goods at the expense of the owner, I think we may be inclined to err on the other side. I have knowledge of people here who may get goods, and these goods may arrive on Saturday or Monday, and they may not get their invoices for three or four days, as they are not in a position to pass for the goods without their invoices, and I understand the Government are not favorable to giving them sight entry for goods that arrive here. They may get their invoices by mail and the mails may be delayed by a block on the line or some other cause. For this reason, I think consideration might be given to a suggestion that the time be extended beyond five days. I agree with the principle of the Bill, and I think that the whole trade will be relieved of a great inconvenience. I know myself the inconvenience that many of these parties have been causing. You have to go down there and bundle over stuff to get goods belonging to you and some of the stuff that you are turning over has been there for a month or six weeks or two months. I think this Bill will affect the remedy. I would suggest an extension of the time for a longer period than five days. I think you might make it seven or eight, because parties may be greatly inconvenienced owing to the non-arrival of invoices or other reasons.

MR. KENT—I think there should be some provision for the publication in the Royal Gazette of the Rules and Regulations referred to here.

MR. MORINE—A matter has just been drawn to my attention that I would like to speak of. It has been

suggested that in the past by an arrangement between owners of sufferance warehouses and importers of goods, goods could remain there by paying storage. When you make your regulations you ought to have a distinct prohibition in it that there shall be no storage charge for any goods remaining in these warehouses. The Premier I am sure will see the reason for that. You cannot have these warehouses blocked up by the owners and importers of goods making these arrangements. I know that there was an attempt made to get permission for this in the Bill, but the Committee was strongly opposed to it. That ought to be in the regulations.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendment.

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

ESTATE DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in reference to the imposition of duties on the estates of deceased persons.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MORINE—What is the Rt Hon Premier going to do about that definition clause?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Let it go as it is.

MR. MORINE.—Well I want to point out the absurdity of doing that. The Premier has told us that this is practically a copy of the Transvaal Act which was highly recommended. Now under that Act the word Company

would not only mean a company incorporated in that Colony but any company doing business in that Colony. By leaving out the definition clause you make this Act inapplicable to a Company doing business in the Colony that happens to be incorporated somewhere else, and the first effect of that would be to drive every Company to get incorporated somewhere else instead of here and paying their incorporation fees somewhere else instead of in this Colony because as I have said before you make a company liable if it is incorporated in this Colony but a company doing business here but not incorporated here is not liable. That is absurd. Now if you put in an interpretation clause the same as was done in the Transvaal Act it would be all right. Of course the trouble with this Act is that part of it was taken from the Transvaal Act, an important part of that Act left out and words which refer to that left in. Now there is no reason why this definition clause should not go in. The Premier, last night argued that this Act applied to every kind of Company doing business in the Colony.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I said "shares."

MR. MORINE.—I am talking about shares of a Company whether it is incorporated inside the Colony or not. By looking at the Transvaal Act you will see that it applies to the shares of Companies no matter where incorporated if they are doing business there. It turned out last night that this was left out of this Act without the intention of the Government at all. Now I am drawing the Premier's attention to another serious omission and it is not fair to this House because the solicitor did not put in this definition clause the Government should insist on the Bill going through

as it stands, when it is a manifest absurdity.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I want to assure the hon. gentleman that that is not the intention at all. The difference exists simply because the law officers of the Crown are satisfied that the Bill is all right as it stands.

MR. MORINE.—Who are they?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The Attorney General, the solicitor of the House and those who are responsible for the measure; and so far as I am capable of judging I should say it is all right. However, there is no desire of forcing through this proposal and I do not think that the suggestion of my hon. friend would impair the measure, and consequently I have no objection to putting in the clause suggested. We want the Bill to be as perfect as possible; but that clause was deliberately and intentionally left out.

MR. MORINE.—It was left out for this reason. The solicitor of the House told me he left it out because he did not think it fair that a company not incorporated here should be made liable.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I said deliberately left out.

MR. MORINE.—Yes, By the solicitor of the House. But after all this is not a mere question of putting in words. We are the responsible parties and not the law officers of the Crown and the policy behind leaving this clause out is that it leaves every Company doing business, in the Colony and not incorporated in this Colony outside the limits of the Bill. Now I submit that was not the intention of the Government at all.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have stated that it was deliberately left out.

MR. MORINE.—Yes, but not by yourself. Now in order to make this

Act a copy of the Transvaal Act it only requires that this definition clause be put in.

MR. KENT.—It appears to me it is merely a matter of intention as to whether the Government is to include these companies or not. If it is the intention to include these companies—and I think from what the Prime Minister has said that it is—then in order to carry out his own intention this definition clause is necessary.

MR. LLOYD.—I don't know whether it is the intention of the Government to put in this definition clause or not.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes.

MR. LLOYD.—That being so the whole matter is practically settled. I take it the principle of the Bill is that in the case of any one interested in a company, although that person does not reside here, if the actual property is here then the something should be paid to the Treasury. If that is so the question of where the Company is incorporated is absolutely irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions with an amendment and recommended that the 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 Act 5, George V., Session 1, Cap. XI, entitled: "An Act to increase the Revenue by the Imposition of "Certain Duties on the Estates of Deceased Persons," was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

RT. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Thursday move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of this Col-

ony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 21, 1915.

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

REPORTS TABLED.

Hon. Minister of Finance tabled the following statements:—

Public Works Trust Fund 1913-14 Roads—Local, Main and Special.

Railway Arbitration Awards, 1914.

Old Age Pensions Expenditure year ending June 30th, 1914.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled:—

Report of the Postmaster General for year ending June 30th, 1914.

Report of Commissioners on General Hospital.

Report of Registrar General of Births, Deaths and Marriages for year ending December 31st, 1914.

QUESTIONS.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to lay on the table of the House answer to a question of Mr. Jennings.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to lay on the table of the House answer to question of Mr. Stone of the 14th April. It is a long question but this is an answer to Sub-section "F. 1."

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I beg to table answer to a question of Dr. Lloyd.

MR. COAKER.—I wish to ask whether it is the intention to table the evidence in the Hospital Commission?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Not at present. We shall consider that matter later. There is no objection to your reading it. It is done entirely in the interest of the institution.

MR. LLOYD.—I may say that there is no objection whatever to Mr. Coaker seeing it, but at the present time it is undesirable to publish it.

MR. STONE.—I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that my question of April 16th has not yet been answered.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I think I have that information here. I beg to table it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

MR. ABBOTT gave notice of question.

MR. JENNINGS gave notice of question.

CUSTOMS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Customs Act, 1898," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

TEMPERANCE RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Mr. Hickman, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

BE IT RESOLVED.—

(1) That the Importation and Sale of Spirituous Liquors and Wines be prohibited.

(2) That the Manufacture in the Colony of Spirituous Liquors and Wines be prohibited.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN.—In introducing that Resolution, Mr. Chairman, I do so with the object of stamping out the liquor traffic, which has been so disastrous to this country. I am not a teetotaler myself, but I advocate the adoption of that measure for the benefit of those who cannot help themselves. When I first gave notice of this motion, I had planned to make it a total prohibition measure, but after hearing others discussing it, I thought it would not be advisable to introduce it as such, so we decided to take out one clause, that which affected the sale of light ales and beers. This was done not because I am not in favour of total prohibition, but because the present was not considered a suitable opportunity to press such drastic legislation.

The object of this Resolution (for this is a Resolution and not a Bill and the Bill can, if the House pleases, be made a Total Prohibition measure.) was to have introduced into this House a bill which would go further along the same lines as the legislation asked for last year.

We find that Russia, which is not as far advanced in civilization as we, has enacted legislation to stop the sale of Vodka; that France has adopted a temperance measure to suppress the sale of liquors; that Total Prohibition measure is now advocated in Sweden to cut out the use of alcoholic liquors. A great many people will say that to grant Total Prohibition now would be interfering with the rights of the people; but let us see where we stand in connection with this matter. If a scourge of small-pox, diphtheria or Scarlet fever came to this country or any settlement of it, the Government would immediately take steps to quarantine the infected places and take stringent measures to put an end to the scourge, regardless of interference with anybody's rights; and where is there a greater scourge

than liquor? A few will suffer indeed from loss of employment, and a few will lose the income which they derive from this business but they are but few indeed and what will the loss of these few be compared with the suffering of the wives and families of drunken husbands. The stuff is no good; it is injurious even to the moderate drinker. You look at a man of 70 who has been temperate all his life, and compare him with one of 60 who has been perhaps only a moderate drinker. You see in one the clear eye and upright figure, while the habitual drinker presents the appearance of a piece of humanity many years older than his age. What can you expect from posterity? What can you expect from our children if this drinking goes on as it is now? Who fill our public institutions, our Poor Asylum, our Lunatic Asylum, our Penitentiary, but those who are there as a result of drink? Liquor is the source of our economic troubles. A great number of our laborers are addicted to the drinking habit, with results on our economic condition that neither you nor I can estimate. You cannot and I cannot calculate this, but it is a fact that nine out of ten of our vessels are delayed in sailing from two to five days by their crews who just as the vessel is ready to go, desert her and it is necessary to call the police to hunt them up. These delays caused by these drunken seamen are often serious and great expense comes to the owners and captains as a result. The delay often has the result too of the vessels getting a poor market for their fish.

I know from personal experience that there are, roaming about St. John's all the year round, tradesmen who are earning nothing, and who but for their intemperance would be earning from \$10 to \$20 per week.

The one strong argument that will be raised by the Government is that

the revenue cannot stand the loss which it would suffer through losing these duties. Well, if this country cannot live without exacting revenues from the importation of liquors at the expense of poverty, degradation and disease, it is not worth while being in the country. I doubt very much if there would be a falling off in the revenue, and on the contrary believe that if we had prohibition the revenue would be increased.

The revenue from liquors annually amounts to about \$347,000; as \$200,000 of this is made up in excise duties, the revenue from the imported amounts to about \$145,000. The first cost of this liquor is about \$250,000 to \$300,000, but the men who drink this stuff pay in the vicinity of \$1,000,000—\$1,250,000 for it. Now, if this \$1,250,000 was spent in groceries, provisions and clothing by a sober people, the income to the revenue would be, not \$345,000 but nearer \$500,000, or approximately \$150,000 more. Besides, what is the good of the revenue if we have the human wreckage it causes to put up with and support? The revenue afforded by this item of our imports is not sufficient to keep up the institutions made necessary by its importation and use; so in this connection the use of liquors is a distinct loss.

If the cost of the running expenses of these public institutions for the past twenty years was totalled up it would be found that the cost of these has hardly been paid for by the moneys obtained from this traffic. Last year for example, the vote for the Lunatic Asylum was \$48,000, that for the Poor House \$18,500; that for the Penitentiary \$19,600, making a grant total of \$86,000 spent. In addition to this there was the sum of \$40,000 voted to the help of those suffering from tuberculosis, for medicines, disinfectants and such necessities. No one will deny that this disease is in this Colony

and that it is a disease of poverty and ill nourishment. A great many of the drinking men and their families are very poorly and improperly fed, clothed and cared for, and their constitutions are therefore not in a suitable condition to ward off the disease. Other people, the children of a drunken father, are born weak, and are in no condition to face the dreadful disease with the result that they become victims in their youth.

The Government will perhaps say that they have not a mandate from the people to take this step. But they have it in the petitions which were presented to this House last session, and I have since I gave notice of this resolution received one petition signed by 316 people and another signed by a large number of members of the Independent Order of Good Templars, both in support of this movement.

I believe that when this measure shall have been brought into this House and passed into the statutes of this Colony, that a new era will be opened up for the country, and that the people of the generations to come will as a result be better fed, clothed and educated. I want to say before I finish that this is not a party measure, and that I have not had any party meeting in respect to them, and do not know if the members of this side of the House are going to support it or not. I have canvassed nobody, and have left the resolution entirely to the moral feeling of the members of this House. I have great pleasure, Mr. Chairman in introducing this resolution.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, I second the resolution.

HON. MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Bay de Verde in introducing this resolution, and I would like to make a few remarks concerning the subject he has touched upon.

The hon. member seems to have anticipated the reply of those who would not be able to see eye to eye with him on this momentous question which is one having very far reaching consequences especially at the present period of the history of the country. The newspapers which support this resolution have time and again reiterated the statement that a great responsibility would rest upon those hon. members who would not support it in its entirety, but I for one am quite prepared to take full responsibility for the manner in which I shall cast my vote concerning this Resolution.

The hon. member has stated that we received the mandate from the people last year in the form of several petitions, and that these authorized this House to adopt such a proposal as prohibition this year. Now I take issue with him and say that we have no such mandate from the people, and that to cut off by one stroke of the pen the importation of liquors would be a high handed proceeding on our part.

If I remember correctly the petitions last year were upon a matter very different from the subject which we have under consideration at the present time. The petitions asked that liquor be prevented from passing into local option districts, and that the necessary machinery be provided for a plebiscite when the people asked for it. Now that is not in my opinion, a mandate from the people, and I am not here to vote for this without having the majority of the voters of the country favour such a course; for the constitution of this country and the constitutions of every British country declare that our actions shall be guided by the majority rule. To vote in this House that liquor shall not be imported into this country without the electors being first consulted is in my opinion wrong and is one of the best

reasons for not supporting the resolution. I do not admit that we have the mandate of the people of this country to pass this law. I would go further and say that there has been no agitation for the past two years from anybody for total prohibition, and that prohibition had not been spoken until notice of the resolution was given since the last general election, and that it was not then on the platform of any party. Was the question of prohibition a vital one at the last election, and was it a plank in the platform of either of the political parties? Is that what they returned me for?

I do not say that I am not in favor of prohibition, but I believe in letting the people have a voice in the matter. The majority rule applies in every institution in this country and in every other British dependency, and I would leave it to the people to decide what they want. This is one of my reasons; we have no mandate from the people and our vote would not be the majority vote, which in accordance with British custom is necessary to pass legislation. I should be only too pleased at the next session to cast my vote too in favour of the measure, if in the meantime the majority of the electors decide in its favour.

It is perfectly true that the revenue of the Colony would suffer considerably if this measure comes into force, but if we had the mandate of the people I would not fear this because I believe that soon the purchasing power of the people would be so improved as in a short time to overcome the immediate loss. But, during this war, now when we already have a large deficit to face, and when large contributions are being turned from business channels into funds such as the Patriotic and other funds and the military expenditures, I think it would be decidedly risky at such a time to

cut off from the revenue such a large amount as we receive from the importation of wines and liquors.

I say then that the time is not opportune, even if we did have the mandate of the people, to cut any of the revenue away. I believe as the hon. member for Bay de Verde has said, that in time the decrease would be made up, but this is not the year to make the experiment. So, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that the time is not opportune from the revenue point of view, and for the reason that we have not the mandate of the people, I would not favor this resolution on this occasion. But I am prepared to vote for prohibition in all its forms, without any exceptions whatsoever, provided the people signify that such is their wish and desire.

I appreciate everything that Mr. Hickman has said with regard to alcohol and its effects. I agree with him when he says that but for it the lunatic asylum and goals would not be filled, nor would disease be so rife; and we have seen of late years that the medical profession has held that from a medicinal point of view liquor is not of very much value, and is not prescribed to the same extent as formerly. I understand that in hospitals its use is reduced almost to a minimum. There is no necessity for me to go in to that question. I would vote for prohibition provided it was brought in here under the circumstances which I have suggested. Before sitting down I may say that I appreciate all that has been said by the hon. member for Bay de Verde in relation to this matter and am sorry that I cannot see my way clear to support these resolutions at the present time.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation whatever in supporting the resolutions which have been brought before the House today. I do not do this because I can

see farther than any other person in that direction or because I claim to know any more about the situation. I support the resolutions on principle. I believe the whole business is wrong, and contrary to the law of God, and an injury to mankind, and I am prepared to support any measure which will tend to bring this evil to an end. I know it is quite easy to get up here and declaim against the evils which liquor has brought about, and I don't intend to use any of the time of the House for that purpose. I merely wish to state my position in this matter. I believe in a higher power than even this Legislature in matters of this sort, and I am prepared to support anything which I believe to be pleasing to God, who rules this Universe. The difficulties that now seem to be so great would, I believe, amount to nothing if we pursued the right course, and for that reason I am prepared to support any measure of this kind on principle. The last speaker has said that we have no mandate from the people for a measure of this kind. I think, speaking for the outport districts, I shall have to disagree with the hon. member. Almost every outport in the country has declared in favor of Local Option, believing, hoping, that that measure would mean total prohibition; and we have their mandate in this respect, at any rate, with no uncertain sound. Now, as one of the representatives of a prohibition district, I stand here to-day with the certainty of a mandate from that district in favor of prohibition. I have now in my possession resolutions from the Temperance Society at Twillingate, which they took the trouble to send along by special courier to Lewisporte so as to reach this city in time to show their sympathy with this measure, and I cannot afford to treat those lightly. Twillingate is the largest town in the district of Twillingate. It is the capital town, and any

measure which the majority of the people there support should certainly be taken into consideration; and I am very sure that this measure would be gladly welcomed by them. The sale of liquor in St. John's has to a great extent counteracted the good effects of local option in the outports. In fact, it has almost made it null and void, because of the facility with which liquor can be obtained by the people of the outports; and there is apparently no way of curing that except by cutting it out altogether.

Already reference has been made to the effect of this measure upon the revenue. The mover of those resolutions has stated that they would affect the revenue to a very great extent. Probably there would be a deficit if this source of revenue were cut off, but I would suggest to the temperance supporters—to the people in favor of prohibition in this city and also in the outports, that they should come forward in a practical manner and offer to bear the burden in some other way. I am prepared to-day—and I want fifty cents as badly as any man in this House, and perhaps worse—to pay fifty cents a barrel more on every barrel of flour that I use, in order to make up the loss which the revenue will meet as a result of this measure. I think, Mr. Chairman, if we want measures of this sort that we should be prepared to take the consequences.

Just one word with regard to the effects of the drink traffic in other countries and upon other peoples. I read somewhere a little while ago some figures dealing with this evil in Great Britain. The first six months of this terrible war resulted in a little over a hundred thousand casualties of the British army of which 20,000 were killed. We can all realize what terrible consequences this meant, not only to those who actually suffered but to their homes. During that

six months 25,000 people in Great Britain went to their graves as a result of the use of strong drink. Now, it seems to me that that is worth consideration—the realization that a greater number of people met their deaths in Great Britain in six months as the result of drink than as a result of the great war in which the Empire is engaged. I have never heard of any attempt having been made to ascertain just what proportion of our death rate was due to intoxicating liquors, but I have no doubt that it would open our eyes if we had some means of finding it out. To my mind if in five years only forty or fifty intelligent reputable citizens went to their graves because they indulged in strong drink, it would justify total prohibition.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, the attendance at the House to-day, and the very general interest that has been shown in this subject since it first became known that these resolutions were to be brought forward by the hon. member for Bay de Verde, are evidence of the fact that the House, in considering a measure of this kind, is confronted with one of the most serious problems that can be offered to its members. It is a problem which has engaged the attention of this House in years gone by, and which has been engaging the attention of the Legislatures of the world at large for very many years; and I think it will engage our attention until we arrive at the solution which has been suggested here to-day, and that is, have the matter disposed of by a straight vote, and take out the evil, as has been said, root, branch and tree. But the great feature of the present resolutions that I would like to draw the attention of members of this House to is that we are not by the resolutions put in the position suggested by my hon. friend the member for Bay de Verde, when

he says that they will give members an opportunity of showing their moral courage; because I want to say to him—and I shall delay the House as little as possible in doing so—that if I am against the resolutions it is not because I may not be as great an advocate of prohibition as he is—not because I may not be as great an advocate as he is of even a greater measure of prohibition than his resolutions call for—but I would respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman that those of us who are voting against these resolutions in the form in which they are put before us to-day, are doing so for reasons other than anti-temperance. No member of this House would seriously get up and attempt to defend the abuse of liquor; no member, whether he votes for these resolutions or not, is going to seriously question the wisdom of any legislation that will lessen the terrible evil that the hon. gentleman has referred to; no member is going to be found in any legislature in the civilized world, who has any respect for himself, who will get up and champion the abuse of liquor. Because it is with the abuse of liquor that unfortunately we have to deal. Liquor in all its forms, whether it be beer or any other intoxicating drink, when taken to excess brings all the attendant evils that the hon. gentleman has referred to. There can be no possible doubt, therefore, that a great responsibility rests upon each of us to see that when the opportunity offers we do not lose a chance to stamp out an evil that is doing so much harm. But, Mr. Chairman, while that is perfectly true, while the unfortunate position is that what makes liquor such an evil is the abuse of it by people who can least afford it (and consequently the hardship that follows falls amongst the classes who can least bear it) we must be careful that we do not in attempting to cure that evil, create a

greater one. Now right here I wish it to be clearly understood that so far as I am concerned I am prepared to go beyond the doctrine that has been advocated here namely, that we are bound by our districts. I say that, generally speaking, in a representative legislature of this kind, ordinarily and usually we are bound by the voice of the people; but I go further, and I say that no member of this House should shirk the position,—if his conscience told him and if the circumstances around him told him that conditions were so bad that the general welfare of the people demanded it—that it would be his duty to come to this House and stamp out the evil. That is what happened in the countries that have been referred to by the hon. member for Bay de Verde—in Russia, France and Great Britain. But, Mr. Chairman, we have got to remember the fact that all three of these countries are engaged in a great war. We have particularly to remember the fact that that great Russian army, from whom we ourselves, as members of the British Empire, hope so much in the future, was being demoralized by liquor; and it was to prevent that demoralization that the authorities very properly stepped in. The same condition existed in France. But what has happened in Great Britain? I may say that I am very glad that the hon. member has referred to conditions in Great Britain, because it gives me an opportunity of referring to an article which I recently read dealing with this subject, which we all know has been receiving very serious attention from the Imperial authorities because of the terrible effect which it has undoubtedly had upon industrial operations in Great Britain. This article deals with the reply made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lloyd George, to the deputation which called on him in connection with this

matter, when he made use of the words that have been quoted so often recently, namely, that "we are fighting three foes—Germany, Austria and Drink, and the greatest of these is Drink." But the Chancellor went on to say "The fact that the Government have not up to the present time taken even more drastic action than that which they have taken is due to one or two causes. The first, and perhaps the most important, is that before you take steps of this kind you must feel confident that you are not going in advance of sentiment, otherwise more harm will be done than good. You must feel that you have behind you every class in the community when you are taking action which interferes and must interfere very sensibly with the individual liberties of men of all sections". In other words, that right in the Homeland, where the evil is greatest—right in the heart of the Empire, at a time when the very existence of the Empire may be said to be threatened by the evils of drink—the Imperial Government do not feel justified in endeavoring to force any measure of prohibition upon the people. And, Sir, let us be sure that the people of this country, whose social and economic conditions are going to be so affected by such legislation, have the opportunity of passing upon this matter at the polls. If the hon. member's resolutions asked, as did last year's petitions, that a plebiscite be taken on this question, I would have the greatest pleasure in supporting them. Last year we had petitions presented here, largely through the influence of an organization that has done much good in this community, The Women's Christian Temperance Union. These petitions asked for a reasonable course—one that no Legislature except it were decidedly anti-temperate, could object to: That an Act be put on the Statute Book to al-

low the country an opportunity of expressing at the Polls their decision as to whether they desire prohibition or otherwise. In that request I concur. And I would just say to the hon. member here now that I think that when the time comes for the people of the country to express that decision, they will either ask for prohibition out and out or they will not have it at all. There will not be any prohibition in the form which these resolutions suggest; because the resolutions in their present form practically permit a man to continue to be a beast through drinking beer, on which he can get just as drunk as he can on any other form of liquor, and that must not be permitted. The resolutions have been put in their present form apparently to meet the suggestion of some parties that beer might be permitted and the stronger liquors shut out. Now, I do hope that if prohibition is submitted to the people of this country that it will be prohibition in all that the word ought to convey—prohibition from every kind of liquor that can bring man down to the level of the beast. I would also say in connection with the position that confronts us that I am probably in the fortunate position that were I to consider the interests of my district alone, I might immediately answer and give as my own reason for voting against these resolutions the fact that the last time local option was submitted to the people of St. John's it was defeated. I say that I might offer that as my sole reason for voting against these resolutions. But that is not my reason, and I do not think it is a reason which I should advance, because I think that the Local Option election meant nothing with regard to the present issue. In the first place, there are men in St. John's who would have voted for prohibition, but would not vote for local option; and

there are also, I have no doubt, many men residing outside the city who voted for local option but may not be prepared to vote for prohibition. So that the vote for local option is not an index of what would happen in a prohibition election and the best proof of that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the consumption of liquor in this country has remained practically the same, although during all these years we have had this marked increase in local option sentiment; and whilst that consumption has remained practically the same throughout the colony, conditions have improved in St. John's; so that the only conclusion that one can come to is that the local option districts have been consuming, I don't say as large a quantity of spirituous liquors as before, but certainly a very large quantity; and the fact that that is true is shown by the petitions which have been frequently presented to this House stating that local option districts have found that the abuse of the traffic was still going on, and asking that steps be taken to stamp it out. With regard to conditions in St. John's—and I think that I certainly would be somewhat derelict in the duty incumbent upon a representative for the city if I did not say it to an assemblage of this kind, I want to say that they are not the conditions which existed 25 or 30 years ago; they are not the conditions which existed within my own knowledge, fifteen years ago. Conditions in St. John's have improved for the reason that to-day a man, for his own self-respect, has got to be sober. There was a time, some few years ago, when all walks in life, professional and otherwise, were accustomed to meet at the bar; when the leading men, the brightest intellects of the day, so history tells us, met at the public house, but to-day that practice cannot be followed. A man may not

be a teetotaler, but he certainly cannot afford to be an habitual drinker. He cannot afford it, because he realizes that it means wasting a great part of his life, and that realization is doing its work. Then there is another reason, and that is, that the work that has been done by the bodies such as those who approached this Legislature last year is bearing fruit. Year in and year out these organizations have been carrying on their work, which, after all, is the great temperance work of the world; because the best results are obtained, not through Acts of Parliament, but through the example which those who are striving for temperance give to the people around them; and the fine work that these bodies are doing will in time have its effect, because we must all respect the man who by the rectitude of his own life influences others, and we must likewise respect the man who not alone influences others, but influences them along the lines which I have suggested without the aid of legislation. But I do quite agree with the proposition that if the people of this country, upon reflection, are satisfied, that despite that good work, despite the changed conditions to which I have referred, that the abuse still goes on, then it will be up to every man who has any interest in the country to vote for prohibition when the time comes.

I have carefully, as the hon. member for Bay de Verde will have observed, avoided giving him as a reason why I do not support his resolutions the financial aspect. I do not consider that that would be a good enough reason to give him. I think that the independence and self-respect of the members of this House are of such a character that I would not advance as my only reason for opposing these resolutions, the present financial condition of the country; because if

this country has got to depend for its existence upon the revenue which it obtains from the liquor traffic, and if that liquor traffic is harmful, then in the name of all that is good, let us get out of it. But while that, of itself, would not be a reason which should be advanced against these resolutions still, at the present juncture it is an element to be considered; because say what you will, Mr. Chairman, if we pass these resolutions at the present time there is going to be a certain amount of loss; and I think it is only fair if there is to be this temporary loss, and if this loss has to be met either by increased taxation or otherwise, then the people of this country, who will have to bear that increase in whatever form it comes, ought to be given the opportunity of passing upon it.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, It makes no difference whether the bill passes as it now stands, or includes beer; I will vote for it. I will vote for a plebiscite; that is if the bill provides that it shall be followed up by a law enforcing prohibition as soon as it is approved by the plebiscite. I wish to reply now to some of the points made this afternoon by hon. members on the other side. There is first the question whether we have a mandate from the people or not. Have we never before passed bills in this House without a mandate from the people? We are here to represent the people. It is altogether wrong to think that we have to go back with a referendum to the people at the polls on every little matter that comes before us. That is an American doctrine, entirely foreign to British constitutional precedent. We are elected by the people for a term of four years to vote with their authority on all measures. So far as I am concerned, I want no mandate from the people upon any measure that comes into

this House; and the only way in which those I represent can prevent my voting according to my opinions in this House is by terminating my sitting here. We met here a few months ago and dealt with matters of the gravest importance in connection with the Empire; did we ask for a mandate then? The war is our mandate. You impose taxation which a few months ago you were taking off; and without a mandate. If you could, up to the present, act in the most important matters without a mandate from the people, surely to-day you can act without a mandate in this matter? The hon. member for St. John's East said that he thought that we ought not to take a step without consulting the people, but I am sure that he is too logical to think that himself. It is not even as if we were proposing to take any money out of the people's pockets. The country will lose \$350,000 per annum that is now collected on liquor but we can get it back into the Treasury to-morrow by re-adjusting the tariff so as to put back the same revenue on other goods. Looking at it from a revenue point of view; imposing that same \$350,000 on other goods, will not alter the position one iota. It will not take one extra dollar out of the pockets of the people. Why secure a mandate from the people? Our position here is an everlasting mandate from the people to do whatever we think right and desirable.

Then there is another point which has been debated here; that the time is not an opportune one in which to wipe the liquor revenue away. I do not see why it should not be as opportune as any other time. I think that the time is extremely opportune. It is true that we are facing a large deficit this year, and we will have to borrow the money in any case to make

up the general deficit; why not borrow a little more? We shall undoubtedly have to make extensive changes in the tariff, and while making them, why not make this further change and meet the need by placing larger duties on other goods than liquor. It will not very much alter our financial position. I think that this is an extremely opportune time. As we have got to change the tariff we can do this at the same time. I am not one of those who agree that the \$350,000 will be lost even temporarily. It would be easy to replace what was lost on the liquor duties, and the cost of liquor which to the consumer amounts to \$1,250,000 when spent in other directions would easily make up the difference to the revenue. That million and a quarter dollars will be spent for other things. The greater part of it comes from people who are not depositors in banks, and who, accustomed to spending their money according as they earn it, will immediately spend it upon other goods. I should be prepared at this moment to take the office of my hon. friend Mr. Cashin and undertake to put every cent of the money lost, back into the Treasury at once. But when I offer to take that position I do not mean in the present Government. I do not envy them. While I was listening to the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, I thought that he intended to vote 'n favour of this resolution. He held the same views as I hold, regarding the mandate. The only difficulty was to discover the reason that he had for not voting for the resolution. He argues that conditions in this country as regards liquor are and have been bad enough, but that they are steadily growing better. Well, that improvement is the result of the efforts of those who are called temperance cranks. It is by their actions and theirs alone, that society is be-

ginning to recognize this evil. And I think that these are the people to whom the Legislature ought to look for guidance. Mr. Higgins began by saying that the abuse of liquor was what we had to deal with. No human law can be made which can strike at the abuse without interfering with the use of liquor. It all helps a little, but if we are to deal with the matter effectively, it is necessary to get down to the root of the evil. We ought not to allow the claims of any person to prevent us from making a sacrifice to stop the liquor traffic that is endangering the prosperity of this country. We ought to demand a sacrifice from the people. We have been told that the fact that the consumption of liquor in outport districts has not decreased under local option is evidence that the people do not desire prohibition. In every local option district there are some people that drink; but that is not an evidence that a district will not vote for local option; and if they cannot get local option they will vote for prohibition. Drinking is still going on in outport districts although they have local option, and the law is being violated. I say, we can regard every local option vote in this country, as a mandate for prohibition. We know that the majority of people in Newfoundland are in favour of this resolution and we ought to give them this law. We have had prohibition voted upon in this house before, when it was only defeated by the casting vote of the Speaker. Now the same thing is introduced again, and we are told the Government is in favour of a plebiscite. Why are you in favour of a plebiscite when you already know the wish of the people? It has been unquestionably expressed.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a

great deal of interest and pleasure to the speeches made here this evening, in regard to this very important question. I think that we may congratulate ourselves that we have fought the questions out from the standpoint of statesmen. We need not discuss the evils that come from the abuse of strong drink, nor now we delay the House by a discussion of that question. That evil follows from the abuse of liquor is admitted on every side, and we can all admit that it is an evil in this community. But on us rests the responsibility as to the cure of that evil, recognizing that there are people of all opinions in the community who must be considered.

Now there seems to be some confusion here in relation to the question of local option and the good work that it has done, and there has evidently been a misunderstanding by my learned friend who has just sat down of the hon. member for St. John's East, in relation to the consumption of liquor in local option districts. There is an entire misunderstanding and misconception. It does not follow at all that if liquor is consumed in local option districts today to a very large extent that in any way represents a failure of local option. Not at all. There never was any mandate from the local option districts to prevent entirely the consumption of liquor. Local option never interfered with the consumption of liquor, it dealt with the question of public sale and not of consumption, and there is no reason to confuse the issue. Local option exists nearly all over the country today. St. John's is the only district where there is no local option, and it is not fair to say that the local option districts are going back on the principles that for years actuated them in their splend-

id efforts to increase temperance.

Away back in the 70's I think the first local option law was brought in and the people all over Newfoundland were given the right to say whether liquor should be sold in their districts, and year after year the various districts and settlements put that into force. Under the first Bill introduced any district or settlement required a two-thirds vote to do away with the sale of liquor. Then the Legislature enacted a law by which a bare majority could decide whether liquor should be sold. What happened? Why is it that the consumption of liquor is higher all over the country today than it was forty years ago in spite of the temperance reforms that have been taking place all over the Island. The reason is that local option only affects the man that goes into the public house. It never affected the man in the outport that kept liquor in his own house, and consumed it moderately and properly. That is why the consumption has kept on and has not decreased. There is no question of the failure of local option in the outports. But today we are not talking about local option, but about total prohibition of liquor. Local option has been brought in here merely as a side issue. The question we have to consider is in relation to prohibition. Now my learned friend has talked a great deal about there being no necessity for a mandate; he says practically that an Assembly does not need a mandate even for anything in any portion of the British Empire. Now I do not agree with him. Why the very question that we are now discussing only a few years ago was submitted to the whole Dominion of Canada. It was not merely a provincial affair, but it was submitted to the whole Dominion by the Laurier Government and the people of the whole Dominion voted. That was I

think only in '98. If that is not an illustration of seeking a mandate I do not know what is. It is quite true as he has said that we have had this question of prohibition up here before; but if he will go back I think he will agree with me that he only told one-half of what happened in relation to that time. The first time it was brought in here it was defeated as he says by the casting vote of the Speaker, but the next time it came up there was a very large number on the other side who voted against it. I think there was a majority of seven or eight, and since then the question of prohibition has not been brought before this House or the country in any shape or form. We have to hesitate somewhat before passing into law any matter of so radical a nature as prohibition. We are not as a whole a people who drink to excess. There is hardly any other country in the world—I do not think there is any British possession—where the consumption is so small as in Newfoundland. I heard the figures given out by my learned friend, Mr. Morine. He said that our drink bill today was something like one and a quarter million dollars. I do not agree with those figures. I think it would be nearer three quarters of a million, or seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. In the first place this year I think it will be found—and I have no figures by me now, and I am merely quoting from memory—that the duties on spirits and beers will not be more than \$300,000. It may be a little more or less; but taking \$300,000 as an average of the duties collected and add to that the price of the liquor which will not be more than \$150,000—and even if you put it at \$200,000—that is only \$500,000 when the liquor reaches the public house; and now if you add the profit of the publican after it is watered or drugged or whatever may

be done with it which you cannot put down at a much larger amount than \$250,000, it gives you a drink bill of \$750,000, or three dollars for every man, woman and child in the country. Now how does this compare with Great Britain. Why last year their bill was \$17 for every man, woman and child in the country, and in Canada today it is \$12, and in the United States today it is \$26; and yet with us it is only \$2. Now that I think, if figures mean anything, will show that we are not a drunken people, and while we consume a certain amount and perhaps more than we ought, we are very much under the percentage of other countries.

Now, as has been stated, we have had this question before us on two other occasions, and while there are a great many matters and a great many subjects that this Legislature is quite competent to deal with without any mandate from the people—we deal with them every day—yet in a matter of this character which so personally and so closely affects the whole public we ought not to deal with it without at least ascertaining their views. The temperance people who last year petitioned the House in large numbers admitted that. Their very request and their very petition showed that they had fully considered this question, and wisely so; because if it is going to have a result merely like local option, and if you have not the country with you, and have not public opinion behind you, all the Acts of the Legislature and all the prohibitions you can pass will not have the desired effect, and for that reason it was thought well to move slowly and to make haste slowly, and to make certain that in this great national movement we have no mere section of the people, but the whole people behind us; and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, and only for that

reason the Government up to today have not taken action in relation to the petitions presented here last session. Now when these petitions were here they were very fully discussed and the various subjects contained in them fully ventilated by both sides of the House, and it is on record in the Hansard what was said on that occasion by honorable members. The view was taken then I think, if my memory serves me, that we as representatives should not leave this to the people, that this was a matter that we should assume the responsibility of. Well, I regret exceedingly that I have to differ from my learned friend on the more constitutional question. I think you will find on a closer examination that you will get thousands of precedents in this country and in every part of the British Empire where large radical measures are to be introduced they are first submitted to the people; and we ourselves in our own State Book have such precedents—why the very local option law itself is a matter that has to be submitted to the people. The whole trouble of those elections could have been avoided. All these elections could have been dispensed with by a mere Act of Parliament—by five words in an Act of Parliament prohibiting the sale of liquor in the District of Twillingate, or Placentia or Harbor Main or Bonavista; but when the local option question was up the Legislature said this is a matter for the people; it is no mere ordinary civil matter or mere industrial question; but one affecting them in their persons, and affecting them in their lives, and in a way controlling and limiting their liberties, and everywhere that principle has been recognized. "Mandates from the people." Why look at them in every form—not alone in relation to tem-

perance, but in relation to every other matter of grave importance—and you will find that important subjects like this are settled at the polls either following on manifestoes or in other ways.

Now as I have said Mr. Chairman, last year we had these petitions before us, and since they were presented here the Government have had them before them on several occasions and we have been making enquiries in all directions—the most careful enquiries to ascertain whether even we would be justified in bringing down a bill in relation to a plebiscite. We have never come to the point, and it has never been raised until the motion of my hon. friend, Mr. Hickman, of forcing upon the country this measure, and we have been only considering, like the temperance people, as to whether the people should not be given the right to pronounce upon the question. That is the question asked us a year ago, and I have today a Resolution passed at a large temperance meeting in this city the other day in which the very same request is made in relation to this prohibition, and I am glad to be in a position to be able to say to the House to-night that the Government have resolved to bring down a bill this session and pass it into law to enable the people of this country to say whether we should have prohibition all over the country.

But in any case, even if the Government had not resolved on that, there would be no justification for voting for the present legislation that is submitted in these Resolutions because it would be monstrously unfair to say to one half of the country you can drink all the beer you like and to say to the other half, you will not be allowed to have a glass of wine. That is wrong in principle and it is worse than that, because it raises dis-

crimination all over the country and draws a distinction between a man who takes a glass of gin and a man who takes a glass of beer. We have been told here that the reason the Resolution was submitted in this form is that it would be less objectionable. Now, I don't think there is anything in that reason whatever. I think that if we are to have Prohibition here it should be strict Prohibition, and that the people should be allowed to say whether liquor should be excluded from the Colony and whether legislation should be passed to do away with it. It is a very important matter and a very serious matter, and one that ought not to be taken up hurriedly or dealt with lightly. A whole year has gone by since these petitions were before the House. I myself had an opportunity of discussing the whole question with an influential deputation from the Methodist Conference when it was sitting here last year, and I then told them what I have said here, that the whole thing was under the consideration of the Government, and it was only a few weeks ago that the form in which this legislation was to come in here was discussed by the Government with the Attorney-General. And as I have said we have now resolved to give the people of this country an opportunity of saying yes or no to the question of Prohibition, and when that Bill passes, if it passes in the affirmative, we can deal with the whole question all over the country.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am unable to support the Resolution, because it is only a Resolution representing class legislation and dealing with a great question piecemeal, and instead of doing good, it only has the effect of creating great confusion, and would be of no permanent advantage to this country. Now, I agree to a certain extent to what has been said by the hon. member on the other side

as regards to the loss of revenue. Our revenue will be made up and the three hundred thousand that we get from liquor can be obtained by placing duty on other goods. No doubt a great deal of it will come back from the very men who are now spending their money on spirituous liquors; but be that as it may, that would not be a conclusive argument against prohibition, although it might have some weight and some fairness in relation to the Act when the question has to be taken up. I hope now that in view of this announcement the learned introducer of the measure will see that all that can be expected in reason by any of his friends outside is met by the undertaking which I have just stated.

MR. MORINE—Would the Prime Minister explain whether that legislation when it is brought down will merely provide for the taking of a vote or whether it will provide for the Prohibition of liquor to go into effect as the result of the vote without subsequent legislation in this House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say in reply to the hon. member that the Government has not yet come to that point. The Bill that we had had before us is the Bill submitted to the Canadian Parliament, a precedent which my learned friend will be ready to admit is not always a bad one. The Bill that we have been considering is the Bill which was introduced in the Canadian Parliament in 1898, the Bill under which the whole Dominion voted that year. Now, beyond that the Government has not gone.

MR. MORINE—I am sorry that I cannot agree with that precedent. The Prime Minister knows what was the result of that Bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Prohibition was voted down.

MR. MORINE—I will tell you how it was voted down. They voted in

favor of it in every Province of Canada except in Quebec, where as a result of wholesale frauds, they got enough votes to give them a majority in the whole Dominion of Canada, and the law never went into force.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is not a fact. The reason that Sir Wilfred Laurier did not carry it out was that of the whole vote only about 23 per cent. went to the polls.

MR. MORINE—I do not think the Bill will have any value if you are going to follow the Canadian precedent.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I did not say we were. I said that we had not got to that stage yet.

MR. MORINE—You said you were introducing legislation along the Canadian model which you asked me to admit was a good precedent. I said that it was a bad one, but I am now completely satisfied as to one point, and that is that as far as the Government is concerned they do not intend to do anything that will promise that Prohibition will result from the vote of the people at an election which may cost the country between \$40,000 and \$50,000.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No, \$10,000.

MR. MORINE—Well, even \$10,000. The result will simply be that subsequent legislation will have to be introduced. Now, you are asking the member for Bay de Verde to defer his Resolution in view of your promise to bring in this Bill. I would advise him to do nothing of the kind.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I did not ask him. I only hoped that he would consider my announcement sufficient.

MR. MORINE—You did not order him, but you expressed the hope. Now, I would advise the member for Bay de Verde not to be taken in by an expression of hope backed up by

an explanation which shows that the Government have arrived at nothing.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I cannot say that I can compliment the Premier on the stand that he has taken in connection with this matter. He has admitted in his address that the liquor question is an evil. Now, if he recognizes that this is an evil, why does he take all the trouble of asking the people whether they are going to vote for it or against it. If liquor is an evil so great as he makes out, why does he hesitate to do away with it. For my part I am ready to vote here and now for total prohibition, excluding everything in the shape of liquor—ales, wines and all the rest of it—and from what we have heard from the other side of the House the main objection is to the present form of the Resolutions. Now we do not intend to let them get out of it in that way. We represent districts which I consider have given mandates in favor of Prohibition, even though Local Option may have no connection with Prohibition, but I go so far as to say, Sir, that all the Northern Districts when they cut out liquor in their own section are quite prepared to exclude it from the whole country; but knowing that they had no opportunity to do that, the only thing they could do was to cut it out of their own district, and they have done so. But if the Government have resolved to vote down that Resolution, they can do so. We cannot force them. As far as I am concerned, I regret that the Premier did not long ago make this announcement on the Temperance question: Fourteen months ago this matter was brought before him, and up till to-day we have not heard a word about it, and it is my opinion that we would never have heard of it again if this Resolution had not come before the House to-day. Personally I am opposed to liquor. I believe that the man who does not take liquor at

all is the best off. I do not think that the man who takes liquor in moderation is any worse than I am, but I think he would be better off without it. I have always been convinced that liquor is an evil, and all my life I have been a temperance man, and I have always favoured the temperance folks because I have seen many a poor chap go to the bad through liquor. Now, I do not know what will be the effect of the Government's measure, and in order to have this Prohibition matter copper fastened I am going to move an amendment to the Resolutions. I have made these assertions because I do not want the issues of the present session to turn out fruitless. I must, however, say that I cannot altogether agree with the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, as regards the view he has just laid down in reference to consulting the people. I do believe the people ought to be consulted in great issues, such as we are now at present facing, and I thoroughly agree with the views maintained by members of the opposite side who are in accord with me in this respect. For in a difficulty such as the present I think the people ought to have the last word.

MR. CURRIE—I have no intention of entering into any argument on this matter now before the chair. It is one of those questions which might be discussed till doomsday without reaching any conclusion. My sole purpose in entering the debate is to explain briefly my position, as I intend to vote against the resolutions that have been introduced this afternoon. It will be remembered that when the petitions from the Temperance people were presented to the House last session I very strongly endorsed them and claimed that the least that might be done was to give the people an opportunity of voting on the question and settling it once and

for all. Since then I have interested myself somewhat in the petitions and I am in a position to state that they have received the careful consideration of the government and the decision been reached to grant the plebiscite requested. To this legislation I have already pledged my support as it is thoroughly in accord with my views. I know something of the bill, even though as yet it is only in skeleton form and it is one that should receive the support of every honest temperance worker both inside and outside this House. Much has been said here to-day on the necessity of sending this matter to the people. Now while I very largely agree with the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, that this is a question with which the Legislature should not hesitate to deal, I see one very strong reason why it should be left to the people to decide, and it is this. If a prohibition measure were passed by the government, there is always the danger that strong influences might subsequently be brought to bear by the liquor interests which might result in the act being annulled. Such could not occur if the matter were decided by the people for no government would dare to go contrary to the voice of the people. And I think the Temperance people would rather have the question submitted to the electorate. Indeed only to-day I had the pleasure of discussing the situation with a prominent Temperance enthusiast, a city clergyman, who thought the only effective manner of settling it, was by letting the people decide. It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of the plebiscite, and for this reason I shall support the government measure when it comes before the House later on.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Chairman, I

desire to express my ideas on this resolution now before the Chair. Whenever the occasion has offered itself in this Chamber, I have always given my most hearty support to temperance Legislation, and I am prepared moreover, on every occasion that I can conscientiously do so, to support any comprehensive measure or prohibition that will ameliorate present conditions, provided it first be submitted for the decision of the people. I am not prepared to proffer any argument as to the effect such resolutions would have on the revenue. I agree with the member on the opposite side of the House who said that such consideration should not deter us; but I am fully prepared and disposed to favour in any form the decision to put the question before the people and to await their answer. If we are to have a prohibition measure, I desire a clean, comprehensive and an ameliorative one. I do not think that in a matter of such momentous issues the Government should act without the certain authority of the people.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few observations on the matters now before the Chair, that is to say, the motion introduced by the hon. member of Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman. I do not propose to discuss the effects of intemperance, because that has already been dealt with and laid down by previous speakers. There cannot possibly be two questions as to the evils that accrue from the over-indulgence of intoxicating liquors. At the same time I personally prefer to regard the matter from a more temperate standpoint because it must be borne in mind that these resolutions are promoted by a strictly temperance class, and while these people deserve every praise and consideration, yet, we must remember that there is another large class of people who

have rights as well as the others, and I cannot absolutely concur with the Temperance Workers who desire to dictate to that class of people which is perhaps a little less temperate, what must and ought to be. The proportion of people who over-indulge, and the proportion of suffering thereby entailed is not perhaps quite as great as one might suppose and I think on account of this fact, and on account of the very nature of this Resolution we ought to be most temperate in any resolution we may pass. Indeed I am more inclined to wait until this promised legislation comes down to this House. It seems to me that a question of this kind should most certainly be submitted to the people. I think we ought most decidedly to ascertain the feelings of the public in this matter. If I felt that I represented Twillingate alone in this House, I should have no doubt as to how I should vote, but I recognize the fact that I do not sit in this House as a Representative of that District only. I am here as one of the representatives of the whole country, and I do not feel that I am justified in casting my vote in favour of a motion of so far-reaching an importance as prohibition without having an opportunity of testing the feeling of the people of this country. With regard to the amendment just introduced by the Hon. member, I may say that I think that this could be dealt with in the Bill which the Government proposes to introduce when the Bill reaches the Committee stage; but most certainly must the feeling and sympathy of the people prompt any action we may take.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, if I were asked to say whether I would or would not vote in favor of prohibition I may state that I cannot at this juncture say whether I would, or would not. It is a point on which I have not yet made up my mind. But there is

one point, I may say, upon which I have made up my mind, and it is a sentiment to which I have given expression a year ago. I feel a great deal of sympathy with the views referred to by this Bill, which has been so ably advocated by my hon. friend, Mr. Morine, but I must state I am not prepared to be a delegate for any constituency. If any district in the Island wishes to find a delegate, then I am afraid it will have to find some one else other than myself. It is my strongest conviction, and no new notion, that Members of this House are not here as Delegates of their electorate. Whether we are dealing with Temperance or anything else, the Member coming here is supposed to exercise his own judgment in the best interest of the people of the country, for I contend that a member elected to this House does not sit there as representing only the district which elected him. I am a representative of Newfoundland here, and not merely of Trinity. This is no new doctrine. It was given voice to by one of the greatest authorities on this subject, Edmund Burke, who, when he stood for Bristol, stated boldly to his constituents that view, that he was not the delegate sent by the people of Bristol, but that he represented all England, all Great Britain. That is the position that I now take, even if it sends me to sure defeat the next election. A man who acts otherwise is not fit to be in this House. This will explain my attitude towards the Resolution brought forward by Mr. Hickman—a Resolution I may say that I am in great sympathy with. He might have gone further and asked for the total prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of spirits and malt liquors, but as the Resolution now stands I am afraid that I cannot agree with it. It does not seem to go quite far enough. I am not prepared to vote for prohibition under this Re-

solution or any similar resolution. In fact I am prepared to vote against it, because in my belief it is unsatisfactory, and if it were satisfactory I should be prepared to vote for it if I conscientiously thought it desirable. I am prepared, however, to express my approbation of the amendment, but in this case I see no cause of dispute between the Resolution itself and the amendment thereto. I am thoroughly in accord with those hon. members who desire to place this question before the people, for in this matter, where the law is experimental, drastic and far reaching, I consider it but right and proper to refer the question to the whole country, the country at large, before bringing in such an enactment into force. Furthermore, I may say that a measure such as this is very capable of embarrassing the Minister of Finance at this season, a time too critical to permit any dubious steps in a new direction being taken. But I would give my heartiest vote to any measure supporting Prohibition Legislation, if it contained a suspending clause, arranging for a plebiscite, say next Fall, and providing for the resulting enactment coming into force some time like July 1st, 1916, whereby the finances of the current year, and that of July 1st, 1915, to July 1st, 1916, would not be embarrassed. This measure would permit ample time to the Government to consider and make changes in the Tariff, which changes are inevitable more or less under present circumstances.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the intention of the Government is to bring in a Bill providing that a plebiscite shall be taken in November of this year.

MR. M. J. KENNEDY—Mr. Speaker I have listened carefully to the remarks of the honourable speakers and since I have had the pleasure of hold-

ing a seat in this House I always gave my support to any measure in favour of temperance. I have been a temperance man all my life and am a member of an organization in this city with a membership of something like one thousand; no matter when the opportunity may come I shall be one of the first to support a measure for the total prohibition of intoxicating liquors. I was very glad to hear the hon. member Mr. Hickman introduce the measure, but since I have heard the remarks of the Premier, he has made it easier for us to know that there is going to be a measure to support in which the whole population has a voice. I am not going to deal with the measure as it is in its present stage, but when it is brought up, I will be able to give all the support I can. We will be able to put this very important question before the people, and while I have the pleasure of a seat in this House, I never will be a party to anything that the people have not their say in.

F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Chairman, the subject matter of the resolutions now before the Committee is one of considerable importance, and a decision of this House in favour of total prohibition must necessarily have a widespread effect on the rights and liberties of the citizens of Newfoundland. The Temperance question has come to be recognized in this Legislature as a hardy annual, for, during the past twenty-six years since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, scarcely a year has gone by without temperance resolutions of some kind having been introduced. I must congratulate the hon. member who introduced the resolutions here this evening, on the temperate language used by him in his portrayal of the many evils that follow from the over-indulgence of intoxicating liquors. I do not think there is any person who reads

and thinks, and who has the sight of his eyes to observe the happening of things, but must come to the conclusion that the abuse of spirituous liquors has a very bad effect, not only on the individual, who is unfortunate enough to be addicted to over-indulgence, but to his home, his friends and the community generally. So much therefore on the aspect of the question from the abuse and not the use of alcohol.

There are very few subjects that can be introduced into the Legislature where there will be absolute unanimity of opinion upon, and matters generally receive from the various members a certain amount of adverse criticism as well as favourable comment. An important matter of this kind requires a good deal of consideration, as it affects the rights and liberties of a considerable portion of the people of Newfoundland, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, if we vote here to-day for those resolutions the majority of the members of this House will be doing so without having consulted their constituents and ascertaining from them, as undoubtedly they should, their views upon the matter, I doubt not but the resolutions have a considerable number of sympathizers, not only amongst the members of the House, but those outside, as instanced by the large attendance of citizens inside the Bar of the House this evening. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, are those resolutions the outcome of the different temperance organizations all over the country? Or do they merely represent the opinions of one section of the community only. I would ask, Sir, what have we here this evening in support of these resolutions from the great temperance bodies of the Church of England, who we know have done and are doing, such good work all over the country for the cause of temperance. Are these resolutions backed up here to-day by the Total

Abstinence Society of St. John's and by other large and influential temperance bodies that exist all over the country who are members of the Roman Catholic Church. I am always loath, Mr. Chairman, to introduce a question of creed or sect in relation to matters that come before this House, but I am constrained to do so on the present occasion after hearing the hon. member for Burin's statement a while ago, that the Temperance petitions presented last year to this House, were the outcome of one denomination only of the country, and that these prohibition resolutions are the outcome of these petitions. How is it then I ask, that other denominations have not been heard from in this matter? Would not a reasonable inference be that for the present at least, they see no reason for so radical and sweeping a change in the present law of the land. I merely introduce this aspect of the subject because we must view this matter not from a sectional or personal standpoint and before we pass upon it we should fortify ourselves with the opinions of all those outside the House whose interests and rights may be affected.

The district that I have the honour to represent, Placentia and St. Mary's, was one of the first in Newfoundland to come under the operations of the Local Option law. The inhabitants of that District number some sixteen thousand, with over five thousand voters, and up to the present moment I have not had a line or a word from any resident either for or against prohibition. Would I then, Mr. Chairman, be justified in casting my vote here this evening for a measure, the passing of which would curtail their rights and liberties without consulting them, or representing their opinions, in any way upon the matter. I do not want to be, nor would I accept the position of a delegate in this House when dealing with public mat-

ters, still I do not feel myself justified in voting for a measure that will seriously curtail the rights of those I represent, without first consulting and ascertaining their views, especially as this measure is merely the outcome of a section of our temperance workers. Now I do not wish by this, Mr. Chairman, to underrate in any way the good work which the ladies and gentlemen who are identified with this prohibition movement have done, on the contrary, whilst not seeing eye to eye with them on this matter, I extend a respectful sympathy to them in their work, and if, after consultation with my constituents and finding them favourable to prohibition, when the bill as has been outlined by the Premier, is brought before the House, I shall unreservedly give it my support.

I want to make myself clearly understood as to the position I take upon this matter when I say that we as representatives of the people have no right to exercise our mere individual opinions in this House when voting in favour of a measure which if passed, will interfere with the individual rights and liberties of a very large portion of the people whose representatives we are. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the resolution.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, the debate so far appears to have developed a very small and compact question. The main question as to whether one should adopt for this country prohibition or not, is not at issue in the debate. The subject of the debate has been whether this House should pass a Bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors or whether it should take a plebiscite. That is the subject. The main question of prohibition has been referred to by some speakers here this evening. It will be remembered when this question was before the House last year there was

some expression of opinion on the question of a plebiscite. My opinion on that is that we are here with a general mandate to perform all acts of Legislation which become necessary and desirable for the interest of the country.

Now, Sir, in the question before the chair we have criticized it and from the tenor of the debate that is surely what the members are talking about and I do not think anyone could regard this question of Total Prohibition as a matter of ordinary legislation. Take the question of changes in the Tariff and other Legislative matters of kindred nature; here we are dealing with the ordinary duties which devolve upon us. In this case, we are not dealing with normal rights, and I think it should be borne in mind when dealing with rights of this kind, unless you have a public opinion backing you then your efforts are going to be in vain. We look around our country, what are the evils we are legislating upon? We are not suffering at all as other countries are; we are, as a country, a sober one; I do not deny that the abuse of intoxicating liquors in this country has brought evils and grave ones, but take St. John's as the only part of the country that the Legislature is at now. You will find that the liquor traffic is conducted in St. John's in such a manner as to surprise people coming from other countries. That is the fact that most people will admit, the trade is conducted in such an orderly manner. My opinion is, Mr. Chairman, that the use of intoxicating liquor is not in itself a wrong. The use and sale of intoxicating liquors is not a wrong I do believe that intoxicating liquors were placed by Nature's God on this earth for some purpose. I believe the man who abuses these gifts of Providence, is committing an offence against himself and God and his country. But, Sir, I do not think we

should act in this matter until we are satisfied that public opinion is behind us and they demand it. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, in letting the matter drag on; I believe in having a decisive settlement of the matter. I don't believe in having the matter brought up year after year. If we are going to ask the people to express their opinion on it we ought to do it in a proper manner and have done with it. As Dr. Lloyd pointed out a plebiscite should be taken on this question and let us take a certain time and if the pronouncement is in favour of prohibition, then let Prohibition come into force at the date named. Then every person will have the opportunity of expressing his or her opinion on the matter and then the Government can deal with it in a business like way.

Mr. Speaker left the chair from 6.30 to 8 p.m.

The Chairman resumed the chair at 8 o'clock.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr Chairman, the matter I was going to speak about just before the House adjourned was the question as to whether the representatives of this chamber had the power to make such an alteration as this without first appealing to the people, and I would differ from those who say that we have that right. I take it sir, that we are not the supreme authority in all legislative matters; that rests, Sir, in my opinion solely in the people. Laws have been made, Sir, in which the people have had no say; in fact they have not been recognized, and I think that in large issues as the present the people should be considered and consulted. It has been said here this afternoon that if we had to resort to the people for every important bit of legislation that we would always be referring to them. That, Sir, in my opinion is what ought to be done. The laws are for the people and they should decide as to what shall be

these laws. There has been legislation passed in this House which has been passed despite the entire disapproval of the people. The remedy is the question of the "referendum." Before any important legislation at all is passed, the wishes of the people should be considered, and they should give the deciding vote, which is recognized to be the deciding vote not only in this but also in every other great measure.

There are various reasons why I believe that this should be done. In the first place I believe that much of the graft that prevails to-day in the United States of America and Canada would be at an end if the representatives were under the control of the people as they should be; if at any time a member could be recalled to explain his actions at certain times. This is the status of the representatives in the parliament of Switzerland, so now every law made there is virtually what the people want. The fact that they can be recalled at will by the people makes the politicians there wary and they consequently make sure of their districts' desires before adopting any legislation, and to-day there is no need for the enforcement at first necessary because the legislators have learnt the lesson and are practicing it. That sir, is the reason I support the referendum. There has been quite a time since the notice of this resolution and if the people wanted it they had lots of time to petition the Government to that effect. Not only do I know the wishes of my constituents in this matter but I believe I know the wishes of the whole country by the fact that most are Local Option districts, and further by the fact that at the last session of this legislature petitions were received asking that the sending of liquors to the outports be prohibited. When it becomes necessary to petition for such things as these it is very plainly

shown that the people are very strongly opposed to the use of wines, ales and spirituous liquors. That being so, I do not see how the Government can do anything else than act on the suggestion of the movers of this amendment and submit the question to the people not later than November next; for in doing so they will be but carrying out the wishes of the people.

There has been a lot of discussion as to how to get the prohibitive law in this country. The suggestion has been made that each district should be left to itself as to what it will have. I think, sir, that the whole country should decide once and for all its wishes in this connection, and that the Government, after the vote has been taken, should bring in a bill embodying all the legislation needed to carry out the wishes of the people so declared.

In regard to the matter of revenue, I do not think as the hon. member for St. John's East has expressed himself that the people consider the question in this form. There would be no objections as the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings, said to the Government putting on 50c. per barrel more for flour if they knew that by doing it they were conferring a great favour upon the people of St. John's and the outports.

I think the hon. member for St. John's East, if the question were put to him squarely whether he would consider the question of revenue before that of the happiness and comfort of homes, would say, by all means let us have happy homes instead of the broken ones which we have to-day—instead of the ragged children which we see going around our streets or working on our wharves when they ought to be at school, because their fathers don't bring home the necessary money to provide for their education. I do not think, Sir, that hon. members on the other side of the House, if they

considered this matter fairly and squarely, would say that revenue is a question to be considered in this connection at all. To my mind, the only question is as to whether it is proper for this Legislature to decide here tonight that we shall have prohibition or not. I submit that in view of the fact that we have to-day all the outport districts supporting Local Option, and in view of the large number of petitions which were presented to this Legislature last year, the people of the outports have expressed, in no uncertain way, that as far as they are concerned, they want this measure put through the House as quickly as possible. I trust that the Government will give the amendment which was proposed here this afternoon the consideration which it deserves, and allow it to pass.

MR. CURRIE.—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. gentleman on the other side, it is my intention to vote against it. I consider that the amendment questions the bona fides of the Government. The Premier has stated that it is the intention of the Government to bring down a bill along the lines of the petitions presented last year to this House, and if I vote for the amendment it is tantamount to saying that I have no confidence in the Premier's statement that this Bill will be brought down. When that Bill comes before the House, it will then be time enough to discuss its details. I have every confidence that the Government will bring down the measure which they have promised, and I am prepared to support it.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, before recess I understood the hon. member for Burin to say that he had seen the Government's proposals and was satisfied with them.

MR. CURRIE.—I saw part of the skeleton bill, but not the completed bill.

MR. MORINE.—You said that you had seen the Government's proposals and that you were satisfied with them. Now, those proposals do not contain a proposition to the effect that if the people vote in favor of prohibition the law shall go into force at once.

MR. CURRIE.—If I might be allowed to interrupt, as far as I understand them, they do.

MR. MORINE.—We had from the Premier this afternoon the statement that he was following the Canadian precedent.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I did not say anything of the kind. I said that the Government had considered that Bill. I did not say that the Government was following it in our own Bill.

MR. MORINE.—You referred to it as an example. Now, if I understand anything, an example is something that you are going to follow. I don't know any other meaning. Certainly, we had not the slightest suggestion from the Premier that he had any thought whatever of going beyond the Canadian bill. He has not made a suggestion up to the present moment that the Government entertained the idea of going beyond the Canadian bill. I make bold to say across the floors of the House that up to the present moment the Government have not even considered going beyond that Bill; and I go further, and challenge criticism now, and say that the Government have not up to the present entertained the idea of introducing into this House a Bill which would come into force, upon a favorable vote of the people, without subsequent legislation. There has been no suggestion here this afternoon that the Government had had any such measure under consideration, or had thought of it. Now, if they had not thought of this, how could the hon. member for Barin be satisfied with the proposals, in view of his present statements? Be-

cause let us see what that means. In Canada, the Government, as I have been reminded this afternoon by the Premier, felt that there should be a vote of the people on the matter of prohibition. When the vote was taken, a great many people refrained from voting altogether. The Dominion is tremendously large and tremendously scattered. There was nothing except the enthusiasm of a few temperance people throughout the country behind the movement; there was no organization to send speakers around the country to discuss it; I suppose thousands of people hardly knew that a vote was being taken at all; and the result was that the number who voted at all was so small that, as the Premier has said, although a small majority of those who did vote were favorable, the Laurier Government declined to act upon it. The effect of that was that all those who were dead, all who were absent, all who were sick, and all who were indifferent, were practically turned into opponents of the Bill. If you follow that example here and require a certain proportion of the people to vote for the measure the same thing would result here. Everyone who was indifferent, or absent, or dead, or for any other reason did not vote, would be counted as against the Bill. Furthermore, I think I am right (the Premier has looked at the Canadian Bill recently and can correct me if I am wrong) in saying that the Canadian Bill contains no provision that prohibition should go into force on a favourable vote, but simply provides for a Bill. It contains no pledge at all, other than the pledge of the Government to the effect that if they were satisfied with the vote a Bill might be introduced. That would mean that in this case, after the vote was taken, the Government might come in and say that they were not satisfied with the vote, there was not majority enough, or something of that

sort; and then the whole thing would have to be gone over again in the Legislature; or a change of government might take place in the meantime, or something else that would interfere with the Bill; and all the money and effort which had been put into the matter would be simply wasted. If the Government follow along those lines at the present time there would not be the slightest assurance on the Statute book, not even the verbal promise of anybody, that anything would result, because a thousand and one things might happen which would prevent the plebiscite vote from resulting in anything whatever.

Now, the next excuse we hear from the hon. member for Burin is that he will vote against this amendment because it questions the bona fides of the Government. How does it do this, Sir? The Government have not said that they will do these things, so that we can be said not to be trusting them. If the Government had said that they would introduce a bill of that kind, the position would have been different. In fact I will make this offer now—and I am sure that it will be acceptable to everybody: We will not press this amendment, and we will withdraw this resolution, if the Government will get up now and say that they will introduce a bill this session containing what is in this resolution. We are willing to do that. If the Government will say that during this session they will introduce a bill providing for prohibition in this country, to go into force on the 1st July, 1916, provided the result of the plebiscite vote is that a majority of the electorate is in favor of such a measure going into force, without the necessity of any further legislation in this House, we on this side are prepared now to withdraw the original resolution and the amendment, and accept the statement of the Government to that effect. Now, does that look

like lack of confidence? It is not lack of confidence to instruct a government as to what you want them to do when they have not declared any contrary policy, or when they have made no declaration as to their policy. And what is the declaration which has been made by the Premier? The Premier has merely said here, in effect, that they have been considering the matter, and that the consideration has been along the lines of providing for a plebiscite. He has not said as to what is to follow the plebiscite. He has not told us whether the Bill will go into force as a result of the plebiscite or whether we will have to come back to another session of the House and pass a bill—to have it thrown out, perhaps, in the Legislative Council, if not here, or some one of a thousand and one other things that can happen to interfere with the result of the vote.

The hon. member for Burin says that this is questioning the bona fides of the Government, and says that it will be time enough to discuss this matter when the Government bring in their bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me deal with that question. The hon. member is a member of a party, and while in that party he is bound by the majority, and the majority of that party is the Government. The Government will consider this bill and decide on some course and come down here and support it; and he must either vote for it or else get out of the party. Then we will have the hon. member getting up and saying: I have faith in the Government; I believe in the general policy of the Government and am not going to vote against them; and he will support the bill, not perhaps because he likes it but because he has got to support the Government. Now is the time for the Government member who is in earnest about this question to express his convictions in a concrete form, so that

the Government may know what he means and what he will stand by; it will be too late by and by when the Government nail their colors to the mast. The sly old fox who leads the Government on the other side would like to have an unpledged membership behind him, I can understand, so that whatever he resolves to do will receive the entire support of his Party.

The debate this afternoon has been a very remarkable one in several respects. In the first place it has been marked by brief and excellent speeches, directly to the point; and in the next place it has marked a high-water mark in debates on prohibition, in that it has been admitted by practically everybody in the House that prohibition would be a good thing, if a majority of the people were in favor of it. That is the best that I have ever heard in this House in a debate on this subject. The question is, however, not prohibition, not the abuse of liquors, not individual liberty. The question is: Are a majority of the people in favor of prohibition or not? Now, I would advise all those who are in favor of the original proposition, and I am one of those, to vote for the amendment, which will come first, because that brings the debate here this afternoon to a concrete action. If the amendment is lost, and any other amendments that may be proposed, we come back to the original resolution. But we who are in favour of the original resolution ought all be in favor of the amendment, because while it will not result in direct prohibition, it will send the matter to the people, and direct prohibition will result if the vote is favorable. As Mr. Kent, the Leader of the Opposition, put it, the question which we have to consider at the present moment is not should we have prohibition, but should we have a plebiscite; and what shall result from the plebiscite? Shall it be merely a declaration, to be followed

or not followed, as the case may be, or shall it be something definite? Now, the proposition before the Chair in the amendment adopts the principle of leaving the question to the people, but it goes further, and says that the people's voice shall be decisive; it shall not be an empty expression of opinion, but, if favorable, and inexpensive because it will be worth it. What is the use of beating about the question? If the only question is whether we shall leave the matter to the people, then let us introduce a well-considered prohibition measure into this House during this session and have it put on the Statute Book, and provide that it shall not come into force until a plebiscite vote of the people has been taken, and, if a majority of the people are favorable to it, then, by a mere proclamation to that effect, by the Governor in Council, it shall become the law of the land, to go into force on the 1st July, 1916; then the people of the country will have some return for the effort which they may make. If you adopt the other course, what will happen? Why, the temperance people, who will have to do the work, who will have to bear the expense, even if they succeed in securing a majority vote, will still be at the mercy of the Government of the day—either this or some other Government—as to whether a bill will be introduced or not. Let us have a measure providing for prohibition, if the people decide in favor of it, and then there will be no chance of interference from the Government, or another House, or any of the things which might otherwise render void the decision of the people. As I have said, the temperance people will have to do all the work; everybody else will stand on one side. Well, then, these people have the right to a guarantee in advance that if their work is successful the result will be prohibition and not a mere promise.

It appears to be that that is a doctrine that ought to appeal to every honest, square man in this House, no matter on which side he may be; and therefore, this amendment is one which the Government could accept. It is not a vote of want of confidence. Nobody has mentioned that idea.

The Premier said this afternoon that he thought \$10,000 would pay the expenses of the election. I think I am right in saying that a general election costs something in the neighbourhood of \$50,000, and while it is true that some volunteer labour will be given in this instance, yet I think it will be found extremely difficult to get the expenses down to that figure. But whatever the cost is, we can ill-afford at the present time to spend it without getting some good result.

The hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Clift, said this afternoon, I think without sufficient consideration, that instead of pressing this matter here now to a decision, we ought perhaps wait until the Government come down with their proposals, so that we might see what they are. Now, nobody should know better than he that then it will be too late to do anything, if the proposals are not satisfactory to us. If the Government come down with a proposition, they will put it through the House; and therefore to wait until then is practically to leave the matter in the hands of the Government. I don't think that is a wise suggestion. But I have been authorized by those who sit on this side of the House to say that if the Government will undertake to introduce a Bill during this session, with a proviso that it will go into effect upon the vote of the people being favorable, we will withdraw this resolution here now, and leave the whole matter to the honor of the Government.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken, and I do not intend to occupy much of the time of

the House now; but I think that certain of the remarks of the hon. member for Bonavista must have conveyed to the House the fact that it is a good thing that we have as Leader of the House the "sly old fox."

MR. MORINE.—A good thing for you.

MR. HIGGINS.—A good thing for us all, because I think we must all admit that it will require some sly old fox to keep track of the arguments of the hon. member. What has actually happened is that he has assumed the position of Master of Ceremonies of this affair, and he has flung at those of us who are daring to vote against his amendment the taunt that we are taking refuge under the party wing. Now, I would like him to know that when I vote against the amendment, as I shall do, I shall vote against it because, unlike him, I have confidence in that sly old fox, and, unlike him, I am not unmindful of the fact that the Leader of the Government, from his place at this House, has informed the House, and through the House, the country, that he proposes to accede to the wishes of those who petitioned this Legislature in connection with this matter, and that during this session he will bring down a measure putting on the statute book the plebiscite that they have asked for, and I have sufficient faith in him to say now that I believe he will carry out that promise. It is not a party measure. Is not the position this, that the history of this Government has been that the requests of temperance people have had from it a more friendly ear than from any Government in recent history? The temperance people come to put a straight question to this Government, and the Government announces that they are going to grant the request. I would not be unkind enough to suggest that this is being viewed from the standpoint of a clever politician. When we fight against the amendment

we do not fight against prohibition. The hon. members opposite heard the statements of the Government. What I understand is that the Government had under consideration the petitions that were presented last year to this House. The Government proposes to put the law on the Statute Book and take a plebiscite. The Government that would not grant what the people want would not live 48 hours afterward. No Government would dare take upon itself the responsibility of refusing to the majority of the electorate of this Island what they want. If a plebiscite was not granted when the majority wanted it, I certainly would not remain with such a Government. A lot of consideration has been given to the fact that an election was held in Canada on this same question, which was turned down because only 23 per cent. went to the polls. This cannot be said to represent the people. A bare majority of those who vote must not govern a question like this. I trust that the Government Act will be to that effect. A majority of the people of this Island have to decide the question. Because there are some people who are strong on temperance in a community, is that a pronouncement upon which the Government should work? That is a provision that I should expect such a bill to contain. It was suggested here that there was a burking of this question. But that is not so; it is the Government's intention to bring into this Legislature this session a resolution for a plebiscite of the people, who will then get the benefit of the bill. I wish to say this, that I think that the hon. member will find that there will not be any attempt to make a party measure of it. I am voting against the amendment because I think that it is safer to limit the Government on a matter like this. I have no reason to vote for the amendment, because I know that the measure will satisfy the members of the Opposition.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, who has just sat down, tells us that the government that would not introduce a bill after a plebiscite in favour of it, would not live forty-eight hours. But governments in other places have done the same thing, and they are still living; if however the people of this country have the good sense to put us in power, we will put the measure into force.

There is another point that I want to make; no government has power to bind the Legislative Council; nor has it power to force the Upper House into line. The hon. member cannot see how a bill could go into force without the majority of the electorate behind it. Yet the opposition on this side of the House has had a majority vote behind it for the last two sessions. I do not know the exact vote, but I do not think that the hon. member represents a majority of the votes in his own district. The member for St. John's East said that with him it was a matter of principle. If the bill must have a majority of the whole country behind it, the indifferent and the sick and the dead who are on the voters lists will be voting against it. The principle of the resolution is to have prohibition if the people wish. The date which the hon. member fixed is far enough away to be convenient for financial reasons. In all great measures, practically every measure is introduced by a resolution expressing the principle there is in it; and then the bill is introduced.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I ask the member for Burin what he means when he states that any plebiscite must be carried by the majority of the electorate and if he still intends to take the same position.

MR. CURRIE—The member for Twillingate is mistaken. I said nothing regarding majorities; he must be

quoting some other speaker. As the question has been raised, however, I desire to say that in my opinion a fair percentage of the total vote should be obtained to carry prohibition. I do not think, for instance that if say only twenty thousand persons went to the polls a bare majority of that figure should bring the measure into effect. It would be too small a vote.

MR. MORINE—What vote would you consider necessary?

MR. CURRIE—I'll tell you that later.

MR. COAKER—You go outside and preach temperance and then come in here and say that you will not vote for it. The hon. member for St. John's East said that the history of the present government has been that they acceded to the people's wishes. What action was taken upon the matter last year when those petitions came in. The temperance bill did not go in and will not get in. Why, does the government come here and state that they were going to introduce a bill and give the people an opportunity of voting on the matter. We have found out the facts. We believed the government last year, but what did we find: their promises were not fulfilled. Why do you make a party measure of it? Come out and end this debauchery. Are you going to make a party measure of it? There are 6 or 7 men on this side of the House who did not ever taste liquor and who would give their lives for the bill to come through. The temperance people might as well go away for they are not going to get what they want. I did not change my views to suit Mr. Morine and do not intend to. But I am willing to listen to the advice of my seniors. The government would not live forty eight hours if they did not accede to the wishes of the people. Who is going to turn them out? If it was as easy to pass a prohibition

bill as it is to turn them out, then we will soon get prohibition. There are 30,000 more voters on this side of the House, than on that. What have you done with your minority vote? Why did we last year trust to the word of the Premier and of the government? The defeated candidates of last election were sent up to the Upper House.

These two brilliant men, these two most popular men went down to their districts after so many years of service and were kicked out by the electors. If you can put up with these men you can put up with anything.

Last year when we brought up in this House a very serious matter in connection with the Minister of Finance and Customs we were told that it was going to be investigated in the Supreme Court. Well what has been done and where is the investigation now? Are we going to have a result like that in connection with these promises for Prohibition? We want you to put in black and white what you are going to do in this matter coming up year after year but we want you to bring in a bill to hold an election and if the people vote in favour of Prohibition then let us have it once and for all. You have a chance to pass total Prohibition right here and now. There are some men on your side of the House of pronounced temperance principles and we will all vote for it. What is the need for all this row that has been started over this measure. We do not want it. Things have been going very smoothly for the two weeks that we have been sitting. There has not been a division of the House and there has never been a session when the government and opposition have worked so well together. But if you want something else in place of that and if you want trouble I for my part am quite prepared to give it to you. Now I

wonder if I can ask the Premier to tell me exactly what he is going to do in this matter and if his explanation is satisfactory we may be able to drop the whole matter and withdraw this amendment to the Resolution. As a matter of fact I know that quite a number of members on that side of the House will vote against the Resolutions and against the amendment because they think we are endeavoring to make political capital out of this question. Well, now, I promise you that if you will meet us half way we for our part will attempt to make no political capital out of it. We are only to do our best in the interests of this question. We are all determined that we shall have Prohibition and I believe that if we pass it you will be doing the best thing that you have ever done for the country. I believe that sincerely and truly and I will work for it and do all in my power. Now a good many members of the House believe the same and where will you find the man who will go out of this House and say that he voted against Prohibition being put into force in this country. Well then if we agree on that why can't the Premier get up and say that he will bring in a bill providing for those conditions laid down in the Amendment. If he will do that we are satisfied. We are not divided on the matter and we all say that we would like to see these temperance reforms. Why then not get to work and settle the matter once and for all. It is too serious a matter to be fighting about and we have been talking about it for the past two years.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman, it is with somewhat mixed feelings I rise for the purpose of discussing the question before the Chair. There have been many differences of opinion expressed in regard to this great question and I feel assured that we ought

to give the question itself our utmost regard because it is after all a moral question and one that insinuates itself into every one's heart and it ought to be considered by every one and especially by us representatives of other men as the question is of the utmost importance. Nevertheless I regret to say that there have been one or two treatments of the question this evening that are not altogether in line with the subject to be considered. There is in the first place the question of revenue. Those who are in favour of Prohibition made light of the financial aspect, that is in so far as they have touched upon it and only referred to the \$350,000 which is derived from the duty on liquor. But, Sir, that is only a small part of what must be considered in relation to the carrying out of this question of Prohibition. Suppose to-morrow this House by a majority vote carried Prohibition and we issue our proclamation a week hence, where is the provision for carrying out the act. Where is the small item of \$350,000 to be considered in relation to the immense expense that will be entailed on this country in properly carrying out the act, because no man surely proposes to carry a measure through the House without being perfectly satisfied that the country is capable of carrying out the law in every particular. Just think for yourself, Sir, we have in the vicinity of the Colony millions of gallons of liquor, within a few miles of the coast and we have to-day a revenue boat or sometimes two and it is said in the public Press of the country that these are incapable even at present of protecting certain sections of the coast of this country. Think what will happen if you passed this Prohibition. I am prepared to say that if I believe that to-day it was possible to carry out the measure in its entirety and to the satisfaction of

the people of this country I would be one of the first to vote for it but because I believe that it is impossible under the present circumstances to carry it out, I believe we would be only stultifying ourselves, and I believe if you pass a law and are unable to carry it out you run the danger of bringing that law and every other law in the country into contempt. If you cannot carry out the law you create a vast number of smugglers, men that will be night and day contravening the law and every subsidiary law in connection therewith.

A great deal was said because the Government was not immediately prepared to acquiesce in the proposition before the chair. Well look at the Mother of Parliaments. Look at Gladstone, Disraeli and various parliamentarians that we read of in recent history. Look at the legislation in connection with the Corn Laws and the Ballot Act and other great measures passed through the Commons and look at the number of years and brilliant speeches and the number of sessions before these became law. Now we sit here and when any measure comes up it must be given careful consideration because the Government has not only to think for itself but for the whole people. Not only for those that believe in their policy but also for those who oppose it and it is only natural to think that we should take time in considering what we are doing.

Now reference has been made to temperance legislation in the United States and in Canada but is there anyone in this House who can stand up and say that anyone of these acts in these various states or provinces are being carried out in any degree like what was expected by the temperance people. You have to-day in these places drug fiends, opium eaters and the like of that. Are we going to introduce that here? I say we are unless we are prepared and the country is

able to carry out the Act that we are about to place on the Statute Book. Our island is large, its coast line immense and the people scattered all over the island on the fringe of the sea. How are you going to prevent with our present machinery or even with treble that machinery, smuggling in this Colony. Take care that you do not create a greater evil than you have at the present time. It is unfair for the Opposition or any party of men to practically make the assertion that this country is not practically sober because it is. Every town outside of the city of St. John's is under the Permissive Act. The people carried Local Option themselves and you have no right at all to stand up here and make the statement that these men are anything other than sober. Surely a man is not a drunkard or intemperate because he takes a glass of spirits and it surely is not contended that such a man is going to brutalise himself and fall into a drain because other people abuse liquor. There ought to be a distinction between the man that takes his glass of wine and the man who brutalises himself through alcohol. All medical men agree that liquor is necessary in certain cases and we know to-day we have in this Colony the soberest people on this side of the Atlantic and we should take care that we do not do anything which will open the door to creating greater evils than at present exist. Do we intend to bring ourselves into contempt because of a few individuals in the community who are accustomed to making brutes of themselves by the abuse of liquor. Surely, Sir, this is a question wherein moral suasion comes in to a large degree and we have men with us this evening, those leaders in temperance who are prepared to sacrifice their time no matter where they may be and who by the example of their lives are prepared to show the value

of temperance. They are not singular in this. Take even the last century and you will find leading temperance workers showing an example of rectitude and morality and by their work and example bringing about the great reforms which exist to-day. Take the great English Bishops down the century. Take that magnificent world figure, John Wesley, who is the man in this House to-night who will not admit that the world has been better because he lived? Look at great men like Blackwood and Gore and the great men of the Roman Catholic Church and the Presbyterian Church and the Salvation Army. Surely we cannot throw all these aside and surely we cannot forget the grand example seen here this afternoon and yesterday afternoon who are prepared to give their time and come here and try and advance this temperance movement with the hope of raising up common humanity.

There is a great deal said from the other side of the House with regard to the manner in which this Bill will be considered by us when it comes down and it appears that some members on the other side of the House are lacking in confidence and thinking that this Bill is not going to come. Well now supposing we were to say to members of the other side of the House that they were not altogether sincere in everything they said in their advocacy of this measure. If we were to say that there was some other object in view. An hon. member the other day in discussing the financial measures of the Colony was advising us that we ought to be very careful in relation to our public moneys because we have had a deficit last year and may have another next year and we may eventually find it impossible to carry on our own affairs and yet he comes in here to-night and speaks to this motion so strongly that anybody who has known him for more

than thirty years is led to believe that there must be some other object in view because the direct and immediate result of this Prohibition measure will be that the Colony will lose \$250,000 to \$400,000 annually and in addition to this there is the great expense that will be entailed in carrying out the Act itself.

MR. MORINE.—Would you allow me to ask you a question?

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Yes.

MR. MORINE.—Do you not intend to vote for the plebiscite proposal of the Government?

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Yes.

MR. MORINE.—And why are you talking against Prohibition?

MR. DEVEREAUX.—I am not talking against Prohibition. I am only giving my ideas of it and the reason that I believe that the Government ought to be most careful in considering this before bringing down a Bill. That is all. There may as I say be some other object than Prohibition and if there is surely any hon. member from this side or any side ought to be very careful before voting in connection with it.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this Resolution to pass without placing myself on record as being a consistent out and out temperance advocate. We have had very many excellent speeches from members on both sides of the House on this subject;—some very good, others indifferent and others evading the question altogether; but I wish to be quite plain in my statement in supporting the Resolution introduced this afternoon by the honourable member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman. I do so on principle, because I believe that the liquor traffic is a great evil; and if we have something in our midst that is sapping our existence, taking away from us our best manhood, endangering us not only

physically, morally and economically, but from every standpoint you may look at it I think that any and every means of checking this evil and if possible putting it out of existence should be restored to; and if this Legislature simply votes for these Resolutions which prohibit the importation and sale and manufacture of spirituous liquors it will be, as has already been said, the greatest blessing that ever came to this country and this land. Now, I cannot understand the last speaker and cannot congratulate him on his effort. I am sorry for that because I look with pity upon the members who spoke upon this subject this afternoon and who could not speak in favour of the Resolutions; and I think if I were in their place and had nothing good to say about these Resolutions I should say nothing at all.

Now Mr. Devereux, the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, although perhaps he did not mean to do so, has, in my opinion, insulted the intelligence of temperance workers in this house and in the country. He tried to make it appear that they did not know what they were working for and plainly and most emphatically expressed himself as being opposed to prohibition. Now if the honorable member really feels in his own heart and believes that, it would be much better to keep it to himself and not insult the intelligence of ladies and gentlemen who have taken the trouble to interest themselves in this subject and come to this House this afternoon. He should have more regard for these ladies and gentlemen, and not say that they did not know what they were working for; that they should use moral suasion and get down to the level of these men who are wallowing in the gutter of intemperance and by moral suasion

get them to sign the pledge. They have been working at that all their lives.

MR. DEVEREUX—How did I insult them?

MR. HALFYARD—The insult is to tell them that prohibition is no good and they should not be working for it. Perhaps, however, the honourable gentleman did not mean it that way.

From that he went on to insinuate that there were ulterior motives at the bottom of the introduction of these Resolutions? Such an expression comes with bad grace from the hon. member and I am sorry he used it at all. From the little knowledge I have why these Resolutions were introduced I think that nobody outside of the introducer himself had any idea that the Resolutions were coming before the Legislature till within the past ten or twelve days. He had the courage of his convictions, and knowing that this Government and other governments had burked the question from time to time, he resolved to bring the question fairly and squarely before the House. He need not look from any help from the government; and some people who outside this House have always posed as the greatest temperance advocates have spoken against the Resolutions. By passing these Resolutions nine tenths of the sins and suffering of our people will be eliminated; and the way I look at it is that any consistent temperance worker should support any measure that would in any way curtail the sin and suffering caused by intemperance. Some people, however, seem to want the whole thing or nothing. Then the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's referred to some great men. He however was content with mentioning their names. He did not say what they did. Have they all been in fav-

out of moral assuasion? Do you want to know what Canon Willberforce said about the liquor traffic?

I will now read some extracts from the sayings of great men on the question of moral assuasion as applied to this ever-absorbing topic of liquor.

Canon Willberforce says:—

"I do venture to say, even if I am called unpatriotic for saying it, that there is more blood on the escutcheon of England at this moment than there is on the escutcheon of Turkey. I accuse my country of adopting a policy which is subversive to the morals of her people. I accuse her of going forth to colonize other nations with the brandy bottle in one hand and the Bible in the other. And I accuse my country of gaining the major part of her revenue from the vice and immorality of the nation. I would sooner see the cathedrals rot upon the ground than that they should be rebuilt by the colossal fortunes that have been raised from the drivelling illocy of the English people. With one hand these immense drink firms beautify cathedrals, and with the other hand they replenish the drink shops. Is it not a grim and awful mockery while the back streets of the city are a sink of drunkenness, reeking up every night to heaven? It seems like hush money given to the church of the living God to pay it a price for silence."

This is surely a sufficient indictment against the liquor traffic to satisfy everyone that it is bad from every point of view. I will now read an extract from one of John Bright's speeches on the subject:—

"What is the chief obstacle to the evangelization of the heathen? Hear the report of the missionaries. Through the drunkenness of British and American seamen and the extensive introduction by them of ardent spirits among the natives, many of the little

churches gathered upon the heathen strand have been broken up; the labours of the missionaries thwarted, and their lives endangered. The beautiful islands which gem the bosom of the Pacific, in peril of being flung back into the scathed and blighted desolation of spiritual death. What is the greatest obstacle to the diffusion of education among the masses of people of this country? The love of strong drink! How many thousands of children are deprived of instruction, and reared in contact with vice and every debasing influence through the drunkenness of their parents? The drunken habits of the people prevent the good which a general distribution of the Holy Scriptures is calculated to produce."

C. H. Spurgeon says:—

"The demon of drink must be fought, for it swallows men by thousands, makes their homes wretched, their children paupers, and their souls the prey of the devil." He says: "No two opinions can exist upon the point—namely, that the accursed habit of intoxication lies at the root of the main part of London's poverty, misery and crime."

These are the words of men who know what they are talking about, and how any hon. member in face of such words can vote against those resolutions, is beyond my comprehension. During the course of this debate some hon. members had stated that our present financial position and the loss of revenue which would result from prohibition, would not justify them in voting for the resolutions. There was a statement made here this evening that the sum of \$750,000 was annually spent by our people on intoxicating liquors. Upon this question I wish to quote the following figures, as taken from the Customs Revenue for 1912:—

THE VALUE AND DUTIES OF THE ENDED, JU	FOLLOWING IMPORTS FOR YEAR NE 30th 1913.	
	Home Consumption Value	Duty Gross Amt. Rec'd. in Currency.
Ale, Beer, Porter, etc.	\$14,565.00	\$ 5,520.05
Cider	415.00	107.30
Spirits, Alcohol, Spirits of Wine etc. . .	82.00	311.50
Spirits, Cordials	594.00	261.40
Spirits, Brandy	3,844.00	22,862.00
Spirits, Whisky	44,635.00	98,301.20
Spirits, Gin	2,866.00	5,586.20
Spirits, Rum	27,876.00	180,861.60
Malt	4,190.00	419.00
Wines, Champagne	2,658.00	1,360.40
Wines, Port and Madeira	9,577.00	7,524.00
Wines, Sherry, Manzanilla, Malaga, Montilla, Hock, Burgundy, etc., Claret, Spanish, Red Sicilian, De- nia Cape and Common Lisbon ...	5,979.00	2,378.45
	<u>\$125,107.00</u>	<u>\$230,702.95</u>

Additional duty collected if same quantity imported since the taxes were increased by \$1.00 per gallon on the following:—

Brandy	\$ 4,532.00
Whiskey	28,452.00
Gin	3,687.00
Rum	75,259.00
Wines, Champagnes	274.00
	<u>\$114,204.00</u>
Amt. collected under old tariff.	320,703.93
	<u>\$435,007.93</u>
10% Surtax	43,500.79
Total Revenue	\$478,508.72
Value when landed ..	125,107.00
	<u>\$603,615.72</u>

Allowing 15% on \$603,615.72 as re-
tailed, to be added to cost and duty,
equals \$1,509,923.30 spent by the peo-
ple in this colony on alcoholic bever-
ages. If that amount of money was

spent in dutiable goods, for which
40% duty would be paid, a revenue of
\$603,615.72 would be derived, whereas
we now get a revenue of \$478,508.72,
a difference in favour of the Colony
of \$125,107.00.

In the face of these figures, how can
any hon. member vote against pro-
hibition? Look at the wastage of hu-
man life caused by the excessive use
of alcoholic liquors. Men who indulge
freely in this respect cannot do a day's
work faithfully, and further time is
lost during the sobering-up period. The
money spent in drink is wasted, and
much comfort would follow its ex-
penditure in other directions. In the
face of the fact that nearly all miser-
ies are caused by the excessive use of
liquor, we have heard hon. members
on the other side of the House, who
profess to uphold temperance princi-
ples, oppose those resolutions on the
ground that the country would be af-
fected from a financial standpoint.
This is simply burying their convic-
tions, which I believe is done for party

reasons. I did not think that any party spirit would be displayed on this question, and I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Currie, expressing himself as he did to-night. The partisan spirit manifested here is contemptible. By passing this bill we know that contentment and happiness would take the place in this country of a large amount of the misery and wretchedness caused by drink. The plea of patriotism is put forward by some hon. members as a justification for their opposition to the resolutions. Someone has said: "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." I believe the truest form of patriotism consists in making the inhabitants of the country contented and happy, and any hon. member who would shirk his responsibility by opposing any measure having those objects in view, is not worthy the support of the electorate. I do not care what a district would want me to do in a matter such as this. I do not intend to consult the district of Fogo as to my attitude in this matter. I agree with Dr. Lloyd's remarks in this respect. I look upon the people as being too rational and intelligent—even if some of them are opposed to prohibition—to do or say anything against me because I supported those resolutions. Men are intelligent and reasonable, and they sent us here with the object in view of bringing about such a condition of things in this country that would put them upon a higher plane of living and thinking, and bringing about a state of contentment instead of the dissatisfaction which now exists. I look upon the present occasion as an opportunity given to this House to bring contentment and happiness to the people. We are willing to spend money and extend our sympathy to the men and their dependents who die on land or sea, fighting for their King and Country. Loss of revenue and the expenditure of a million dollars is not considered

when the independence, happiness and homes of our country and nation are threatened. But we forget that the lives and homes of our people are threatened by the use of intoxicating liquors. The hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, in the course of his remarks on the Speech from the Throne, stated that any industry, the prosecution of which entailed such expense that proper provision could not be made so as to ensure the lives and safety of the men employed, should be discontinued. I agree with the learned Doctor in this particular. If you cannot safeguard the lives and safety of the crew of a steamer by the installation of wireless telegraphy, let that ship remain in port. So with the liquor business; it is too dangerous; cut it out. The excessive use of intoxicating liquors is a menace and a danger to the youth and men of this country, and it is an insult to the intelligence of our people to be told that we must go to the people and receive instruction from them as to whether or not we are to take measures to remove such a menace. The speech delivered by the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, Mr. Devereaux, was permeated with sophistry, particularly in his reference to the evil being overcome by moral suasion. In this respect we have Russia, France and Great Britain as an example. Some people are inclined to take the Mother Country as an example for everything. But I do not agree with England's policy in relation to the liquor traffic. A country that has quite a number of its clergy shareholders in breweries and distilleries is showing a poor example and one we should not copy in that respect. England's connection with the liquor traffic and opium trade is to be censured, and she is now repenting of her sins, and trying to curtail a business which is her greatest enemy. Some hon. member remarked that the reason why Russia

had prohibited the sale of vodka was because of its demoralizing effect upon its armies. The demoralizing effect of vodka was not confined to the army but to the whole nation. It is remarkable what a reformation has been brought about in the industrial lives and in the homes of that country since this prohibition of the sale of vodka has taken place. By the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of vodka in Russia a miracle has taken place by which bread has been given the poor, fire on their hearths, reformed the wifebeater, and lifted a people from vileness and despair to happiness and self-respect. Previous to the Czar's Ukase, Russia had its 'Black Monday.' The peasants went to work sodden, stupid and depressed after a day spent in the wine shops, and generally a day was lost in the mid-week for the same reason, drink. Their wives were underfed and half naked. Now all is changed. The men come to work cheerful and sober, their work has improved incredibly, and women have a great burden lifted from them. They are better fed, better clothed and better housed, and they look like a superior order of beings. There is the change from a people starving, hopeless, inefficient, slaves to drink, to a people well nourished, industrious and regenerated. The Chief of Police of Moscow says there is now comparatively no crime. It used to be a common thing to see men and women lying dead drunk in the side street; now a drunken man is not to be seen, and a woman can walk the streets with no fear of being insulted.

We must not look upon the question of the expense incurred by adopting these resolutions, for to do so would be arguing backwards. A great saving in the expenditure now incurred owing to the drink traffic would be saved. The hon. member Mr. Deneux had suggested that a large

amount of machinery would require to be put in force in order that a prohibition law be carried out. I cannot agree with such an argument. The loss of revenue which would immediately result by the prohibition of the importation of liquors will be more than made up by the increased earning power of the people, and less money will be spent in enforcing laws which are broken by those addicted to drink. From every point of view, this country would benefit by prohibiting the importation of liquors and I therefore have great pleasure in supporting the amendment now before the chair.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

It is not my intention to delay this House at this late hour, but I wish to place myself on record on the matter now before the Chair. The hon. member for Bonarville Mr. Morine early this evening stated that the debate of this afternoon was a remarkable one because the speakers were brief, concise and to the point in a way that reflected credit on the House. I think I may continue his remark and say that in reference to the debate this evening it has entirely lost sight of the question at issue now. Last week the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman gave notice of the introduction of this resolution, which, when it was pointed out from this side of the House that at that time we were hardly in a position to consider the resolution he then courteously deferred until this date. In due course Mr. Hickman started the debate, and in the most clear, concise and able fashion the subject matter permitted him set forth his case in support of the resolution. His case as presented impressed everyone in this room as being convincing and well worthy of consideration and attention. Now, sir, I would like to

state that I have been in this House for eleven years and during that time I have had occasion to address the House on the subject of temperance, wherein I advocated temperance enthusiastically. But at the same time I think it is a subject of such far-reaching importance that every detail of it ought to be considered most thoroughly. There are two sides to every question. This is a fact however, that does not recommend itself to all temperance people. And as regards this subject, as I have said, the gravest consideration must be given.

I am not prepared to subscribe to these resolutions; it is not total prohibition; but partial. My hon. friend, Mr. Conker, has brought up the further question of prohibition. The question of prohibition as I have said, is one of vast importance and should require the most earnest consideration of the members of this House. I think it behoves every member of this House to take every question and view it from every aspect. Every member has his mind and he should act according to his conscience and do what is right. I am not prepared to say that this House should have the power to decide on these resolutions, and look at it as a piece of mere ordinary legislation. I think the procedure is a wrong one. Go back to the real conditions: This question is of importance in that it affects the whole people of the Colony; I think everyone should be considered in it. If the people want it I would support it and put it in operation as soon as possible for the government to do so, and I am not prepared to admit the principle. This precedent might be availed of on other occasions and it might come some day that the very independence of our Colony will be carried away, our independence be gone while we are sleeping. This House has not got the right to dispose

of such a far reaching question as this.

Another point that is raised here today is the independence of this House. Every member of this House should have due regard to this fact. He is the law maker. His constituents put him here and then expect him to do the right thing. God has given every man intelligence and he has to use it to the best of his ability. A man who shirks it is not fit to have a seat in this House. Every member is burdened with a grave responsibility and every question should be looked at with every consideration. No member should have a prejudiced mind; we are the judges of what laws should go on the Statute Book and we have to see them carried out to the very letter.

I have no intention to delay the House, but I am sure the question that is before the chair is one in which we are all interested. We are prepared to admit it, every one of us, and I am prepared to vote for that principle. The Government is contemplating bringing down the measure and put the principles that I have outlined into practice and while we are here, I guess we ought to be able to finish things according to our own ideas and not be coerced by other gentlemen; I have not any desire to bring any undue friction into this question. I merely stand on my independence as a member and member of the Government and when the Government brings down this measure which I have spoken of, although the Premier is ridiculed and insinuations are that it is a Government trick, I have no doubt but the Premier will carry out his promise to the satisfaction of every man.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken on the Resolutions before the chair, and I do not intend to delay the House now. I do not for one moment wish to doubt the bona

files of the Premier and the Government. I believe when the Prime Minister moves, it is his intention to bring in legislation for the reasons we have been discussing. I believe he intends to have the measure carry out the intentions of the men who have approached the House.

I state here freely now, what is the position we are in at the present time. The Resolutions that are now before the chair and the amendments submitted by the hon. member for the district of Twillingate, would be in accordance with the wish of the Government. There is scarcely any difference between us. I don't think this matter should be made a party question. I simply speak here my own opinions, and I have always expressed what I think of the matter. I do not think that the sale or manufacture of intoxicating liquors is in itself an evil. It is the abuse of that commodity that brings about all the trouble. I think when we come to consider legislation for this country, we have to consider what exists in the country; we are not to compare this country with other countries, because we have not the same evils arising from drink here, as in other countries. Most people who have seen other countries know some of the evils that this country knows nothing about. Now, why then do we support resolutions asking for the decision of the people? I have said before that I do not want people to think that it is right for this House to submit any questions of legislation to the people for their decision. Here is the place to decide it. What the result of a plebiscite will be I know not. I have my own opinion on the question of Prohibition. There are many evils connected with the consumption of intoxicating liquors.

MR. LLOYD.—I rise the second time to express the hope that this matter will not be regarded as a party ques-

tion. I cannot agree with the Colonial Secretary's position regarding the amendment.

If we are going to pass an act let us embody it in the Resolutions. Then the result of this legislation will be final and every one will have to accept the conditions as they are whether the people decide for adoption of Prohibition or continuance of the sale of liquors as exists at present in the country. I was astounded when I heard him.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary has given us an intimation that the Government have made up their minds to make this vote a party vote. There can be no other conclusion. You are determined at all cost to make it a party measure. We are not doing that. I have been sitting here wondering what all the talk was about, for the life of me I do not know yet; because in the main what members on both sides of the House have said has been entirely in accord. But the Hon. Colonial Secretary says he will have no dictation! Something on this side of the House shall not cross to that side of the House. I always understood that these measures have always been treated as non-party measures, and I thought until I heard the Colonial Secretary say that this vote was to be a non-party vote. Let me point out to the Government that the Governor in his Speech from the Throne made no reference to this as a party measure. We heard nothing about it until we were well on the course of the discussion. Some of us on this side who have supported the measure have intimated that they intended to vote against the Resolutions of the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman. One reason is that we don't want to embarrass the Government; that we do not want to embarrass the Finance Minister; that we do not want in passing these resolutions to take

from the Finance Minister any power of raising money for the next year and the balance of this year. There will be no embarrassment for this year. We will not take a vote now on Prohibition, but a vote should be taken about the 1st of November. There will then be no embarrassment for this year. If the people are willing on the 1st of November then it will not be brought about till about July 1st 1916 therefore protecting the Government from financial difficulties for 15 months from to-day. We are not treating the measure as a party measure. I wish to remind the Prime Minister that by doing this we will follow his own example of a few days ago. It will be remembered that the Premier introduced into this House a measure with regard to local government and referred the Bill to a select committee. Before doing that he said: "Let us have the full benefit of the suggestions of the whole House." We are trying to give him the benefit of our ideas. Why are they rejected? Merely because they come from this side of the House. If we wanted to embarrass the Government we would have voted for Mr. Hickman's measure, but we did not. We showed the Government the way out. Am I dictating to the Government when I rise and make suggestions? Is that the dictation?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I do not refer to this at all. I referred to the amendment you were trying to force.

MR. LLOYD.—Why should a member of this House be accused of trying to "dictate," merely because he proposes an amendment to a bill. After all, I speak in a strong way, but at the same time, the main point remains, what is all the pother about?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I am prepared to support the motion for a plebiscite on Prohibition. I said I would support anything that

would be brought to bear and bring about a plebiscite on Prohibition.

MR. LLOYD.—What I said was I understood Mr. Bennett was prepared to support a motion for a plebiscite on Prohibition.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—It is incorrect.

MR. LLOYD.—The Colonial Secretary is prepared to support the Premier's intimation that he intends to bring in a Bill to provide a plebiscite.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Yes.

MR. LLOYD.—But at this stage he is not prepared to support a motion for it. He will do whatever his boss asks him. That is what you mean! Is that why so much twisting and turning about is being done. What is it all about any way? Who asked for this resolution? We have no difference in principle in the matter of whether we need the plebiscite or not. Every speech here to-day has been in favor with this resolution and yet because it comes from this side of the House and has the sanction of this side of the House the Government will unite and vote it down. I have heard from the other side of the House another argument. One of the hon. gentlemen was not going to support the bill because some other assembly might nullify it in a succeeding year. What nonsense. Does not the member know that whatever is done here to-day can be reversed by the Government of to-morrow? If he is going to take that attitude it is an indication that he is going to do nothing whatever, because a subsequent Parliament can reverse anything he does. Then when a member of the Opposition points out some amendment or suggestion the taunt is thrown out that the remark was proffered with some sinister motive. This is hinted at. The hint was thrown out that the members on this side of the House had entered into a combination to attack the Govern-

ment; that they had made a confederation among themselves to embarrass them financially. I may point out to the Colonial Secretary that there is no need for those sinister hints against this side of the House. We are doing our best to help the Government out of this hole and to protect them. Is it true that the Government has in this bill they are going to bring into this House authorization for a plebiscite? If so we want to know where they are going to get the lost revenue from; we have no means of finding this out, and because we are the Opposition and on this side of the House, all our opinions are unheard and condemned.

MR. HICKMAN.—Before the discussion advances further I want to make a few remarks. I would like to make clear to this House that this resolution was not put into this House with the intention of embarrassing the Government. This is not a party resolution; not an Opposition resolution; and I have neither solicited support from any member or brought any pressure to bear on any one in its favor. If to vote against the Government means that those who do so are questioning the bona fides of the Government, I for one will not lay myself open to such accusation.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman the hon. member for Trinity Dr. Lloyd, wants to know what all the trouble is about. He can see no substantial difference between what the Opposition ask for and what the Government promises. I would like to make it clear to him that what we want is a measure that will cover the full requirements of the case. Our resolution requires a law providing for the enforcement of the law automatically upon the result of the plebiscite. This the Government has not signified its intention to give and without it a plebiscite would be useless.

Then again I think the member for Trinity takes the Colonial Secretary

too seriously. He tried to disabuse him from thinking that we on this side of the House were stage acting and trying to dictate to the Government. We must excuse that. We know that it is but an indication of the party whip. We know the Colonial Secretary and no one knows better than he that we could not if we would, dictate to his Government, as any measure we proposed would be sure to be defeated by a party vote. I think that the discussion that has ensued here to-day has been not in the form of dictation, but merely the use of the prerogative granted to the members of this House. It is the endeavour of every Government to get the support of the whole House on their measures, and no sane man would accuse the Opposition of trying to dictate to the other side. I do not think the Minister at all serious in his remarks.

Now that crafty old schemer the Prime Minister, the sly fox, has resorted to the same old excuse which has served him more or less during his ministry, the excuse of the revenue. If this country cannot be kept up except by the aid of drunken citizens, it is time to get out of it. Such a suggestion is not worthy of the dignity of a debate in this Legislature.

The Colonial Secretary told us that the Government contemplated putting into practice the measure the Premier told us about. What is that measure? That is what we want to know. What are the principles he promised to put into practice? We are not doubting the Premier's statement but are merely asking him to give us some definite information. We will accept his cheque if he will mark on it the date and conditions. They are contemplating nothing; they have promised nothing; and therefore we are to conclude that their refusal amounts to the fact that they have yet to consider the measure we were told was to be intro-

duced. The Colonial Secretary has told us that this resolution does not completely exclude intoxicating liquors. Would it then have his support if it were made more exhaustive in its application? I would invite them to consider as an amendment the insertion of words to make up the deficiency complained of by the Colonial Secretary. We will accept their dictation and put in these words if they will give the amended resolution their support. We will allow them to dictate to us. What we want, Mr. Chairman, is a vote the result of which will fix once and for always without further legislation the destination of this traffic. We ask the Government to bring in a bill which will give this country total prohibition automatically upon the result of the plebiscite if that plebiscite be favourable. They have not assured us that such will be the make up of the bill they are considering. They have assured us of nothing; their promises are vague; they will not assure us that the bill they will bring in will need a majority of votes cast or of votes registered. The temperance people want this to settle this matter and do not want the country to be appealed to on a ballot which has not its own machinery to complete the work it starts. To pass a bill without including in it this highly necessary point would be to try to delude the public, and the whole vote would be a delusion and a snare. We ought to benefit from the experience of other countries and know exactly what benefit will accrue therefrom before spending the money necessary to carry out such a plebiscite as asked for.

MR. COAKER.—May I ask if the Premier has any other further announcement to make?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—If I had I would have made it before this.

MR. COAKER.—Well are we going on or what?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is for you to decide.

MR. COAKER.—You are the leader. You have to express your opinion.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—We will continue if you wish.

MR. COAKER.—I would just like to say a word or two in reply to some insinuations that have been made here this evening. It has been said that this bill was brought in with a sinister motive. I want to say Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Hickman never asked us to support his resolution, nor had we a meeting in connection with this matter. Neither the Liberal Party nor anybody else was asked to support this measure. As far as Mr. Morine was concerned he knew little or nothing about it until he was asked by Mr. Hickman if he would second the resolution. Mr. Hickman did not know whether he would do this or not before he asked him, and so the insinuation of the Government members is liable to convey a wrong impression. This resolution was prompted by no ulterior motive, and was the spontaneous suggestion of Mr. Hickman and Mr. Hickman only.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and that the Resolution had been negatived.

On motion this report was received. On the motion to adopt the report Mr. Morine moved and Mr. Coaker seconded the following amendment:

That in the opinion of the House the Government should introduce:—

(a) A Bill prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of ales, wines, beers and similar beverages, and all spirituous liquors within this Colony and its dependencies.

(j) Containing provisions for taking a plebiscite vote of the election on the question during 1915.

(c) Containing also a provision that the Bill shall come into force on the

1st. day of July, 1916, if a majority vote in favour of the Bill.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment, Messrs. Kent, Lloyd, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Jennings, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes, Morine, (14) and against it: Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, Hon.'s Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Croshie, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Parsons, LeFevre, Currie, Higgins, G. Kennedy, Young and Walsh (15); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon, the original motion for the adoption of the Report was put, and there appeared in favour of it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon.'s Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Croshie, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Parsons, LeFevre, Currie, Higgins, G. Kennedy, Young and Walsh (16); and against it: Messrs. Kent, Lloyd, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Jennings, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes and Morine (14), so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

PETITION OF RIGHT BILL.

On motion of Mr. Kent the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Proceedings against the Crown by Petition of Right" was referred to a Select Committee of the House consisting of:—Rt. Hon. the Premier, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Morine, Mr. Kent.

ESTATE DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill "An Act to amend Act '5, George V., Session 1, Cap. XI, entitled: "An Act to increase the Revenue by imposition of certain duties

"on the Estates of Deceased Persons," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

STAMP DUTIES BILL.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on the subject of Stamp Duties.

RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, since we met yesterday, one who was a member of this Chamber from 1894 to 1927, has passed away, I refer to the late Hon. John B. Ayre. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him intimately knew what an ideal type of citizen he was. His example and his life in the community were in themselves assets to the city and the country in which he lived. With ample means at all times at his disposal, he was still frugal and conservative and simple in all his tastes and mode of living, yet liberal to all deserving cases. A devoted and sincere member of his own church, in which he was a pillar of strength in all its undertakings, his christianity was still broad enough to succour and assist all creeds and all classes. He was a model type of the Good Samaritan. He never passed by on the other side. From early manhood to middle age he was his father's right hand man, his alter ego, and in those days his untiring industry, unceasing energy in the building up of the immense business of which for a quarter of a century he has been the head, largely aided in breaking down the constitution never robust, but which would have sustained him to old age had he not attempted to do more than his share. In public life he was quiet and reserved, but when great principles were at stake, he never failed to strongly assert his views, and his sympathy and co-operation were regarded

by all political parties as of no mean strength. He sat for the District of Bay de Verde from 1894 to 1897, and since 1898, he has been a member of the Legislative Council. In all those years, though not what would be called a prominent politician, he nevertheless took a very deep interest in all public affairs of the Colony, and all measures that came before the Legislature, and largely influenced his political associations by his wise counsel, and on many occasions did much to strengthen those measures upon which he was called to pass. No one could have thought a few days ago, when he was seen in his accustomed seat at the opening of the Legislature, that his summons was to be served on him in so short a space.

To me his death is a personal loss. For many years he has been a close friend. In 1907 he was the first to sign a public requisition asking me to assume the leadership of the party on this side of the House, and ever since that date he has given me a loyal and unwavering support. We all knew that for years he had been ailing, but no one felt or could have thought that the end was so near. He has passed from us, but his memory, and the example which he set his countrymen will be an inheritance and inspiration to those who knew him and have to live their lives after him.

As a mark of respect for his memory and to show our sympathy for his family, I would propose that the House adjourn until Thursday at 4 o'clock to enable those who may desire to do so to attend his funeral obsequies.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I think we can all join with the Prime Minister in his expression of sympathy at the death of the late Mr. Ayre. He was a highly appreciated and valued citizen, a man of a class which, when they pass away, we miss very much.

He was one of the founders of present business methods in this city, and he built up by his energy, his integrity and his attention to his work, a business which is amongst the largest in the city. As a public man, he deserved and had the respect of every person, irrespective of class and creed. All honored the name of the Hon. John Ayre, and all now regret that he has passed away, and that he is no longer here with us to continue to be useful as he has been in the past in the public life of the Colony. As the Premier has said, for a man who sought not the limelight, he did his work well and effectively. He was an unassuming man but none the less appreciated by his fellow citizens because of that fact. I think, as a mark of respect to him, the House ought to adjourn until 4 tomorrow, as an expression of our own appreciation and of sympathy to his family.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the remarks made by the Premier and by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to Mr. Ayre. In 1894 I participated in the election which resulted in his return to this House, and in 1898 I was a member of the Government which appointed him to the Legislative Council. His career in this House and in the Legislative Council reflected credit upon himself and upon those associated with him. He belongs to a family which holds a deservedly high place in the esteem of this Colony, and he was not the least of the members of that family in his claim upon us. Our sympathy, I am sure, will go out very strongly to the bereaved ones who are left behind.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 22nd.

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

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Hon. Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill dealing with the management of the General Hospital.

REPORTS TABLED.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1914; also, Report of Mr. Walter Duff on the Fisheries of Newfoundland.

QUESTIONS.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

There was a question asked two or three days ago by the hon. member for Bonaville, Mr. Morine, in relation to the returns of the Commissioners of Pilots. I beg to table the information. I also beg to table for his information correspondence that has taken place with the Captain of the 'Tierra Nova.'

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

I beg to table the information in reply to a question asked by Mr. Stone on the Order Paper dated the 12th of April relating to the supplying of engines by the Reid Newfoundland Company on branch lines under the 1909 Contract.

MR. KENT—There is one question which I asked on April 8th, and which has not yet been answered. It is in relation to any claims or requests for payment made by the Reid Newfoundland Company which have not been paid or which are not settled, relating to the Contract of 1909 to date. I think it is addressed to the Minister of Finance.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—There are no claims as far as we know. That is the answer I

received from the Government Engineer.

MR. KENT—I beg to point out that correspondence tabled in previous sessions shows that there are claims in relation to disputed mileage and other matters.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I will look into the matter and let the hon. member have an answer to-morrow.

LUNATIC ASYLUM.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring a matter before the House this afternoon in reference to the affairs of the Lunatic Asylum. In the 'Mail and Advocate' newspaper of the 17th of this month under the heading of 'More Exposures' the following article appeared.

"The report of the Lunacy Commission tabled yesterday, extracts of which we publish elsewhere, reveal a sad condition of affairs at the Lunatic Asylum.

"The death rate is abnormal, the large proportion of deaths being from consumption.

"The report shows the inmates were allowed to become dirty and vermin took charge. The facts are far worse than revealed in the report.

"No thanks are due the Superintendent for the discovery of the unclean condition of the inmates. One of the subordinates almost lost his position because he dared to move in this matter. Eventually the Commission asked the Superintendent to investigate and the result was that nearly every male inmate was desperately fighting a life and death battle with vermin.

"Conditions are not as bleak as one would gather from the reports.

"The Lunatic Asylum is a disgrace to the Colony and it is operated under rules that must be changed. The Superintendent should be told that

he is no longer wanted.

"The report of the expert brought here by the Premier, which was tabled two years ago, showed what he thought of the Superintendent's work, and he recommended that Dr. Dunca be superseded—such has not been done.

"We believe the Asylum to be nothing better than a death trap.

"In 1913, 157 patients were admitted, 60 died and 90 were discharged.

"In 1914, 154 were admitted, 60 died and 85 were discharged.

"On January 1st, 281 patients were under treatment.

"The Superintendent would do well to attend closely to his duties, for sooner or later the House of Assembly will be sending a Committee to ask some questions."

My only reason for bringing this matter up today is to let the House and the public know that it is not as serious as one would be led to believe, but I am quite aware there was some excuse for such a statement made last year. It is quite true that one of the inmates or one of the attendants did report the fact that some of the patients were affected with vermin. He came to me, (I know the attendant very well), and made the report, and I immediately sent him to the Board of Lunacy Commissioners, of which Mr. Hutchings, Deputy Minister of Justice, is Secretary. The same man came to me on a subsequent occasion and I asked him to put his statement in writing, which he did. I sent it to the Commissioners and asked them to make a thorough investigation into the information contained in this writing. They proceeded and the investigation revealed that several of the patients in this Institution were affected in this manner. The matter was subsequently reported to the Government and a Committee of

Council visited the Institution to see for themselves exactly the condition of things. The Commissioners took a great deal of evidence—from the attendants, the Superintendent, the inmates and members of the nursing staff. It was more or less conflicting, but in the meantime it was admitted that ten or a dozen of the patients were affected in this manner. Since that time, on the recommendation of the Commissioners a change has been introduced there by which every patient is bathed and his clothes changed at least once a week. Every attendant on the wards is made responsible for the care and condition of the patients under his charge, and a day or two ago I was handed the weekly reports as filled out and signed by the chief ward attendant in each ward. These I propose to lay on the table of the House this afternoon for the information of members.

I may say that on the whole, the result of all these enquiries was that they found the Institution in a very clean condition, and the general upkeep was most creditable, clean and wholesome in every respect, and was such that one could not desire anything better. Unfortunately part of the place is very old and does not conform to present-day requirements. A few years ago preparations were being made by the Government for the erection of a new Institution entirely. Plans were prepared, but the estimated cost of the building in contemplation was too great to be considered; the Government did not see their way clear to making such a large expenditure at the time. It is well known to anyone who has any knowledge of the Lunatic Asylum that they are working there under great difficulties. They lack the proper facilities for laundry work, cooking and the like. It has recently been decided to

overcome this difficulty by raising the roof of one of the wings and building new sleeping apartments for the nurses there, and utilizing the rooms now occupied by them for other purposes. The plans were prepared by Mr. Churchill, which were brought before the Government a week ago. The cost of that alteration is estimated at about twenty thousand. The Government has as yet not decided what course it will pursue. I am of the opinion, and have been for some time, that it is unfair to the staff and the nurses who have to spend so much of their time in environments so unpleasant, so inconducive to the realisation of the pleasures of life, to allow these conditions to prevail. But I must say, that under the circumstances, I consider Dr. Duncan and staff have done wonders. In Miss Field we have a woman of exceptional ability. She is most attentive and devoted to her work, which she has at her finger tips. The perfect accord and esprit de corps existing between her and her assistants prove that the patients are certainly in good hands. And this report shows that the work has been well carried on. Now I think the House is assured that conditions are not as bad as one would think. My reason in bringing this forward is not any idea of finding fault with the editor of the paper which has been criticising this institution, because I think he has every right to criticise, but I think it is unfortunate that a feeling like this should get abroad, especially among those who have friends in that institution. Reading an article like that would certainly cause them to be concerned and anxious. I think it is unfair that an impression such as this should get abroad, especially in the more remote parts of the country, if there was some cause—which I am prepared to admit

—that has been remedied. I desire to table this report for the information of this House. I hope this will allay the anxieties of those who are concerned about this matter.

QUESTIONS.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House all correspondence in connection with the appointment of the present Lightkeeper, Swarrey Head, Bonaville, to that position; (b) who recommended the appointment; (c) the names of persons making application in writing for that position; (d) the reason for replacing the late Keeper's son.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The answer is in course of preparation.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House, a statement of amount of duties collected by the Sub-Collector at Moreton's Harbour since his appointment; also, statement of duties collected by the Sub-Collector at Exploits for the past two years.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The answer is in course of preparation and will be tabled on to-morrow.

ESTATES DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill "An Act to Amend Act 2, Geo. 5, Session 1, Cap. XL, entitled: "An Act to increase the Revenue by the Imposition of Certain Duties on the Estates of Deceased Persons."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman reported that the Committee had considered the matter

to them referred and had passed the Bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the Subject of the Confirmation of a Contract with the Newfoundland Products Corporation Limited.

RT. HON. PREMIER.—Mr. Speaker: By reference to the Resolutions now before the House it will be noticed they confirm an agreement entered into between His Excellency the Governor, on behalf of the Colony of Newfoundland, and the Newfoundland Products Corporation. The Newfoundland Products Corporation are represented by Mr. Thomas L. Willson of Woodstock, Canada. Mr. Willson's reputation rests chiefly on his discovery of carbide. He is also the inventor of an arc light apparatus and the discoverer of acetylene gas. He was formerly Inspector of Construction with the Fuller Electric Company and the Remington Gun Company, and Messrs. Seward and Morehead of New York. He also promoted the Ottawa Carbide Company, and the Dominion Carbide Company. He is President of the Marine Signal Company.

With Mr. Willson are associated the Reid Newfoundland Company who have thrown in their pulp lands at Grand Lake as well as any water powers owned by them.

The main features of the agreement are as follows:

(1.) The Government leases for a term of 35 years, in so far as they have any power or property in the same, the water power or powers in and upon the Humber River, and in

or upon Junction Brook, with the right to divert and dam the same or any lake or water powers within the drainage area of the Humber River; and also, should the Company at any time within twenty-one years become the owners of any additional water powers within a distance of forty miles of the company's factories at Bay of Islands, within an area laid down by a map and defined in this agreement, the Government propose to allow the provisions of this agreement, with the exception of clause 18, to apply to any water powers so acquired and developed within the said area for the purposes of the same business.

(2.) If the Company fails to develop the water powers so acquired, then the advantages of the agreement shall not apply.

(3.) The Company agree within two years to survey the Hamilton and Northwest rivers in Labrador, and finish the surveys within five years, and furnish the Government with all plans of the survey, and the Government agree that if the Company, within ten years from this date, in addition to an expenditure of \$5,000,000 at Bay of Islands, expend an additional sum of \$5,000,000 in Newfoundland in connection with the extension of its business in Newfoundland, it will grant the Company a water power on the Hamilton River from the head of Lake Winnipeg to the sea or an equivalent water power on the Northwest River Labrador, but the condition of the grant of the said water power is that the Company shall within five years expend in the development of the said water power, and its plant in Labrador, the further sum of \$10,000,000. In the event of failure to so spend the grant shall be void, and the water power on the Hamilton or Northwest river shall revert to the Crown.

(4.) The company agrees to furnish up to 50,000 horse power in Labrador to all persons or companies operating within one hundred miles of their power houses.

(5.) The Government grants to the Company a block of limestone near the Humber River, about five miles from Bay of Islands, for the purpose of making lime.

(6.) The Company's property shall be free from municipal taxation. The stocks of the Company are also free from taxation. Construction material and machinery will be admitted duty free. 10,000 acres of Crown Land are granted the Company by the Government at 30 cents an acre for wharves, piers, docks, factories and warehouses. Property required not in possession of the Crown to be taken and paid for by arbitration.

(7.) The Company has the right to build telephones between the factories, and piers and workshops.

(8.) Phosphate rock, pyrites, electrodex, soda and bags for packages are admitted free of duty into the Colony.

(9.) Coal for use in connection with the Company's work in Labrador is admitted duty free.

(10.) The Company agrees to sell at its works at wholesale prices, and deliver the same at all railway stations in Newfoundland, and at Ports of call where the Reid Newfoundland Company's steamers now call, its fertilizer, freight free.

(11.) All damages to crown land to be paid for and settled by arbitration.

(12.) Renewal of lease if not determined by 35 years.

(13.) The Company undertakes to begin actual construction operations within two years of the date of the agreement, and expend the sum of \$5,000,000 within the island of Newfoundland within five years. Failure

to begin or expend renders the agreement null and void.

(14.) Dams to be constructed with proper log sluices for the passage of salmon and fish. Use of the waters by the public continues as heretofore.

(15.) The company will provide cranes for lifting boats over dams.

The Company proposes to establish at Bay of Islands at a cost of about \$18,000,000 an industry for the manufacture of ammonium phosphate, which is a fertilizer, ammonia, cement, wood-pulp, and lumber. To produce ammonium phosphate which is a fertilizer, five things are necessary, namely, phosphate rock, sand, coal, marble and pyrites. The phosphate rock in this case is obtained from Florida; the sand can be obtained at Bay of Islands; the coal at present will have to be imported until our own deposits are worked, the marble is in abundance at Bay of Islands, and the pyrites will be imported from Spain, until the pyrites found in our own country can be utilized. These represent the five ingredients which may be called the raw material, and from this the finished product of ammonium phosphate, which is fertilizer, is obtained and slag which will be converted into cement. In addition to these industries wood pulp and lumber will be produced. To produce wood-pulp, timber in the neighbourhood of Grand Lake will be obtained and from the pyrites the sulphide liquor will be distilled, and from the timber the lumber will be manufactured. The intermediate process is briefly as follows:—

From the phosphate rock, the sand and the coke, (the latter being made from the coal) phosphoric acid is produced, and from the lime and coke, a carbide is obtained, and this car-

side, with the nitrogen and pyrites, produces cyanamid or ammonium, and the combination of the two, that is the phosphoric acid and the ammonium, produces the ammonium phosphate which is the fertilizer. From the pyrites, sulphur dioxide or sulphide liquor is produced, and the union of this with pulp-wood produces the wood pulp, and of course from the timber that is not converted into pulp, the lumber is manufactured.

We have here then, first, the raw material, second, the intermediate process which takes place, and third, the finished products. The following is a further detail of the process of manufacture of fertilizer:—

The fertilizer which will be produced at the mills of the company at Bay of Islands, consists of the following:

Phosphate rock is gravel dug up in Florida, by great steam shovels, and its value consists in that it contains phosphoric acid to the extent of 21 per cent of its weight. It takes three tons of phosphate rock to produce one ton of phosphoric acid. It costs at Florida about \$2.75 per ton.

With the phosphate rock is mixed 40 per cent of its weight of sand and gravel, and it is then electrically smelted and this produces the phosphoric acid, which comes off the furnaces, and is caught in water towers in a similar manner to the way in which sulphuric acid is produced.

Having produced the phosphoric acid, ammonia is manufactured out of calcium carbide, which is made by electrically smelting lime and coke. Lime is first produced by burning limestone, which is found in great quantities at Bay of Islands. Coke is obtained from coal. The lime and the coke are electrically smelted, and the result is calcium carbide.

Having obtained calcium carbide, the carbide is ground up and flows from the furnace just like pig iron. It is ground up and put in a retort, and it is treated by passing nitrogen gas over it, which is a by-product from the sulphite pulp mill, producing calcium nitrogen compound which then looks like broken coals.

This nitrogen carbide compound is taken and placed in a digester, similar to a pulp digester, or a large boiler and boiling water or steam is turned on at a pressure of 75 lbs. to the inch, and this converts the carbide nitrogen compound into ammonia gas, which gas is then conveyed by pipes into the phosphoric tanks, and is converted into phosphate of ammonia, which is the fertilizer to be manufactured, and resembles in appearance common table salt.

The manufacture of phosphate of ammonia as a fertilizer in this way is an entirely new process.

The particular process dealing with this manufacture is covered by the patents referred to in the contract. Generally they deal with the production of phosphate of ammonia in the various stages of its manufacture.

The application of these patents render the manufacture of the fertilizer the most economical of any process known in the world.

To produce the industry contemplated when the business is in full swing, say three years after it is started, the Company shall require to import from Florida 557 tons daily of phosphate rock, which multiplied by 365 days equals 202,305 tons per year; 600 tons of coal per day, which multiplied by 365, equals 218,400 tons per year, the duty on which alone to the Colony will be \$108,500; 411 tons of limestone daily, 40 tons of pyrites, imported from Spain, that is iron pyrites, sulphur and iron combined. This will

produce 120,000 tons of phosphate of ammonia, the value of which is \$80 per ton, or \$9,600,000 per year.

To produce this will require about 1,000 men continuously at various rate of wages, no man getting less than \$1.50 per day.

The market of this produce is practically unlimited, and the total output would not represent 5 per cent of what is used in the world to-day.

We use in Newfoundland to-day a mixed fertilizer generally containing ammonia, phosphoric acid and potash, costing \$40 per ton. Now the value of the fertilizer per ton, which is to be produced at Bay of Islands, compared with what is on the market, is about six times as valuable, and would represent one half the present cost of the fertilizer to the Newfoundland fisherman-farmer.

We now come to the pulp mills. This will be erected at Bay of Islands, and will represent the manufacture of pulp spruce wood. The company will obtain the wood from Grand Lake, and will require 250 cords per day or about 100,000 cords per year. In addition the company will use 40 tons of pyrites daily to make the sulphide liquor, which is to be used in the digesters. This will produce 36,500 tons of sulphite pulp per year at the value of \$1,825,000. This apparently high value for pulp, in comparison with ordinary pulp which is only \$25 per ton, is accounted for by the fact of its being the highest grade of bleached sulphite pulp for book making. The pulp is bleached by a process of electrically decomposing sea water.

The total cost of the work before a dollar's worth of the produce is shipped will be about \$12,000,000. There will be ten main dams costing as follows:—

1.	\$110,000
2.	427,500
3.	217,800
4.	193,600
5.	170,000
6.	115,500
7.	162,800
8.	28,600
9.	133,600
10.	37,700
Total	\$1,897,500

Total cost of main dams ..	\$1,597,500
Power Houses	838,400
Penstocks, head gates and racks	771,300
Head gates	70,300
Wing dams	297,500
Storage dams	91,900
Water Wheels	583,000
Electrical equipment	1,065,000
Miscellaneous	58,900
Transmission Lines	612,800
Freight	53,500
Engineering and supervision	287,700
Total	\$6,440,300

The cost of producing the power including these ten dams will be \$6,440,300 and 118,500 horse power will be developed at the mill site at a cost per horse power of \$53.99. It will be seen from this that in order to create the power for the works contemplated, an expenditure of \$6,400,300 will be required. To this must be added the cost of the industrial plant as follows. I am quoting from figures supplied me by Mr. Willson obtained from the plant and specifications prepared by the engineers and experts who have been engaged on the enterprise for the past year.

Construction and Equipment.

Coke and gas works.	\$ 795,000
Lime quarry	75,000
Lime Kilns for 250 tons pro-	

duction per day	142,000
Calcium carbide works	462,800
Carbide Crushing Works	71,400
Electrode Carbon work	25,000
Saw Mills	211,800
Sulphite Pulp Mills, electro- lytic bleaching plants, and wood preparations	1,568,300
Machine shops, iron and brass foundries, boiler and structural shops, for- ges, pattern shops, and storage rooms	161,400
Engineering and supervision of foregoing items	228,300
	<hr/>
	\$3,745,000

The cost of the general work in connection with these plants amounts to \$2,564,800 as follows:—

Grading site and filling in foreshore	\$ 262,600
Construction of docks and re- taining walls, Humber- mouth	270,600
Installation of coal and ma- terial handling equipment and storage	692,000
Construction and equipment of storage warehouses, & buildings	467,600
New location of railway and construction railway sid- ings	140,500
Railway equipment for use of the yard premises, loc- omotives, hopper bottom cars, flat cars, and loco- motive trains	112,000
Construction of bridges, tide gates, tidal basins and trackways	51,200
Railway station and general offices of the company and mill storehouses	290,000
General transformer station, construction and equip- ment	154,000
General facilities such as wa-	

ter supply, sewerage, lighting and fire protec- tion of industrial sites	65,000
Engineering and general su- pervision on above items	145,100

Total	<hr/>	\$2,564,800
Cost of phosphoric acid plant	\$ 900,000	
Ammonia Plant	450,000	
Working Capital	2,000,000	
Railway Revision	250,000	
Total	<hr/>	\$3,600,000

Recapitulation Statement.

Water power	\$6,440,300	
General Work	2,564,800	
Industrial Plant	2,745,000	
Phosphoric acid plant	900,000	
Ammonia Plant	450,000	
Working Capital	2,000,000	
Railway Revision	250,000	
Grand Total	<hr/>	\$16,349,300

The map which I table shows the plant as it will be when constructed at Bay of Islands. The site is at Corner Brook Station, Bay of Islands, with 30 feet of water at low tide.

The survey and plan of the Com-pany which have already cost \$100,000 have been prepared by the well known industrial engineers of New York and London, Messrs. Joseph Wallace and Company, whose staff has been at work in Newfoundland in connection with the staff of the Reid Newfoundland Company, and their reports show that they will be able at this immense expenditure to develop 120,000 horse power, to be delivered at tide water.

No more desirable site could be selected for an industrial plant, as within five minutes walk of it is to be found the natural park of the Humber River, combining scenery and attraction the finest in the world.

The cost seems excessive, but for an immense undertaking like this heavy original outlay is necessary. Take the power alone which is placed at \$3,448,400, or, we will say in round figures, \$7,000,000. At 5 per cent this would mean \$350,000 interest to be made on this outlay alone, which represents the power, whether it be steam or electricity, or \$1,900 a day for this substitute for coal. The cost arises out of the immense expense of damming the rivers and streams at suitable points, thus conserving the entire rainfall or creating artificial water powers. We all remember the colossal expenditure at Grand Falls, but there they were only able to secure 20,000 horse power. In the industry under consideration it will be necessary to create at the very least 120,000 horse power to do the grinding. The cost of which, as I have pointed out, is \$7,000,000.

Then you have the item of \$2,544,000 for the general work essential in the development of this industrial site, and not chargeable to any particular plant in connection with the work, but merely representing the grading, filling in of the foreshore, construction of the docks, the handling of ore and coal and phosphoric rock, warehouses, new location of railway and sidings and railway equipment, tidal basins, general offices, transformer stations and general facilities.

Again there is an expenditure of \$3,745,000 for industrial plants, representing the construction and equipment of coke and gas works, limestone quarries and lime kilns, carbide of calcium work, carbide crushing plants, saw mills and lumber yards, sulphite pulp mills and machine shops and foundries.

The lumber and sulphite pulp mills will utilize profitably the timber avail-

able from the Company's limit, and the balance of their plants are component parts of the commercial productions of ammonia and its compounds.

Further industrial plants will be required to complete the scheme outlined. They will include a plant for the purification of the nitrogen, by-product of sulphate, sulphite pulp mills and production of cyanamid, phosphoric acid and phosphate of ammonia.

The limestones which for centuries merely added to the scenery of Bay of Islands, and of which there is an unlimited supply is located at Marble Mountain, about five miles from the site, and will be there quarried and brought to the plant by train.

The plans show that the docks will provide berthing space for two 10,000 ton coal or ore steamers, and will be provided with modern equipment for the handling of the product as well as storage warehouses, which will be provided at a point that permits the berthing of two ocean steamships for loading finished products independently of the incoming material.

It is impossible to conceive the developing influence of such an industry in the country. Not alone will it be a labor giving industry, but it will bring about the establishment of a city, and create a livelihood for thousands of families, with consequent advantages to the whole country of the circulation of their earnings, as well as the general effect on the Revenue of the Colony by the consumption of dutiable goods. Then from a Revenue standpoint we will get over \$100,000 duty alone, on coal.

The value of the industry to the country can be best seen when we state that it was only a few years ago that the total imports into the Col-

ony, which is a fair index of the earnings of the people, was only \$5,000,000. Now if we export say \$10,000,000 worth from this industry, and put down half that for interest on the outlay, the cost of coal pyrites, phosphate rock, limestone profit, we have the balance say half that, or \$5,000,000 for labour, representing the amount that will be left in the Colony, or an industry which say at \$1,000 per man would give labour to 5,000 men, representing 1,000 families and nearly as many people as are in the city of St. John's. These 5,000 men earning \$5,000,000 are paying say 30 per cent in duties on the consumption measured by their earnings would be \$1,500,000 increase in the Revenue, but if even half this is realized what an advantage it will be.

Here we have a direct increase of Revenue of \$1,500,000 over the present Revenue, assuming that the men working there will not be all men who have been taken away from the fisheries, but people who are not earning today or earning very little, and others who will be working there in addition to their being employed at the other industries, besides retaining in the Colony all those who annually go away.

I know, of course, that it will be said by some that this is nothing more than a mere election scheme, one of the bubbles found annually in the Speech from the Throne. I admit that the project is staggering, and requires a great deal of faith to believe in its realization, but if it is brought about it will be the justification for all the time and trouble expended in advertising the development of the country and the immense amount of money that has been invested in opening up and developing the interior by railway and other means.

There is good grounds for those who

do not take the promotions seriously, who regard these projects unfriendly and unsympathetically. A whole litany of them might be recited, going back to the days of Blackman in 1881, for the establishment of a fast line; the schemes for the construction of docks in the country; the Brender Labrador Railway of 1890; the scheme for the fast line railway across Newfoundland, known as the Peg Free Zone, and the other Labrador projects before and since. Also the projects for the smelting of ore on Bell Island; the proposals under several Governments for the establishment of cold storage, and the export of fish from the Colony fresh, and in other ways; the various schemes for raising Deer Lake and Grand Lake, and the development of our pulp and paper; the millions that have been lost in the developing of mines in the country, including the Bay de Verde projects, the Beck's Cove enterprise and several attempts by companies and others to develop our coal; the knowledge and consideration of all these matters make it difficult, indeed, to maintain and continue one's enthusiasm, but it is only by the encouragement of such schemes, it is only by the assistance of such promotions that any new country containing resources can be developed. Forty-five years ago when Lord Strathcona, Sir John A. Macdonald, Lord Mount Stephen and others associated with the Canadian Pacific Railway projected their great scheme to connect the Atlantic with the Pacific, and link up the great Dominion of Canada from Halifax to Vancouver, they were laughed at as idle visionaries, and in their efforts to create that steel highway they came within an inch of being in the dock, but they survived the sneers and criticisms of those who looked upon those projects as impos-

sible, and their efforts were crowned with success. Not only have we today one railway across Canada, but the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Great Northern Railway parallel the great pioneer road.

The same is true of the pioneers who sixty years ago projected the Atlantic cable, they were laughed at as dreamers, but they were men of vision, and even Edison and Marconi, the great wizards of our day will not leave behind them more imperishable fame than Peter Cooper, Cyrus Field, Frederick Gishwara, Bishop Mullock, and others identified with the laying of that great pulsating artery connecting the old world with the new. They had their trials and tribulations when, after five years after their cable had responded to key as if dead in the unfathomed depths of its grave, but here never once deserted them, and in the end they triumphed.

This scheme may fail. I do not think it will. The great difficulty is not the passing of this measure, or the making of this contract. The great difficulty will be procuring the \$26,000,000 that will be necessary to make the proposal an accomplished fact. But men exist today of broader vision than in older times, and financiers are now prepared to take great risks, and the same type of men that are building railways to Hudson Bay to carry the wheat of Canada from the North west over an ocean that will be only open for a couple of months a year, will be able to appreciate and unhesitatingly invest their money in the scheme under consideration.

Now as regards this undertaking in Newfoundland, I have endeavoured to show something as to the likely result to the country of the establishment of this work. Now what are we giving in return for this? Are we

giving too great a concession; are we giving too large a consideration for what we are about to receive? My answer is first that the contract before the Legislature is the result of many weeks of negotiations with the Company, extending over a year, and anything short of what is in this contract would be to make it more difficult, and more impossible to borrow the money on it. It is quite true that in this country we have attractive resources, but we are too apt to forget that the great resources in other countries are equally attractive to the investor. Unfortunately we are not on the visiting list of financiers. We are remote from the centres of great industrial developments where capitalists live in large cities, and a great many of them like to be near or within easy distance of where their moneys are invested, so that they may be able to study and watch the daily development of the enterprises in which they are interested, and for that reason here in Newfoundland if we want to encourage rapid development and early investment we have to give some reasonable encouragement to those who undertake to do the work.

I have only pointed out the facts concerning the industry at Bay of Islands, and made no reference to Labrador. We need not trouble ourselves about Labrador because if the industry does not come to anything in Bay of Islands, it will be safe to assume that we shall not hear any more of the Labrador project. If the industry is a success at Bay of Islands, it will be an incentive for those who have put their money into it, to go to Labrador, and when that day comes it will not require those who will be legislating in this chamber on Labrador Development to give any reason to justify any concessions there.

What the Company asks, as I have

already pointed out, is a water power on the Hamilton River, or a water power on the North West River, which is a river running into Hamilton Inlet. For any exact information on this matter we have to go to a report made outside this Colony, as this Colony has never made any surveys of the Labrador Rivers.

In Dr. Grenfell's work on the Labrador, published in 1909 by MacMillan, there is an article by Dr. A. P. Low Deputy Minister of Mines at Ottawa, which gives a very interesting description of the Hamilton River and Grand Falls, as seen and surveyed by him.

Dr. Low says:—

"The North West River enters on the north side about eighty miles beyond the narrows. The stream is only about one hundred yards wide at its mouth, but averages fifteen feet in depth. Half a mile upstream it expands into a small lake, which three miles further up, again contracts for four hundred yards to form the outlet of Grand Lake, a large body of fresh water extending westward some forty miles in a deep valley between high, rocky walls.

"The Hamilton River is the most important stream of the Eastern watershed of the peninsula. It is upwards of five hundred miles in length, and extends westward half way to Hudson Bay. To the north and west its tributaries interlock with those of the Northwest River, and with the head waters of the George and Koksoak rivers, both of which flow north into Ungava Bay, while to the south the Hamilton is separated by a low, sinuous water shed from the rivers flowing southward into the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

"At the Grand Falls, some two hundred and fifty miles above its mouth, the river is naturally divided into

two parts, which are quite dissimilar in physical character. The lower part occupies a deep, ancient valley, cut down into the hard, crystalline rocks of the plateau, so that the present level of the river is from five hundred to one thousand feet below the general level of the surrounding country. This deep valley varies in width from one hundred yards to more than two miles between the rocky walls. The river flows with a strong current often broken by rapids, especially along the upper stretches. Only in one place has it a direct fall over a rock obstruction, and that is at the Muskrat Falls, twenty seven miles above its mouth, where a dam of glacial drift has diverted the stream from its ancient course, and has caused it to find a new channel on the south side of the rocky knoll where the river falls seventy feet over ledges in a distance of four hundred yards.

"The greater part of the valley below the Grand Falls has been burnt over by frequent fires, which have destroyed much of the original forest of spruce, its space being taken by small second growth aspen, white birch and spruce. Where the original forest remains, the trees are of fair size and of commercial value, in marked contrast to the stunted spruce found partly covering the rolling surface of the plateau above the valley on both sides. The river varies in width, and usually partly fills the bottom of the valley, being confined between banks of sand or glacial drift forming the soil of the bottom. A reference to the accompanying map shows that the river valley as far as the junction of Minipi River, eighty miles up stream, conforms in its southwesterly direction with that of Hamilton Inlet (Lake Melville). The general direction then changes to west northwest, and so continues to the Grand Falls. A more

detailed account of the various courses and characteristics of the valley than can be given here can be found in my report, and might be consulted by any intending visitor to the falls.

The river flows into head of Lake Melville on the south side of Goose Bay, and is separated from it by a long low sandy point. The mouth of the river is obstructed by wide shoals with numerous narrow channels between them. These continue for about ten miles, where the stream is about a mile wide, and gradually narrows to Muskrat Falls. Above the falls there is a steady current for fourteen miles to the foot of Percupine Rapids which are nearly three miles long; good tracking along the banks with deep water making the ascent easy. An expansion called Gull Island Lake extends six miles from the head of Percupine Rapids to the foot of the last rapids. In the next twenty miles, to the mouth of the Minto, the valley gradually narrows, leaving very little bottom land between the river and its rocky walls. This portion of the river is very rough and almost a continuous rapid. Ascending the stream Gull Rapids extend for nearly five miles above the lake with shallow water and great boulders obstructing the channel. The second, or Horseshoe Rapid, is at the sharp bend to the southward; it is also shallow and filled with boulders. The river now contracts to about one hundred yards in width, and deepens so that although the current is swift, the surface is broken for only a short distance below the junction of the Minto, where a short portage may be necessary to pass the head of the rapid. Above the Minto the valley soon widens, and varies from one to two miles across the bottom. The rock walls rise from seven hundred feet to nine hundred

feet above the water, while the glacial drift in the valley has been cut by the river into terraces, which are seen flanking the walls at heights ranging from twenty feet to two hundred and fifty feet. The navigation is good for the next forty miles, the even current of the river being broken only by a few short rapids not difficult to ascend. A number of very beautiful stretches are seen along this portion, where the channel is divided by islands covered with thick green forest, giving contrast with the bare rocky walls down which a number of small tributaries tumble in foamy cascades. The valley again contracts, and from eighteen miles, to its outlet from Vinokapan Lake, the current is swift, and the river broken by a number of rapids, making the ascent difficult, but probably entailing portages only at a few short stretches.

In the Commission of Conservation of Canada Report for 1911, under the head of "Water Powers of Quebec" the Hamilton River was referred to as follows:—

The Muskrat Fall has an approximate head in feet of 70 feet, with an estimated horse power of 85,000.

The Grand Falls, Hamilton River, has an approximate head of 302 feet, capable of producing 125,000 horse power.

The Grand Falls, including twelve miles of rapids above and below has a head of 760 feet capable of producing 260,000 horse power.

On page 161 the report says:—

This river which empties into the Atlantic ocean, forms part of the boundary between the province of Quebec and Ungava peninsula. It is about seven hundred miles long and has a drainage area of 25,100 square miles. According to Dr. A. P. Low, Deputy Minister of the Department of Mines, the Grand Falls of the Ham-

Utou river have a perpendicular fall of 302 feet, while, if we include a series of smaller falls and rapids above and below, extending over a distance of 12 miles, the total fall is 760 feet. In his report describing the Grand Falls, Dr. Low says in part: "Such a fall (760 feet) would not be extraordinary for a small stream, in a mountainous country, but is phenomenal in a great river like the Hamilton. The basin into which it precipitates itself at this point is nearly circular, and about 200 yards in diameter. It is surrounded on all sides by nearly perpendicular rocky walls, 200 feet high, except at the narrow cut at the head of the falls, and where the river issues from the basin. The noise of the fall has a stunning effect, and although deadened because of its enclosed position, can be heard for more than ten miles away, as a deep booming sound. The cloud of mist is also visible from any eminence within a radius of twenty miles."

In the Extracts from Reports on the District of Ungava for 1911, on page 4, the waterfall on the Hamilton River is referred to as follows:—

"The falls themselves have a sheer drop of 302 feet, and Low estimated their discharge at 50,000 cubic feet per second. For twelve miles above the falls the river rises rapidly, so that in that distance the difference in level, including the falls proper, is 760 feet. Adopting the discharge estimated by Low, these figures would give approximately 1,500,000 horse power for the falls proper, and 1,660,000 horse power for the twelve miles of falls of the river. However, Dr. Low only saw the river at a period of high water and the above figures are probably much too high. In the data compiled by the Commission of Conservation and published in the "Report on Water Powers in Canada"

the possibilities of Grand Falls are based on a low water drainage of 9.5 c.f. per second per square mile of drainage area, which is the quantity generally adopted under the climatic conditions of the country. Under these conditions the estimated horse power of the falls would be 128,000 and of the total fall for a distance of twelve miles 208,000."

It will be seen from this that the Muskrat Falls for which application is made has an approximate head of seventy feet, with an estimated horse power of 55,000, capable of being developed. The Grand Falls, some miles above the Muskrat Falls, and which are not asked for here, have an approximate head of 302 feet capable of producing 128,000 horse power, and the Grand Falls, including 12 miles of rapids above and below has a head of 850 feet, capable of producing 300,000 horse power.

The company asks therefore for a water power on either of these rivers, the Hamilton or the Northwest River, and they agree to spend \$16,000,000 on Labrador in development.

The only question for us as a Legislature to consider is whether we should make this agreement? Nothing better can be done. The promoters have been pressed by the Government for a reduction of the concession, but this is the last word, their answer being that capitalists will not advance their money on anything less.

It is not as if we were giving away to the Company the only water powers we have. As a matter of fact there are numerous water powers on the Labrador, and further we are making provision that any industry within 100 miles of this water power on the Muskrat Falls requiring power will be taken care of by being able to purchase, at a figure to be fixed by

arbitration, power up to 50,000 horse power.

The other side of the question of course is that we do nothing and let the waters continue to boom and run over the rapids as they have since primeval times, without making an effort to develop them. I must say Mr. Speaker, that this is the first thing that I have seen which almost convinces me that we are within reasonable distance of a great development. It is true we are giving concessions which I have enumerated, some of which we have given to others, and which we shall no doubt have to continue to give if we want these great industries established in our midst.

In 1881 we passed a Dock Act, guaranteeing the interest of the Company up to \$650,000 at 5 per cent a subsidy of \$20,000 for forty years, and all their building material and machinery to come in duty free. Unfortunately nothing came of it, and we afterwards had to build the dock ourselves at a cost of \$450,000 admitting everything duty free and we leased it afterwards for a sum that did not pay half the interest, and even that sum was not paid.

Then we had a scheme for a short line railway which was proposed by Blackman in 1882, and in which we proposed to give 5,000 acres in fee simple for every mile of railway constructed, guaranteeing them freedom from taxation on railway stock and business, and the sole right to build, and granting them free entry for material. Then there was the Great American Express Company, which was also granted freedom from taxation on capital, stock and business, and we all know the history of those two proposals.

Previous to this, the Anglo American Telegraph Company was given a monopoly for 50 years, a franchise for-

ever with a right to import all of their material duty free. In 1890 we had the Bender Railway Contract, with Sir Henry Isaac, Lord Mayor of London; Sir Robert Fowler, M.P., Banker; Thomas Wood, Banker, Chairman, of the Millford Docks; Charles J. Mott, Director of the Great Western Railway, and Sir Douglas Fox, Engineer, now famous on account of his connection with the Channel tunnel, and that also came to nothing.

In our own day we have had two or three projects for the construction of railways on the Labrador. Besides these we have had a half dozen cold storage contracts made with different companies.

In 1898 we had the Reid-Newfoundland contract, under which we gave them freedom from taxation on their dock and land, and exempted them from municipal and local taxation. We also gave them freedom from taxation for their telegraph lines. Then there was the Reid Incorporation contract in 1901, in which they were incorporated for \$25,000,000, in which the Land Company, the Street Railway Company, and the Dock Company all merged, and their stock, dividend, bonds, debentures and mortgage bonds were exempt from taxation. Then we had the Harmsworth Company who made a contract with us, and in which we gave them free entry for all construction material and equipment. Their property is exempt from taxation, and they have had a fee simple grant of the land.

Only a few years ago we had the Company that undertook to build a railway across Newfoundland, known as the Fog Free Zone Company, and under the contract we made with them we agreed to admit all material duty free, and undertook to give them a subsidy of \$75,000 a year.

This list contains a few of the undertakings that were still-born as re-

could any great permanent development, and it is on account of these failures that we should carefully consider before making up our minds for and against the concessions in the contract under consideration, whilst it also contains the names of the Belle and the Harmsworth whose prospects have matured.

If Mr. Wilson can get his money, and can spend \$15,000,000 in Bay of Islands, the problems of Newfoundland's financial future and development will be settled for many years. I hope he will. I believe he will. He has assured me that he will, and I am sure all will wish him the very best of luck.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and asked leave to sit again on Wednesday.

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

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 23rd, 1915.

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

PETITIONS

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Valleyfield, who ask for a local hospital. This is a much-needed institution in that place, and we ought to do all we can for the sick and suffering. They ask that a sum of \$250 be allocated for the pur-

pose of building the hospital. I have great pleasure in presenting this petition and ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Speaker: I have much pleasure in supporting the petition just presented. These people are willing to build the hospital themselves, and ask the Government for this sum towards it. I trust that the Government will give this petition due consideration.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker: I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

MR. YOUNG.—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Spenser's Bay, in connection with a road from the Church of Scotland to the public building, down Water Street, and leading back to the grounds of the public building again. The petitioners ask this grant for the removal of bollards which are a nuisance to particular people. I trust that the Government will give it their consideration.

MR. PARSONS.—Mr. Speaker: I support that petition.

MR. MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker: I support that petition.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition signed by Isaac French and others, of Summerville, or Indian Arm, asking that the telegraph wire may be extended a distance of 6 miles from Southern Bay to Summerville.

REPORTS TABLED

BY HON. PRIME MINISTER tabled—

Report of Sir William MacGregor on the Labrador.

Report on the District of Ungava.

Report on Water Powers of Canada.

Dr. Grenfell's Book on Labrador.

MR. LLOYD.—Is there available any Report in connection with the areas on the East Coast, dealt with in the Newfoundland Products Corporation

BILL? We want to know if the Department has any information in relation to water powers within the area.

MR. MORINE—May I remind the Premier of some details of this matter which I have already asked him to furnish.

MR. LLOYD.—I understand, rightly or wrongly, that there has been an estimate made of the operations of the Products Company. Would it be possible for the Premier to obtain from the promoters their calculations as to wages.

MR. MORINE—Perhaps the Premier will tell me, without the formality of asking a question, whether the Government has been represented in the drafting of the Agreement by legal Counsel, and if so, by whom? I understand that the negotiations were with the Premier and Council, but I mean the legal work of criticising and examining the formal agreement. Who was acting for the Government?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I do not know that anyone was acting. We had several drafts before the Council, and at each meeting the Attorney General and the other lawyers who are members of the Council, were present. We had probably a dozen drafts before the Council, and changes were made from time to time by the Council.

MR. MORINE—You say you had several drafts before the Council. Who prepared them?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The first draft came from the Promoters, through their Solicitor, Mr. Furlong, who handed it to me. There is practically no resemblance whatever between that and the Bill in the form it has now reached. No one has been attending to it specially, except the Attorney General and myself.

MR. MORINE—In getting it into shape, would it not be necessary for changes to be made from time to time in the language, as you were altering

and re-drafting it. That, I presume, would be made by yourself.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Largely by myself and others at the Council meetings.

MR. MORINE—Nobody has had it definitely before him to pass on it in detail.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The Attorney General and myself have had several meetings, but not in the sense of having it referred to us.

MR. LLOYD—Referring to the Resolutions which have been brought in here: are these the wish of the Solicitor to the House, or the wish of the Attorney General or others?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The Attorney General and myself had the drafting of the present Resolutions. We went over the various precedents as found in a number of similar bills; then we agreed on the form, and the Attorney General gave instructions to the Solicitor of the House to draw the Resolutions in harmony with what had been agreed on.

MR. LLOYD—Then they come from him?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The Attorney-General and myself went over the precedents, a number of Acts and Resolutions of this kind previously passed. Then we agreed on the form and that was submitted by the Attorney General to the Solicitor to the House.

MR. MORINE—Then the drafting was actually done by you and the Attorney General.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The final draft was done by the Solicitor of the House. When the proof came back it was sent to the Attorney General.

MR. LLOYD—After the Solicitor was through with it, you approved of it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes. The Attorney General and myself went over it and approved of it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—**Mr. Speaker:** There is just a word I want to say about the final draft of the Products Company's Resolutions. What happened was this: When the proof came back from the printer, I went over it with the Attorney General, and we sent for the Solicitor of the House and pointed out two or three matters in the Bill in relation to the Resolutions as to whether they did not go further than the Agreement for confirmation. We discussed that fully for two or three hours, and the Attorney General and I were satisfied that the Resolutions did not give any further rights to the parties than the agreement itself, and then the final draft went back to the Solicitor.

MR. MORINE—In relation to the returns I asked for: The Premier will see that as this is up on Wednesday we should have those as soon as possible.

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE—**Mr. Speaker:** I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Catalina, asking that cod-traps have not more than seventy fathoms of leader when set between Black Rock South and Whale Back Rock, North. It seems that heretofore traps have had from one hundred to one hundred and twenty fathoms of leader, and the result is that they take up the room of a great many others that wanted to set traps, and I think the fishermen have decided that they don't want more than seventy fathoms. It is largely signed, by nearly all the fishermen of the place. It has about 86 signatures. I hope the Government will give it favourable consideration.

MR. TARGETT—**Mr. Speaker:** I rise to support the prayer of that petition.

MR. JENNINGS—**Mr. Speaker:** I beg leave to present a petition from Little Beaver Cove, in the District of Twillingate, asking for a sum of money

to make a road to the graveyard. Also asking for a sum of money to complete the public wharf. There was a small amount of timber cut and a small allocation made years back. The timber was never used, it is now rotten, and it was merely so much money wasted. I have no doubt that the needs set forth in this petition are genuine, and I trust the Government will accede to the requests. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. CLIFT—**Mr. Speaker:** I beg to present a petition from John Rideout, Jr., and other residents of King's Pt. and Rattling Brook, South West Arm, Green Bay, on the subject of the appointment of a male courier at that place. The petition asks that a certain individual, Mr. John Gillard, be appointed to the work, and all recommend him very strongly. I ask that this petition be referred to the Colonial Secretary who may communicate with the Postmaster General in reference to it.

MR. JENNINGS—**Mr. Speaker:** I beg to support the petition.

MR. ABBOTT—**Mr. Speaker:** I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bonavista asking for \$100 to repair a road to agricultural property. It is signed by 139 electors. This road is badly needed, and I hope the Government will see their way clear to grant this request.

MR. WINSOR—**Mr. Speaker:** I wish to support the prayer of that petition.

MR. TARGETT—**Mr. Speaker:** I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Sibley's Cove, asking for a sum of money to build a breakwater. It is a very hard place to land, and the people find it hard to land their fish. They only ask for the sum of \$150, and I trust the Government will grant their request.

I also have a petition from Lead Cove. The petitioners there have a certain amount of land to which they

cannot get with a horse and cart. They want to widen a lane, and the same road will lead to the place where they get water. I think it is a hard thing to get water there, and this road will serve two purposes. They only ask for £25.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions presented by the honourable member.

QUESTIONS

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker: I beg to title the answer to a question asked by Mr. Jennings.

MR. LLOYD—May I ask the Minister of Finance if he has another indorsement of the answer to the question I asked a few days ago. I thank him for what I have got.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I do not think I can get that information for another fortnight.

MR. ABBOTT—I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a question I asked on April 13th, concerning Customs in Bonavista.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think I tabled the answer.

Mr. Morlan gave notice of question.

Mr. Thargatt gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House (1) A statement showing the amount of money spent on Meloney's Bridge, in Harbour Main Proper, for the year 1914, the amount each man received, and the name of the parties who received the said amounts; (2) A copy of the returns of the main line grant from Harbor Main to Holyrood for 1914; (3) A copy of the returns of local road grants for Harbour Main Proper for the year 1914.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—That is in course of preparation.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House, a statement showing the total cost of the Motor Ferry Service on Pleasant Gut, including cost of landing piers, since its inception to date; the name of the parties who received any moneys on this account, and the amount received by each.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—That also is in course of preparation.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of two allocations, \$50 and \$25, made to Isaac Bolton of Dock, Port de Grave District, for 1912-13.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—I shall table that on Monday.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to a question asked by Mr. Abbott, I may say the Government Engineer's Report was tabled on the 16th of April and is now in the hands of the leader of the Opposition.

ESTATES DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Act, 5, George V., Session 1, Cap. XI, entitled: "An Act to Increase the Revenue by the Imposition of certain duties on the Estates of Deceased Persons" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is much for me to add to the explanation I gave when introducing the Estimates on Monday last. If there is any information necessary as we pass the votes I shall be glad to give it to the Committee.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, When the motion for supply was made two or three days ago, I drew the attention of the Minister to what I thought would be a very proper practice that in view of the financial situation he should depart from the usual practice of making his Budget Speech when going into Ways and Means and make it when going into Supply. He could of course defer any explanation as to how he proposed raising the money until he went into Ways and Means. It is common knowledge that the financial situation of the Colony is extremely grave. The deficit last year approached \$300,000 and a very large deficit may be expected this year so that the total of the two years will probably approach very closely to a million dollars in addition to which there is a large war expenditure that will probably go into another million in the course of the twelve months. Of course we understand that this is merely a loan from the British government and we are only assuming the interest upon it. There are in addition large outstanding obligations amounting to a good many millions of dollars and upon which the temporary loan made some time ago has to be provided for. Now under these circumstances it is clear that the financial situation is extraordinary and a departure from the practice formerly adopted ought to be made. The usual way is first to go into Supply and then later into Ways and Means

but this procedure is upon the assumption that conditions of affairs are normal and that ordinary provision only have to be made, that the changes in Supply are only for administrative purposes and the change in Revenue likely to be small and consequently there is never much trouble in going into the question of Supply, before you have any general statement. But it appears to me that we have got into the condition when we have to consider some such action as was taken in the winter of 1895 when a cut had to be made in every branch of the service. It may be on the other hand that the government will be able to submit financial proposals that can meet the situation, but we ought to have some outline before we are asked to pass these Estimates. So far as we have them before us they embrace large sums spent last year and to be spent this year and we have not been given any information as to how they are to be provided for. It is clear that they must be provided for by abnormal legislation by large increases of taxation and by large borrowings looking forward to an improvement in our affairs. Before we vote these supplies we have the right to know whether we shall approach the solution of the problem by a broad cut of expenditure, by additional taxation, or by trying to borrow money. Now for these reasons I respectfully throw out the suggestion and I hope it will be accepted by the Government, that instead of proceeding with Supply we should adjourn it until the Minister of Finance is able to make a broad financial statement of the expenditure up to the end of the year, and how he proposes proceeding the coming year. Then we will be able to consider these votes as they come before us. As far as I can see the Estimates are made up on the old model. There seems to have been no decided cut, in

fact, some of them seem to be made up of over-expenditure in a way that is grown too common and a bill of indemnity is now sought for them. I hope he will take the suggestion in good part and not refuse it simply because it comes from this side of the House.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot see eye to eye with the hon. gentleman. The course that we have pursued is the usual one. All financial statements necessary have been tabled before the Estimates were brought down and any information asked for by hon. members has been given to them. In his remarks he seems to foreshadow that certain unusual things are going to happen and he asks that we tell the House what these are. I do not know that anything unusual is going to happen, I do not know why we should come down with a financial statement before coming down with the Estimates and until we come down with the Budget Speech. There is no reason for it whatever.

I remember that in 1898 when the member was Finance Minister, he did not lay on the table of this House the financial statement before Supply had been considered by the Committee. The financial statements asked for will be tabled in due course and at the proper time, and I see no reason why the usual custom should be departed from during this particular session.

MR. MORINE—I ask for those documents simply because the conditions this year are entirely different to any previous period. We are faced with a large deficit and in all probability the coming year for which we are now providing will see a much larger one. I did not make any such statement as attributed to me by the

hon. member at the time I brought down the railway contract in 1898 to the House, giving as a reason that it was necessary to pass it as the Colony was on the verge of bankruptcy. This charge has repeatedly been made against me, but I made no such statement at that time. Then, as now, the Colony was passing through a critical period having to face a large deficit and the outlook was anything but bright and encouraging. I think I have a pretty fair idea of the financial condition of the country and the necessity for the Finance Minister to make provision for the deficit and for the civil service by way of adopting drastic measures or meeting a shortage by means of a loan. Owing to the abnormal and unusual conditions existing this House should be in possession of the financial statements asked for before voting for the estimates of the entire Civil Service.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish for a postponement of those Estimates, but as a great deal of my time has been taken up on such work as select committees I have not had an opportunity of looking into them. I would therefore ask that their consideration be deferred.

I think that before we consider supply we should be given some intimation as to the financial condition of the Colony and I am of the opinion that the request made by the hon. member, Mr. Morine is only a reasonable and fair one, and one calculated to expedite the business of the House.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to impress upon the Government the desirability of getting through with the business of this House as soon as possible. The busy season is at hand and hon. members on this side of the House, particularly those sitt-

ing in the back row, must return to their homes as early as circumstances permit. My colleague Mr. Jennings, cannot remain much longer as he engages in the herring business, and the same thing applies to other hon. members. They as well as myself attend here at this time of year at a great loss, consequently it is necessary that we should finish the business of the House as soon as possible.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I have no objection to defer the consideration of this matter until Monday next. I see however, no reason for departing from the usual course. I must say we are in a position to answer any reasonable questions concerning anything the hon. member may desire information on.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. The consent of the hon. minister to a postponement is most acceptable, and we very much appreciate his acceptance of our request. As regards the information he refers to, I wish to impress upon him the fact that we do not desire to embarrass in any way the government by our requests for information. But if there is anything that could with convenience be given us, we would be most happy to receive it. Is there nothing we may be told about how the Government is going to meet the deficit, whether there is any means provided for this by loans or otherwise? Any information like this that would help us to prepare for these statements will I think, be found in practice to facilitate matters in the end.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman. The request of the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine seems to me a just and proper one, when we consider the extraordinary circumstances affecting the present session. I think we ought to have given us a debit and credit statement of public affairs as

they now stand in order to facilitate our present discussions. From the information we have, we can gather no tangible knowledge to enlighten us in this direction. There seems to be no substantial reduction in any part of the public services. At a time such as the present we ought to have something very substantial in the way of reduction. Certain salaries as far as one can judge are capable of reduction and until the minister can show us exactly what he is going to do to maintain the requisite revenue to justify the maintenance of these public services we are unable to offer any criticism.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. There are various items such as the Agricultural Grant and others which we intend to oppose the government upon, until they are able to prove to us in what way they are going to meet all these expenditures. If they can prove these things to our satisfaction, we shall be pleased to accord our heartiest support. But these will have to satisfy us. As has been stated, we have no desire to embarrass the government, but I think we ought to be in possession of the various facts which are essential to our facilitating the business of public affairs.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to be in possession of these facts. I think we should have placed before us statements of the financial condition of the Colony, and if possible a very general statement as to the course the Government proposes to adopt. It has been stated that the course proceeded upon by the Minister of Finance and Customs is the usual one. I grant him that, absolutely. But in view of the prevailing conditions I think that the procedure of this House is a sufficiently elastic one to enable the course suggested by Mr. Morine to be adopted with advantage. I ask the Premier to consider this re-

quest. I may say that I have some idea of the financial affairs of this Colony, and it is only to aid the Government and the Prime Minister that I make this request. I have no desire to have this House held up, and I ask again that our request that this course be adopted should receive consideration at the hands of the Government.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman: I think I am in a position to bear out what the hon. member, Dr. Lloyd, has said. We do not want to embarrass the Government in any way. We merely ask that all should know the condition of the country before dealing with the estimates.

MR. MORINE—I wish, Mr. Chairman, to justify myself also against that aspersion. I do not mean to indulge in captious opposition either, but I am not prepared to give my assent to the statement of the Finance Minister: Up to 1897 the practice of the House was to vote money for the current year, and to bring down a financial statement at the same time with the Estimates. It was I who instituted the present practice in 1897. The Minister of Finance, Mr. Cashin, is in error, when he states the practice dated back further than that. The first financial statement that I brought in was in 1898. That was for the purpose of cutting out useless expenditure, and they should be cut out altogether now. The Colony cannot afford it; part of the expenditure of the present day, useful as it may be, you will have to cut out. We want to know what the Government is going to do in this matter; I trust a statement will be brought down this session.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on Monday.

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

STAMP DUTIES.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of Stamp Duties.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Just a word or two, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Stamp Act. Last year when we brought down this bill we put a stamp duty on all cheques—Government cheques not excluded. Since that we have found out that it was a lot of unnecessary trouble; a case of taking money from one pocket and putting it into another. This is the reason we bring in this Bill this afternoon; we propose to have all Government cheques, all things of that nature to pass without a stamp.

MR. MORINE.—What do you mean by Government cheques?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Any Department of the Government using cheques—

MR. MORINE.—Would that include the Road Board cheques?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—There is no Road Board cheque now. We also propose to put 2c. duty on all receipts to the amount of \$2.50 and upwards and 2c. on Post Office Money Orders and Postal Orders.

MR. CLIFT.—Post Office Orders carry a 2c. stamp at the present time; is it the intention that that is necessary?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Yes. It is considered a Bill of Exchange.

MR. CLIFT.—The stamp is put on by the Post Office and they do not charge for it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—They charge 2c. for it. The Express Orders of the Reid Newfoundland Co. require 2c. stamp as cheques. A Postal Order is considered a Bill of Exchange and therefore is subject to a 5c. tax. This Bill is intended to put Postal Orders in the same class with express orders. The R. N. Co. Express Orders go in as cheques according to the old Bill.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I consider the act so far as it affects receipts, as a great hardship on people of this Colony, and we have no idea of the result of such a tax on receipts. The way the act reads now it is not obligatory to put a stamp on a receipt unless it is required for some purpose of proof in court. The Minister may keep that in his mind, that only in a case of coming to Court to prove a bill is a stamp needed. In that case when a receipt is produced it would be necessary to have a stamp on it. But I think myself under the Act as it is now if you have a stamp on a receipt at the time you wish to use it, then that is quite sufficient, although you do not put a stamp on it at the time it is issued. If it is decided to bring the Bill into force the term "Receipts" should be exactly defined. I am of opinion that to tax receipts as low as \$2.00 is too burdensome on poor people who would have to pay considerably more revenue in this way than the rich man, and I suggest that the amount be extended to say \$20 or \$25.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, this Stamp Bill is connected with a question I asked the Minister 14 days ago. The object of that question was to get at the expenses of the past year. One of the questions was to ask what revenue had been derived from stamp

taxes. I asked what revenue had been derived since September last and until we know that what's the use of going blindly into the matter. I would like to ask him whether he knows exactly what the stamp returns of last year amounted to?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I do not know, because ordinary postage stamps are used and we have no means of keeping it separate.

MR. LLOYD.—You have no means and therefore we must go blindly into the matter.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—There is a pretty large increase of the sale of stamps within the past six months.

MR. LLOYD.—Don't you think we should have the expenditure before going into the matter?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The information is available.

MR. MORINE.—These resolutions, Mr. Chairman, should be carefully considered. What will happen now is you will put stamps on receipts only when you want to use them in court. There is nothing saying when a receipt shall be stamped. The general tenor of the act would lead one to suppose it should be stamped when given.

I find when looking back to the 1898 act which this is an amendment of, that the court shall take judicial notice of the stamp on a receipt, while in the act of last year that matter seems to be covered again by Section 2. I do not know why that was introduced in face of the 1898 provision. In the 1898 Act it was in relation to payments. The 1914 Act is an amendment of that Act. It appears to me that in the whole thing there is ground for grave doubts, which will lead to trouble. To my mind the Act of last year and that of this year might be

consolidated and introduced in one Bill.

MR. CLIFT.—What does the Minister mean by a receipt?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—An acknowledgment of money paid—not a receipt for goods.

MR. JENNINGS.—I would like, Mr. Chairman, to ask exactly what is meant by the term receipt as used in this resolution. As the House is probably aware, it is the custom in the outports to get receipts from those who take your fish, and payment is made on the production of these. I was wondering if the regulations here laid down would apply to these.

MR. HIGGINS.—In reply to the hon. member I may say that I do not think that the word receipt as used here would apply to any but cash receipts. At the present time while a revenue is paid by those who pay their sundry bills by cheque, the man who pays with cash pays nothing. I think that the object of this is to make the application of this tax more general and applicable to every case in which money changes hands.

MR. KENT.—I might remind the hon. member that it is generally the poor man who pays money and who would be liable under this to pay a large share of the revenue so obtained.

MR. MORINE.—But if this goes through there will be no receipts given; people will take the risk rather than pay the necessary tax.

MR. HIGGINS.—That is one of the points yet to be considered. You take the everyday custom. If you go into a shop and buy a pair of boots, you pay money over the counter and you get back a receipt. In the old country there is a system by which receipts must be stamped if over a certain amount. That amount here is fixed at \$2.00. The hon. member will see that the principle is a safe one.

MR. MORINE.—But this would not apply here. In the majority of cases boots bought here are paid for in cash and no notice taken of any receipt.

MR. HIGGINS.—I do not agree with the hon. member.

MR. MORINE.—I repeat that for petty purchases cash payments are made and no receipt is taken.

MR. HIGGINS.—I think that a receipt is required. This being granted I think that there can be no difference of opinion. We ought not lose sight of the fact that at the present time a tax is imposed upon him who pays by cheque, while cash payments exact no revenue at all. The purchaser would under this system pay the same as if he paid by cheque for the amount. I have last year's Act in front of me and it seems to me that there is certainly nothing unfair in that. As I take it, the suggestion that it is the poor man who makes the cash payment and that it will be he who will have to pay the tax is a wrong one. I would think that the person who has to pay it would be the person who receives the payment. I would merely suggest that the principle is not in the least a hardship when considered in this light.

MR. LLOYD.—While I agree with the hon. member for St. John's East, on what he has just said, I would point out to him that the law is different on this side from what it is in England, and that there is no tax on small transactions which are made in the ordinary course of life; no receipt is taxed under £2. Now sir, there is some difference between \$2 and \$10.00. Besides this we must remember that the folks in England do not make large transactions as the people do here. In England people do not purchase their flour by the barrel or potatoes by the barrel, and consequently their spendings do not amount

to as much as £2, and thus they pay no tax.

MR. MORINE.—I hope the Government will remember this point and others which may be raised and for those reasons drop this means of taxation. We had a similar act up in Canada for a year or so and as the people implored again and again the Government found themselves forced to drop it. As the imposition of a tax on small things as Express Orders and receipts would not bring in a large amount, I would suggest that the Government strike out that clause in these resolutions. In the larger stores you get receipts for your purchases if you wait but people very seldom wait for these. Personally, I pay cash, and consequently as I run no bills I have no need to get receipts. In the smaller shops no receipts are given at all and transactions there are strictly cash over the counter. If you put a clause like this in your bill you will stop the custom of giving receipts. People are not going to give receipts now if you tax them, because there is no need of them. The result of this bill will only be that people will burn what receipts they have and will take no more, and if this is the result what will be the material benefit to the revenue.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, certainly the Government cannot be serious in their plan to tax receipts. If they are then I would advise them to take this clause out of the bill, for I can assure them that I will make whatever political capital I can out of it and that will be some.

MR. HICKMAN.—The point raised by the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings, should be carefully considered, because receipts in the thou sand are given away every year for fish and we do not know whether these need to be stamped or not. We have had a great deal of trouble in

the past about this matter. Some banks charge something, others charge a 2 cent stamp and others have let them go without any charge whatever. As a matter of fact there has been general confusion as to the meaning of the word receipt, and as this is being changed, the word receipt should be duly and clearly defined. The same trouble arises in connection with the double stamping which has been spoken about here this afternoon. Even if there was a penalty, people would be found to take the risk, and to have receipts unstamped until it is found necessary to produce it, which may of course be never. In any case whatever is done, the amount of £2 is too small. If it were made 1c. for \$100 and 2c. upwards of \$100 it would be far better.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, there is something in what Mr. Coaker has said regarding the experience of some people regarding stamp duties. If the Government is desirous of making a reputation for itself, this action will certainly have that effect. I do not agree with the member for St. John's East that every person buying goods down town gets a receipt for same. I have had a lengthy experience and can say that only one in twenty of the people keep and even take these. The rest leave them behind. When the purchase is sent out by delivery of course it is different, for it is obligatory to send it out then. As a matter of fact customers very seldom get a receipt.

Then there is another objection to that. By this arrangement the poor will pay more largely than will the rich. There is not the least doubt that with this provision as it is now, the increased revenue will be out of the pockets of the poor. The poor people make their purchases from the small shops and pay up at the end of the week. By this provision it is neces-

ary for them to pay 5c. as this bill will probably amount to \$2.00. With the rich it is different. Their accounts are allowed to stand 2 or 3 months, and then they only have to pay the same price on their receipts. This means that they are paying only one-tenth of what the poorer people are obliged to pay.

I think that the Government ought to reconsider this bill, for if they pass it as it is, the Opposition will be able to use it for political capital. The Government ought to take this advice and accept the suggestion to provide against this unfair proposition which is now before the House.

MR. KENT—I think, Mr. Chairman, that this Act has been very thoughtlessly prepared. Such confusion as is now prevalent ought to be impossible because of the structure of the bill. The fact that, as Mr. Hickman, the hon. member for Bay de Verde, has told the House, it is not clearly defined as to what the term "receipt" means is an omission that ought not have been in the bill. It is not clear whether the application is to money receipts only, or to all receipts. I should take it that it means money receipts, but that is only an opinion, and the interpretation of such a statute as this by personal opinion is something which should be made unnecessary by the terms used in the bill. This is an important matter, and should have the reconsideration of the Government. As it is now it is most confusing.

Now as regards the revenue which such an act as this should bring, I think the Minister has made too low a calculation. In any case the amount of \$2.00 as the minimum is far too low. This as the minimum amount would make the act cover payments of small rents, which are generally made in payments of over \$2.00. These taxes would not be right and fair. If the amount we made was \$20 or \$25 there

would be some difference. There would be some reason in doing this, for in any case the principle is in application. I would suggest that receipts be left out altogether or else if they are left there, have it defined exactly as to what is meant by the term.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the money order system and its relation to this bill. The question is whether or no this being an order for money ought to pay stamp duties; and I think the Express orders have to pay no duties. Express orders are a great deal more satisfactory than money orders for the simple reason that money orders cannot be bought after 4 o'clock to catch the 4.30 mail, while Express orders can be so bought. Money orders ought to be subject to the same facilities as the Express orders to the public. I always buy the money orders when I can get them, but I often find myself compelled to buy Express orders or else miss the mail.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

Mr. Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

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

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Colonial Secretary a Bill dealing with the management of the General Hospital was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourns until three of the clock on Monday next.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 26th.

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

PETITIONS.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a number of petitions from Conception Bay, and also from Trinity Bay. These are in connection with the fishery law concerning trawls on Labrador. In 1909 there was an agitation amongst the fishermen around Conception Bay and other places and petitions were sent to this House to make a rule to forbid the use of trawls on Labrador. This matter was taken up by the Fisheries Board and the law came into force. In 1910 and 1911 the fishermen went down as usual and after getting down there they found very little fish to be trapped on different parts of the coast. They immediately got in touch with the Marconi Stations and wired the Government asking for permission to fish with trawls on the coast of Labrador. The Government acceded to their wishes. That law was suspended until last year. I think the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, had some correspondence from some fishermen and asked that the law would be enforced again. Last season when the fishermen got down there, they found out that they could get but very little fish with traps, and those who had trawls commenced to put them out, and got quite a lot of fish, but other trap men complained about this, and had them take their trawls out of the water. No doubt if they had been allowed to use trawls last season in many places there would not have been so many looking for Government relief this Spring as there have been.

Now these petitions have been very largely signed all around Conception Bay, and the South part of Trinity

Bay, and they have been sent in here asking that this law be annulled and that they be allowed to fish with trawls on Labrador when they cannot fish any other way. I consider myself that the fishermen should be the best judges of this and that they should be allowed to catch fish in any legal manner whatever. You may make a law to hinder the fishermen from catching fish, but if the fish do not come to the coast you cannot make a law to bring it there. I take this opportunity of presenting these petitions, and I ask that they be referred to the Department to which they relate.

MR. YOUNG—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions just presented by my colleague. I also agree with him that you cannot bring the fish to the line, but I think that when it comes there the fishermen ought to be allowed to catch it in any way they can.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petitions.

QUESTIONS

Mr. Morine gave Notice of Question.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the answer to a question asked by Mr. Targett on April 26th, and also to a question asked by Mr. Winsor on April 26th.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House (1) A copy of the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited; (2) A copy of all agreements which have been filed between the said Company and the persons or Companies who have agreed to transfer water powers or lands to the Company; (3) A statement showing the names of holders of land or water rights within the

drainage area of the Humber River, showing the area of the land rights and the locality of water rights; (4) A similar statement in relation to the drainage area of the Hamilton River and Hamilton Inlet; (5) A statement showing the amount of capital stock which has been pledged or allocated by the said Company to any person or persons, and the amount of stock in the Company which has been issued to date for cash; (6) Any report made to the Government by persons acting on its behalf with relation to the water powers in the Humber drainage area, or in the area on the East Coast of the Colony referred to by Sec. 1 of the Agreement between the Government and the said Company; (7) Also for a statement giving the name of any person or Company who hold lands or water rights in the drainage area on the East Coast referred to in Sec. 1 of the aforesaid Agreement, showing the area of lands and the location of rights held by each; (8) For a similar statement in relation to the Hamilton River and the North West River on the Coast of Labrador.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—As to No. (1) I beg to table two copies of the articles. As to No. (2) there have been no agreements filed. No. 3. That is being prepared. No. 4. That is being prepared. (5) There has been no meeting and nothing has been done since the Company has been formed. (6) There has been no specific report. The Government has had only the reports or information that have been obtained from time to time by the various Departments. (7) That also is being prepared, and I hope to have it tomorrow. (8) I hope to table that to-morrow.

I gather from my friend the Leader of the Opposition that the answers to these questions cover his.

There was a question, which was not on the order paper, asked by the member for Trinity, Dr Lloyd, in relation to the acreage of the three areas referred to in the agreement. I shall table that tomorrow.

MR. MORINE—With reference to (7), will the Premier have that amended by the addition of the 40 mile areas around Humber mouth.

MR. MORINE asked the Minister of Public Works if a special grant was given in 1913 to one Abram Hobbs, of Keels; if so, has it been expended, and for the returns; and for copy of all correspondence re the same.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—This is prepared, I expect it will arrive at any moment.

MR. MORINE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary what salary is paid the telephone operator at Keels.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table desired information.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing for what the following amounts were paid T. Bonia for, in connection with Cape Broyle wharf, as tabled recently: \$1,680, \$1,508.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—This is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement of grants, other than local, expended in Bonavista District for the year 1914, to date, and to whom paid.

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

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copies of the returns for the following amounts expended by B. J. St. John on Conception Hr. Marine Works (Harbor Main District): \$25.00 and \$12.50; also, for a copy of returns for \$468 expended by

Thomas Bonta at the same place, and also for a copy of returns of 1850 expended by Wm. Kennedy at the same place.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in relation to a question I was asked as to the value in labor of the proposed fertilizer industry, I may say: Estimate of labor bill by the promoters is under general heads. No detailed estimate has been made as to wages, except for the work of details of the engineers which is not given in any summaries but follows calculations right through. As to the labor bill I am informed by Mr. Willson that if the Company export \$16,000,000 worth of products to produce them the direct labor bill will be about \$3,000,000 in Newfoundland, and 20 per cent of this in other industries necessitated by the works of Bay of Islands, but not directly under the control of the Company and merely subsidiary industries that will crop up. The two other works, namely the factories for the manufacture of nitrate of ammonia and the cement works, the plans for both of which have not yet been completed but are in hand, and concerning which he has no figures, will mean at least another \$1,000,000 labor and probably very much more. This is Mr. Willson's estimate. That would mean an annual Labour bill for the total industry of \$4,000,000. As to the cost of construction, if the industry costs \$18,000,000, I am instructed that half of that amount will be represented by cement, machinery, structural steel and iron works and all the other materials that will have to be purchased or made to go into the structures.

SEAL FISHERY BILL.

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

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries presented the following report:

"April 26th, 1915.

"The Select Committee on "An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery" beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred and recommend the attached BILL.

Sgd:—

A. W. PICCOTT,

Chairman.

W. F. COAKER

W. B. JENNINGS

R. G. WINSOR

R. MOULTON

E. P. MORRIS."

On motion this report was received.

On motion it was ordered that the Bill 'An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery' be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. MORINE—I would suggest to the Committee that they would take into consideration the advisability of consolidating all the laws in respect to sealing. I think the Sealing Act of last year ought to be consolidated with the Report now before the House. The Act of last year is I think without exception the worst piece of legislation we have on our Statute Book. This was well brought out in a controversy before the Police Court Magistrate on Saturday last, when several questions gave rise to differences of opinion as to the interpretation of this Act. It resembles what is commonly known as a patch work crazy quilt. The paragraphs in relation to the date of sailing especially, are composed of phrases some relating to the outside fishery, some to the Gulf fishery and so in a way that can certainly benefit no one, but may be decidedly detrimental to the interests of a great many. Now, I think it is extremely important that we should have our laws in this respect consolidated so that we may have a concrete piece of legislation to regulate the carrying on of this industry in

the Colony, I suggest this knowing that a very capable committee is now dealing with these things who might as far as I can see very well consolidate the laws on the subject.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

As a matter of fact, the Act is or rather has been consolidated by the Commissioners who have the matter under consideration at the present time. They have gone most thoroughly into matters connected with the sailing voyage. Everyone on this commission is thoroughly conversant with the practical side of the question. I think when the matter comes before us next session it will be found that all these things will have been considered and rectified.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. 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.

LOGGING BILL.

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

Mr. Coaker presented the following Report:

House of Assembly,

St. John's, April 26th, 1915.

The Select Committee on an Act respecting the regulation of the employment of men engaged in Logging beg to report that they have consid-

ered the matter to them referred and report the following Bill.

Signed:—

W. F. COAKER
W. B. JENNINGS
W. F. LLOYD
A. W. PICCOTT."

On motion this Report was received.

On motion it was ordered that the Bill entitled: "An Act to Regulate the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging" be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend 'The St. John's Municipal Act.'

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 27th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 27th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Portugal Cove and Bell Island in connection with a subject already brought before this House last year, with regard to the wharf at Portugal Cove. A few years ago this wharf was carried away and a temporary arrangement provided for the convenience of the people there. This petition which is numerously signed by the leading people engaged in business and traffic there, asks that an allocation be made on the suggestions formerly offered for the facilitation of this measure, also that it be

extended to Anchor rock. The adoption of this idea would mean the utilization of this wharf as a breakwater, which would incidentally provide a harbour for the people of that district. It would however, require considerable expenditure of money. But I would point out that this petition is one which does not affect the district of St. John's East only. It largely concerns the people of Bell Island and other places connected with Portugal Cove. It may be said that Portugal Cove is the centre of business in that particular part of the Island, and therefore I ask that this petition receive the earnest consideration of the Government, and beg that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of this petition. I would beg also to point out that this is the third time that this wharf has come under the notice of this House. The wharf is I may say, totally unfit for traffic or public use, and in a state of incompleteness that renders it of little value to the inhabitants of that place. Portugal Cove affects all the surrounding places to a large extent and the attention asked for by this petition would prove greatly beneficial to the whole country. At this wharf the public steamers call with a large amount of traffic and I do not think the wharf is in a safe condition at all for the reception of this traffic. I myself had occasion to go several times to Bell Island last year, and I remember that on two occasions the steamer was unable to come into the wharf because the water was too shallow. A few years ago the steamer could always call at this wharf. The extension to Anchor Rock should be acceded to. I think that if a wharf were well built there it would not be in any way liable to damage from the ordinary storms that occur

there. I think that a sum of money spent in this direction before this summer would be a great advantage to the people. I beg leave to support the prayer of this petition and would impress upon Mr. Higgins the desirability of using all his influence to have an appropriation granted to the people for this matter.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of this petition.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from D. G. Whiteway and a large number of planters of Musgrave Harbor and Dotting Cove in Fogo District, asking that the use of traps be prohibited at certain places situate around these places, namely: Tom Cod Rock, Elliott's Rock, S.S. West Rock, George Abbott's and John Abbott's Rock, and be reserved solely for the use of hook and line men. The petition, which is largely signed by the most influential and important persons there, explains itself in a very clear manner. I beg leave to read this petition. (Hon. member reads petition.) I am very much in accord with the sentiments of this petition, and beg that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Rev. A. B. Stirling and seven hundred others, residents of the town of Twillingate, relating to the subject of total prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. It is a matter that needs very little comment from me, as it has already received the attention of this House, which expressed itself in no uncertain manner. I beg leave to support this petition, and beg that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition. As I said before the people of Twillingate are in favour of temperance. I

hope the measure introduced by the Government will meet the conditions required by all temperance supporters in this country.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition. I am pleased to know that there are 760 signatures to the petition. That means the signatures of all the electors in Twillingate proper. When the vote is taken later on I am sure the people of Twillingate will express their feelings in a tangible way. As this matter is again coming before the House it is hardly worth my while to deal at any length with the matter.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Lawrenceton, asking for a sum of money to make repairs to certain roads. They say the need is very great and that the amount asked for is only such as is absolutely necessary. I hope the matter will receive the attention of the Minister of Public Works.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Brookfield asking that the telegraph office there be reopened. It would be a very small expense to the Government, and it would be a great boon to the locality.

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

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I support that petition. I would ask the Colonial Secretary why this office has been closed. It is regrettable that it should have been closed. The population there has increased and there does not seem any reason why it should be closed.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Port Rexton, asking for the dismissal of Mr. Barnes, fishery warden. He has not it would appear been satisfactory, and has not performed his work. The petitions ask

for his dismissal. I hope the Government will consider this matter.

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

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Nipper's Harbour and other settlements on the subject of telephone communication. They ask for telephone communication between the different harbours named. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and ask that it be referred to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Joe Batt's Arm and other places, asking that Joe Batt's Arm be made a port of call for the 'Clyde.' The people of these places are much handicapped by not having the 'Clyde' call there. Pogo two or three miles away, has a bi-weekly service and places almost within stone's throw, are neglected. They only receive a weekly mail and at times a fortnightly. I am very pleased to present this petition, and I trust that the Government will take it into consideration. It is very largely signed by the inhabitants of these localities. The object of Government is to provide facilities for earning money and by providing this facility you will greatly facilitate these places in the earning of money and otherwise.

QUESTIONS.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled answer to question asked for by Mr. Grimes on Feb'y. 26th.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Clift gave notice of question.

MR. MORINE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement prepared by the Auditor General, showing the expenditure year by year, since 1897, (1) under Section 71 of the Audit Act, 1898; and (2) re any

other way not previously provided for by the Legislature.

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

MR. MORINE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the revenue and expenditure for 1914-15, week by week, compared with the same weeks in 1913-14.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, that statement is made monthly not weekly. I table the monthly statement.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if a man named Mitchell, who was discharged from the Government Telegraph Service, is now employed as a Censor, and if so, if his dismissal was for immoral conduct, or for what reason.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply I beg to say that Mitchell was not dismissed, he resigned, and the Government accepted his resignation. He is now employed by the Anglo American Telegraph Co. as a recording clerk.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. Premier on what authority Deputy Minister of Justice Hutchings and Judge Knight were paid for the Kean inquiry, and for copy of all orders, correspondence, and vouchers re the same.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, that information is being prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if a man named Davies is receiving a salary from the Government for teaching a technical school, under what authority he teaches, and what salary he receives; also a copy of all correspondence in relation to his appointment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the information.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon.

Premier for an explanation in relation to the payment of a large sum of money for hay imported in 1912, and for all orders, correspondence, and vouchers relating to the same.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, that information will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs by what authority payments of \$368.22 per month were made to the Governor for travelling expenses; for a copy of all orders, correspondence and vouchers concerning the same.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, that information will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. CLIFT asked the Rt. Hon. Premier to lay on the table of the House a copy of all grants issued to the Reid Nfd. Co. covering water powers on the Humber River or elsewhere, covered by the resolution confirming the agreement entered into between the Government and the Newfoundland Products Co.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I am having that matter enquired into. I am not aware that there are any. If there have been they will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a list giving the names of those who receive the Old Age Pensions in the District of Harbour Main.

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

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns, showing an amount of money allocated by his Department to Mr. E.C. Brown, of King's Cove, for a well.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—That statement will be tabled to-morrow. Mr. Speaker informed the House

that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled: 'An Act Respecting Patents and Trade Marks' without amendment.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman before resuming the debate I may say that it has been suggested that a preliminary financial statement should be brought down by the Government. Since the House adjourned the Government has considered the matter, and we have decided that the usual course will not be deviated from. Any particular information asked for will be given.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I think it is a pity that the Government has decided after the request made from this side of the House, that they will not bring down a statement showing the present financial condition of the Colony. We have only asked for a general statement, not a detailed one. We only want an outline showing the financial condition of the country. The request is a reasonable one and the Government is in no way justified in refusing a reasonable and just request from the opposition before we go on with Supply, voting away \$4,000,000. That statement of the financial condition of the country ought to be before us. The request is reasonable and the refusal is unreasonable, and I am sorry that the Government has not seen fit to comply. There are several matters in connection with the estimates which are most important and

most necessary for an intelligent debate. On the first page there is the public debt of the Colony and considering the amount of the public debt, and the particular way in which it stands at the present time, I think a statement on that point ought to be supplied. It is not necessary to go into ways and means, but we ought to have a general statement outlining the financial condition of the country in order that the House may intelligently form an opinion on the estimates for the public service. The Estimates of late years have been on the increase. This year they are larger than last and last year they were larger than the year before. In the last five or six years the amount of the Supply has increased over \$1,000,000. And yet we are told that "the business of the country is carried on with due regard to economy and prudence," and that "the Estimates have been prepared with regard to the necessary demands of the public service." If we examine what the Government has done during the time they have been in office we find that they have always under-estimated their expenditure, largely under-estimated it. For instance, in 1909-10 the expenditure exceeded the estimates, including the additional estimates by \$195,000; in 1910-11 it exceeded by \$299,000; in 1911-12 by \$197,000; in 1912-13 by \$195,000, and in 1913-14 by \$234,000. That, Sir, shows that the Government has not had due regard to the requirements of the public service in making up their Estimates. The difference between the estimates which are brought into the House in the shape of Supply and the expenditure which takes place during the year for which the Supply is provided is larger than the difference between the actual expenditure and the gross Supply. For instance, in those years you had Supplementary Supply and you had Addi-

lona Estimates each year. In 1910 you had Supplementary Supply of \$214,000, in 1911 you had \$147,000, in 1912, \$142,000, in 1913 \$237,000, and in 1914 \$224,000.

Now, Sir, in connection with the preparation of the Estimates the Minister stated here last year that the Government were more or less penitential in this matter, and intended in the future to have greater regard for the requirements of the Public Services in making out their Estimates. Well the figures before us now show that is not so. The Estimates that we voted here last year have been exceeded up to the present time. We will have to provide Supplementary Supply before this Committee rises. Large expenditures have been made during the year which were not provided for in the Estimates, and which should have been foreseen and placed in the Estimates, and the needs for which in the Estimates were pointed out by us last year. The Minister told us, when we pointed out certain votes were necessary according to the Report of the Auditor General, that these votes were dropped because they were unnecessary—votes for salaries and increases and other things of that kind, and notwithstanding the remarks of the Minister we find the same comments in the Auditor General's Report for this year.

Then, Sir, last year at this stage, when the House was in Committee on Supply, I took the opportunity to call the attention of the Government to the Audit Act and to the fact that the Audit Act was not being observed and that payments covering large amounts had been paid that were absolutely irregular and illegal and that there was no warrant or authority for the payment of large sums of money which were made by the Governor in Council. This matter is not a new one. It has been referred to

by the Auditor General year after year in his reports. The intention and object of the Audit Act as the Ministers know, and as the members of the Government know is to keep control over the expenditure of public moneys in the Legislature; and the Government when it makes estimates of the amounts required for public services is supposed to consult every Department into which the public service is divided, and to get estimates from these Departments, from the experienced permanent heads of the Departments—not from the political heads, but from the permanent heads who have been there for years, and know the workings of the various Departments, and make recommendations on the matter of Supply, and Supply has been more or less a fixed matter from year to year; and every year the faults and defects have been pointed out. Now under the Audit Act it is provided that all moneys received for public purposes are paid into an account in the Bank. These moneys can only be released by a warrant of the Governor. The Governor issues his warrant and appropriates the money to the different Departments. Then according as the needs of each service require credits are issued in favour of the Accountant or Deputy Head of the Department. These credits are drawn against and a monthly repayment cheque is drawn after the Auditor General has had an opportunity of examining the accounts. The amount is drawn regularly according to the terms of the Audit Act and is placed against the credit. The Audit Act takes into account the fact that circumstances may arise during the year which cannot possibly be foreseen. Emergencies may occur. In these cases authority is given to the Government to make certain payments beyond the payments made in

the regular way under the Appropriation Accounts. These payments are made under a special section of the Act. Beyond this there is no other authority for the payment of public money; but it has been the practice of the Government for years to pay money by Minute of Council. There is no authority whatever in the Audit Act for any such payment as this. It is an irregular and illegal payment, and it is a payment made entirely at the risk of the Bank that makes it, and unless the Legislature, when the amount is brought in here and reported by the Government is prepared to sanction and grant indemnity for these payments the Bank has no remedy except against the person who drew the cheque.

There is another matter to which I would wish to draw the attention of the Government, and it is a matter which has been mentioned by the Auditor General, and which has been referred to by me in this House. It is the practice of delaying payments—withholding the payment of accounts until the close of the financial year, and accounts that should ordinarily be paid in one year are left over until the following year and then paid and charged up not to the proper year but to the following year. Now the moneys appropriated by this House are appropriated by the year to cover the service for which it is voted, and no one here has any authority to use money for one year which has properly been voted for another. Now in order to close the accounts at the end of the financial year on the 30th of June and in order that the various Departments may settle up their affairs these Departments are allowed from the 30th of June until the 1st of October before closing their books. Now the Auditor General in his Report calls the attention of the Legis-

lature to this matter, and I think we ought to take steps to prevent a repetition of this matter.

Now there is another matter in connection with the accounts of last year. Take the matter of overdrawn accounts. Take the General Contingencies vote. The General Contingencies vote has been fixed for years—almost I think since we had an Audit Act. It was first introduced at \$10,000 a year. Now last year a new practice was introduced. The Auditor General last year made a stand and tried to have this account kept within the amount voted by the Legislature. The result was that the account was overdrawn and the Government issued a Special Warrant transferring the amount then charged to General Contingencies to another account, and left General Contingencies open for a further draft. In addition they had to come in here and ask for additional supply under the head of General Contingencies. Now Sir, the Audit Act expressly provides that expenditures shall only be made for services for which they are voted. Look at the Auditor General's Report in connection with the payments under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act. That is the section making provision for emergencies. Now under that section it is provided that if any accident happens to any public work or public building, or any other occasion arises which could not have been foreseen and money is needed the Minister in charge must certify that it is necessary, and the Minister of Finance must report that there is no Legislative provision. Then and only then has the Government any authority to make any payment under this head, and then only for the specific purposes which are provided for. Last year there was under this a Special Warrant in favour of the Department

of Public Charities for \$15,000, and one for \$15,000 in favour of General Contingencies. These are supplementary to the Departmental accounts which were overdrawn, and to which the Auditor General protested again in his Report. Thus a use of this section of the Act for Supplementary votes made by the Legislature. The section is intended to cover emergencies which could not possibly have been foreseen, and not to supply further supply upon which any Department or Sub-Department can draw for the ordinary requirements of the Department. That is taking the absolute control of moneys out of the hands of the Legislature and putting it in the hands of the Governor in Council. The only control which the Legislature can exercise in cases of that kind is by comment afterwards, which after the money is spent is very poor satisfaction to the people who have got to pay the money.

Then there are payments under orders in Council. These are utterly irregular and illegal. There is no authority in law for the payment of these amounts, and they generally cover matters that ought properly find a place in the ordinary Estimates coming before the House. There are rarely any matters of urgency covered by these payments. These payments are mostly in the way of increases of salaries or the creation of new offices and other matters which could wait until the Legislature met and a vote could be put in the Estimates in the ordinary way. Under the Auditor General's Report down to the end of February of the year he reports that an amount of \$25,811 has been appropriated in this way. In order to inform the House of the nature of the services for which these payments have been made and the amounts appropriate, I will read a few of them. Take the first, D. James Davies, Govern-

ment Analyst, no salary voted—\$1,600 appropriated by the Government. There is no legislative authority. There has been no explanation to the Legislature as to what the office is or what the functions of the office are. Then Mr. Davies also receives \$500 from the Department of Agriculture and Mines also. That is a salary of \$2,100. Then there are a number of pensions here which should have been provided by the Legislature last year. I do not think in any of these cases any reason has occurred between the time the Legislature was sitting last and the time these pensions were provided by the Governor in Council which justified them in creating these pensions that did not exist then. If an accident happened to a man in the public service, and he becomes incapacitated, there might be some justification for making a payment under section 33 (b) of the Audit Act by the Governor in Council.

Then in the Colonial Secretary's Department we find the following cases:

Edward Collins, gardener, Piacentia. This is an increase of \$20 in salary. The amount is small, but the principle is not small. The next is N. Petten, Head Constable. The same remarks apply to him. The Inspector of Methodist Schools is increased from \$700 to \$800, an increase of \$100. The same thing has been done in the case of the Assistant Inspector of Church of England Schools. These could very easily have been put in the Estimates.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT

A. Crocker, Shipping Office, no salary was voted last year, but he was paid a salary of \$600. This is one of the cases to which I referred last year, and I pointed out to the Minister that if he intended to keep this man in the Office he should put a salary in the Estimates in the ordinary way. There are a number of boat-

men in the Customs Department for which no salaries were provided last year. These payments amount to about \$2,000 in all. There are seventeen out-port tidewaiters for whom salaries were paid here, that were not provided in the Estimates last year, and I think that the requirements of the service cannot show that between the time these men were appointed and the time the House met last year provision could not have been made for them.

PUBLIC CHARITIES DEPARTMENT.

Doctor Grant and Doctor Jones. These are two cases I mentioned last year when going through Supply, and the Public Charities vote was up. I drew attention to both these officials. One is quarantine officer at Channel, and the other is a District Surgeon. I asked the Minister last year if it was the intention of the Government to continue these men in office, and he said no, that there was no need of it, and it was not the intention of the Government to continue their services. Now, Sir, we find when the Auditor General's Report comes down this year that they are still in office, and drawing salaries which should be voted here.

In the Marine and Fisheries Department the same thing occurs.

In the Postal Telegraphs Department we find large increases. J. W. Mitchell for special services (whatever that means) received \$1,000—a new salary. J. R. Clarke, Assistant Secretary to the Postmaster General received an increase in salary of \$100.

J. W. Payne was appointed to a new office with a salary of \$500; J. M. Knight, another new office, \$400; John Hefferen, new office, \$350; Escott, new office, and so on. There are sixteen messengers whose salaries come to a total of \$1,920, and a number of new operators.

In the Public Works Department the same thing was done. F. Woods, fireman in the Museum, received an increase of \$120.00; H. Whiteway, keeper of the Grand Falls building, a new office, \$400; Tobin, keeper of Harbour Grace building, a new office; Martin, fireman, Harbour Grace, a new office; Dr. J. P. Knight, House Surgeon, \$1200.00. The salary of the fireman of the General Hospital was increased, and also that of the ferryman at Codroy, and so on.

Now, Sir, all these payments should have been provided for in the ordinary way last year.

Then, with reference to the question of overdrafts: if you look at the Auditor-General's statement you will find that there are large overdrafts which occur year after year, in every Department of the Public Service. This, of course, is notwithstanding a system of transferring balances from one sub-head to another, which the Auditor-General acts upon, a practice which is not authorized except to a very limited extent; but to the extent to which it is used now, it is not authorized. For instance we had last year a case where an account was transferred in the Agriculture and Mines Department from the Agriculture Branch to the Mines Branch or vice versa. I forget which, but it was one or the other. That is not the intention of transferring from sub-heads.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to go through the different heads of the estimates to-day, as the matter will be discussed as each head comes up. However, I would like to refer briefly to the public debt. Now, Sir, the gross public debt at the present time, including the amount of the war loan of a million dollars which we got from the Imperial Government, and to which the Prime Minister referred in the beginning of his speech, is about \$22,000,000. That is

the gross. There are deductions for amounts guaranteed, such as the Municipal Council amount, and those would have to be deducted, but the gross liability of the Colony is about thirty-two and a half millions. At the time the present Government came into office, according to a statement of the public debt contained in the Minister of Finance's Budget for 1909, the public debt was \$22,900,000. That would be an increase roughly of about ten millions in six years. Now, this increase is made up largely of railway expenditure. There are eight millions of that for railway expenditure. I include the two million dollar loan which was authorized last year, of which one million only has been raised up to the present time. We are in a position in relation to the public debt which would warrant a statement of the financial position of the Colony, such as was asked for from this side of the House. We have gone on authorizing loans year after year. We find that a large amount of the local loans which have been authorized are still held on temporary loan at the Bank, and are going on from year to year paying $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest, some of them, instead of the 4 per cent. that we authorized here in the Legislature. Another loan is paying $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. instead of the 4 per cent. which we authorized. We have no statement showing exactly how this temporary loan account stands at the present time. The Minister ought to have, in dealing with this matter, a statement showing exactly how the public debt stands at the present time—what has been raised, what amounts are held on temporary loan, and the various rates of interest which are being paid on the different amounts. Now, last year, Sir, when the House was in session, there were two loans authorized. One was for \$2,000,000 for railway construction; the other was for \$500,000

for telegraphs, light-houses, and the construction of public buildings. It is now a year since these loans were authorized, and up to the present neither of them has been funded. All that has been raised under them has been by way of temporary loan, and on terms and conditions other than those authorized by the Act. In relation to the railway loan, the Members of the House will no doubt remember that we pointed out that the recognized conditions everywhere in the markets at that time were such that the Colonial Governments were not getting loans at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and as soon as the Premier went to London he found that that was the case, and he had to make temporary arrangements to provide for the railway work during last summer. The correspondence in relation to this was tabled. There is a letter here from Sir Edward Morris, the Prime Minister, to the financial agents of the Colony, dealing with the impossibility of obtaining the loan on the terms of the Act which was passed here, and stating that at the next session of the Legislature the Act would be amended by increasing the rate of interest to 4 per cent.; and he asked that in the meantime, and until this was done, the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand pounds be advanced. And now, Sir, we do not find in the statement of the public debt that any provision is being made for the balance of the loan of \$2,000,000. There is provision made in connection with the temporary loan from Glyn, Mills and Currie, but for the permanent loan which is to replace it, there is no provision made in the Estimates which are before us at the present time. That, of course, means that we will have to vote Supplementary Supply or additional estimates.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That was voted last year.

MR. KENT.—It will have to be voted again this year. It was voted at 4

per cent. You will have to provide for the difference.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—It is in the Estimates.

MR. KENT.—Where is it?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—On page 4.

MR. KENT.—That is only one million. That shows the need of a clear statement of how the public debt stands. Here you have a general statement of the figures.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—It is provided for.

MR. KENT.—Yes, but it requires an explanation to find it. Now, Sir, I think if the Government had acted upon the opinion which we expressed here last year, they would not have found themselves in the position in which they are to-day in reference to that loan. Conditions have very materially altered in relation to raising money ever since then in consequence of the war, and the effect that these conditions will have is evidenced by the case of the Dominion of Canada, which is now placing a loan of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., an increase of another half per cent. If the advice which we gave here last year had been taken in this matter and a 3 per cent. loan authorized, this additional half per cent., or whatever other interest will ultimately be demanded, would have been saved.

Then, that brings us back to the original source of all this trouble, namely, the terms of the Railway Contract, which provided for the payment of the contractor in gold instead of bonds as every previous contract provided. It shows how difficult it is to measure the obligations, not only on outlay, but on interest, which the Colony was undertaking when it entered into the railway contract of 1913.

Then, there is no provision here, Sir, for any loan or other means of paying the large deficit which has been foreshadowed at the close of the

present financial year. The deficit last year was \$261,900, and it is anticipated that the deficit at the end of the present year will be still larger. We are told that the reserve fund of \$500,000, which has been to the credit of the colony for some years, will be available for the payment of this deficit. Well, Sir, in the first place, you have got \$300,000 of that reserve of \$500,000 already appropriated, or about to be appropriated to meet the deficit of last year, and judging from the statement of bank balances which the Minister has furnished for the half year to the end of December and for the quarter ending the 31st March, that means that there will be very little, if any, of that reserve fund available to pay the deficit which you will have at the end of the present financial year. On the 31st March the ordinary exchequer account, according to the statements which have been furnished, was \$358,900 in debt. There are other amounts which will probably bring the deficit which is chargeable to this account, up to in the neighbourhood of \$700,000. Now, as against that you have got about \$50,000 of loan accounts, and you have got the balance of the Reserve, after taking out of it \$300,000 for last year's accounts. I think, Sir, in view of all these facts, that it will be necessary, in order to close your financial accounts for this year, to make some provision other than that providing for the use of the Reserve Fund. The expenditures during the year that I am talking about, namely, 1913-14, have not shown any signs of decrease. On the contrary, they are about \$120,000 more than they were the previous year on the ordinary appropriation accounts. I asked the Minister for a statement for six months, and that statement does not show that there has been any decrease in the expenditure; on the contrary, the expenditure has been greater; and while

the taxes that the people are paying are increasing almost to the breaking point, still when we ask to have a statement of the Colony's financial financial position placed before us, we meet with a point-blank refusal. It is correct that it has not been the custom, Sir, to give a financial statement until the Minister made his Budget Speech, but I think that in view of the extraordinary circumstances, it would have been reasonable and proper to comply with the request and furnish the statement which was asked for. The information ought to have been in the Minister's knowledge before he began to prepare his Estimates, it ought to have been in his knowledge before the Governor's Speech from the Throne was delivered two or three weeks ago, and there can be no justification or excuse for not taking the House at this stage into the Government's confidence by making a general statement, at least, of the financial affairs of the Colony.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—

Mr. Chairman. Just one or two words of explanation in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. It appears to me that, judging from his criticism this afternoon, he has very little fault to find. He went right back through the years during which the present Government have been in power in order to show how we have abused the Audit Act. Well, now, I take it that that section of the Audit Act is on the statute book for a certain purpose, and that purpose is to enable the Government to deal with emergency cases which could not have been foreseen. Now, we have not made one expenditure under that Act this year that can be termed anything else than regular. The total expenditure under section 33 B. of the Audit Act this year was something like

\$25,023.

MR. KENT.—I was referring to last year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—This is the report you read from this evening.

MR. KENT.—No.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—You had this report in your hand and appeared to be reading from it. However, I am explaining what has been spent under the Audit Act this year, and if that expenditure is not in keeping with the spirit of the Act, then I don't know anything about it. Now, the House closed about March 12th last year. After that date, as will be remembered, over 250 men lost their lives at the seal fishery. Our marine vote was \$5,000, but the loss of seamen during the year was sufficient to eat up that sum, and there was nothing left for us to do but to pass a minute of Council under the Audit Act and provide the money to deal with that catastrophe.

MR. KENT.—That was perfectly justifiable under the Act.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Well, the hon. gentleman never referred to that this evening when dealing with the expenditures here. He gave the impression to the country, through the reporters' box, that we abused the Audit Act.

MR. KENT.—I pointed out instances in which you did.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—We have done nothing under the Audit Act this year that you can point to as being irregular. We spent \$25,000 as I stated before, but take those 250 men that were lost at the seal fishery, at \$100 each, and that practically covers the whole amount.

MR. KENT.—I was referring to last year's expenditure—not this year's.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The whole amount authorized by the Government under 33 B. of the Au-

dit Act last year was spent for marine purposes alone, with the exception of a small amount for war purposes when the House opened in September. One would think, listening to the hon gentlemen's remarks this afternoon about extravagance under the Audit Act, that we were making expenditures that we were not authorized to make. I say now that we were justified in making these expenditures.

MR. KENT—I agree with you there.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—

Then you referred to the several appointments made during the year. Just a word in explanation of these as we go along. There is the case of Mr. D. James Davies. That appointment was made during the summer, after the House had closed. We had to give him a salary. The salary is put down as \$1600. \$500 was paid out of contingencies. Then there were the lighthouse keepers which were pensioned during the year. Well, we didn't know when the House was open that these men needed pensions. Applications were made, in the usual form, within the past nine months. There were, altogether, six applications for pensions, from lighthouse keepers, post masters, and officials of that kind, and there was nothing for us to do but to pay the pensions and ask the House to vote the amount this year. Then, the hon member mentioned the case of James Collins of Placentia, \$24. He did not object to the amount so much as to the manner in which it was given. That amount should have been voted last year. It was left out in error. The other two amounts of \$200 were given to the Assistant School Inspectors, and did not go to the Customs Department. Then, the four boatmen mentioned here, these men were only appointed within the last nine months

in place of men who had died or were on the sick list. The others that he referred to, about 18 or 20, these are paid under the vote for Outport Tidewalkers. That vote is practically under the supervision of the Inspector of Customs, Mr. O'Reilly, who has authority to hire men wherever he needs them along the coast. These men are only paid for part of the year, not for the whole year. Some are hired for three months, and some for six months, and some for nine months. Now, we come to the vote under the head of Commissioner of Public Charities. He referred to two cases—Grant and Johnson. These men are only paid for the work which they do during the year. They are not permanent, and it is only necessary to pay them as per voucher.

MR. KENT—Have a vote for that purpose then.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—We have, under Public Charities.

MR. KENT—Then why not pay them out of that vote?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—They are paid under Public Charities.

MR. KENT—No, they are not.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—

Then we come to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There is a vote of \$100, increase of salary for Mr. T. Cornick. That was done since the House closed, and therefore it could not have been put in the Estimates for last year. The same applies under Postal Telegraphs. Then we come to the Public Works Department, and the hon member referred to increases at Grand Falls and Harbor Grace. My answer to that is this: At Grand Falls we put up a new building—a courthouse, custom house and other public offices. We had to provide attendance for it.

We come to the general hospital. The assistant doctor there receives

\$1200. That is put on the estimates this year. On the balance of the loan there is \$135,250. Part of that loan was asked for four years ago. This was to build a new Poor House. The amount was never raised. Under temporary loans there is extension of telephone. But we have not raised the money. We raised \$100,000 for fog alarms etc. The Volunteer Force loan was \$250,000.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman. I do not think that the minister can be congratulated upon his reply to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. His answers were not satisfactory, to the various points made by the leader of the Opposition. I do not at the present time, intend to make any comment upon the Estimates that are before this House. But I wish to enter my emphatic protest against proceeding with estimates, until we have such information as we asked for before the minister went into supply. Before we discuss the estimates we should have some information as to our present financial standing. Since the 30th of June 1914 there has been nothing to show us what has happened since then. We know that since that time there has been a large decrease in the revenue and that there is a great increase in expenditure. We know nothing definitely because we have no figures before us. We are living in very extraordinary times, and I think that it is reasonable that we should have all information regarding the financial affairs of the country, before we sit down here to vote away \$4,000,000 for the public service. I admit that some of these votes are necessary. But there are other votes that may be dispensed with. We cannot say to what extent they may be dispensed with until we have fuller information. We were told at the opening of the session that the Estimates

of the public service would be laid before us at an early date. We are told that they have been prepared to cover only the indispensable requirements. And indispensable requirements, I thought, would have been taken as the motto of the present Government during this session, and that they would have had placarded outside of this building the motto: "Indispensable requirements only". But what do we find as we take up the Estimates? We find that they are practically the same as they were during those years when the country was in a prosperous condition. No reference is made to reducing the expenditure in connection with the public service. I do not mean the public civil service. I mean the general service of the country. The Civil Service is a service that every Government should pay proper respect to so far as the remuneration given to the civil service. Every Government must depend upon the permanent Civil Service for information and guidance. Those Civil Servants should be placed in such a position as to render services which justify their salary. There are many officials that can be dispensed with. And there are many more from whom better work could be obtained if they were put on a proper footing. But my position is that before we should be asked to consider the voting away of \$4,000,000 for the general public service of this colony, we should know the existing conditions and have some knowledge of the present financial standing of the colony; and I for one will not willingly accord my vote for the passing of any Estimate until such information is laid before the committee. I protest against this procedure and I ask the Government to give us some information as to our present financial condition, before we proceed any further. We had some

idea of the financial conditions of the country at the end of June 1914, but to-day we do not know what it is. If the Government will not furnish that statement, I for one am not prepared to vote for the Estimates. I do that on principle because I do not believe that I am justified in voting away one dollar of the money of this Colony without knowing its financial condition. I propose to communicate with the Auditor General and ask him for such statements. He may give it or he may not as he pleases. If the statement is furnished and I feel that is satisfactory, it may enable me to come in here and vote with a clear conscience. But till then I decline to record my vote in favour of the Estimates before the committee.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to a certain matter. On page 4 under heading A, a statement on railway loans this year, in the 2nd column is a sum of \$1,168,582.23. What I want to know is where that money came from.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—That is a loan of £200,000 raised last year. The amount \$135,250 is under a different loan. That amount was raised for building a new Poor House.

DR. LLOYD—Then why is that under the balance of railway loans? The amount in the second column is the total of two different loans. There is another question, a statement was made last year that we had raised a loan of \$1,000,000 in London for a period of 12 months at 4%. We have not been called upon to pay that 4%. Why is it? It will be remembered that last year I pointed out that the Government was acting unwisely in view of the financial conditions of that day. No colony at that time was able to raise a loan at the rate of 3½%. In spite of that being pointed out to the Government they persisted

in continuing its attempt to raise a loan under terms that were impossible. The Premier had the experience of going to London and being told what was told him here in this House. I say this merely to point out that the kindness of last year has been repeated this year. Now the Government are better able than we are to find out accurately where they are. They have financial agents in London who can advise them. It would be absolutely stupid to go into the London markets at the present time and try to raise a loan at 4%. I am taking the experience of our sister Dominion, Canada, which is far more influential than this colony. They had to raise the loan at 4½% and at a discount and could not obtain one half of it. That is the experience of the Dominion of Canada. Why is our intelligence insulted by this proposal? For that is what it amounts to.

MR. MORINE—The Minister of Finance said that it had been the practice of this House that the Estimates should be brought to the table before any explanations was made of the financial conditions. On the 11th of March 1898 I brought down the Estimates. The House was given a complete statement of the financial condition on that day. Now as regards that temporary loan of \$1,000,000, what arrangement was made as to repayment? When is the loan up?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No stipulation was made.

MR. MORINE—Has there been any correspondence?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no correspondence whatever since the loan was issued.

DR. LLOYD—Well, when does it run out?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—There is no definite time fixed. I suppose in about 12 months.

MR. MORINE—That is the temporary loan?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will undertake to get the loan floated.

MR. MORINE—Might I ask the Rt. Hon. the Premier as to what is his arrangement for marketing this loan at a time when both the market and rate are unsettled. I agree with Dr. Lloyd, the member for Trinity that it would be impossible now to raise a loan at par for 4%. The Minister of Finance and the Government ought to have calculated on this and included the necessary increase of interest. Either the loan or the interest will have to be increased.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There was never any question as to raising it at 3½%. At this moment I would be prepared to float a 4% one.

MR. MORINE—What he means to say is that he can raise a 4% loan at 90 or 80 or some such figure, but not at par. That does not answer the point which we were objecting to. The minister put in his estimates "On Balance of Railway Loan under Act 4th. Geo. 5th, Cap. 23—\$973,333.33." Now the minister has this marked down at 4%. There is no discredit to you at least in the fact that you can't get the loan at that rate, but it is an impossibility. What explanation will the minister give? How are you going to provide for this situation?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—What situation?

MR. MORINE—I am sorry the Minister will not admit that.

DR. LLOYD—The Minister shuts his eyes to it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—That is a matter of opinion.

MR. MORINE—This matter is not one of opinion. There can only be one opinion to this matter. There is no personal connection in this case in view of existing conditions. It is no matter of opinion that Newfoundland cannot at the present time get this loan at par.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—We got \$1,500,000 from the British Government and we are not asked for any payment at all.

MR. MORINE—Well, can you get the Railway Loan the same way?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—There is no need for you to worry at all. We've known you before.

MR. MORINE—Now Mr. Chairman, I must ask for some protection from remarks such as these. This is becoming too personal altogether. I am certainly entitled to proper respect in this House, and to have my questions answered. I would like to ask if the loan referred to here under the Act 1st George 5th, Cap. 23, if this has been raised.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—No. It was attempted to raise this loan locally, but it was not all taken up.

MR. MORINE—The Premier's promise was then that this will be taken up at 4%.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Under the Act we are allowed to do this. Now we are going to put it on the market.

MR. MORINE—But what is going to be done during the coming 12 months. Is there any prospect of getting this at 4%? I have a right to ask the hon. minister for his opinion.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—There may or may not be.

MR. MORINE—Will the Minister tell me what in his opinion is the possibility.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Well we are charging the interest on

anyway, and so if it is not raised the interest will become a dropped balance and no harm will be done. There is no need at all for the member to become so excited.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I want to know if I can get enlightenment on this matter. I have a right to ask for this information, and must have it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—You have started that game before.

MR. MORINE—It will be only fair to take it for granted that the Minister understands.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—We propose to raise the loan. If we don't raise it the interest provided for will come back as a dropped balance.

MR. MORINE—I am entitled to full particulars, and I want to know if the public is going to be informed or not. I also propose Mr. Chairman to ask at what price the Government Debentures were sold last year, that is locally; whether the 4% is at par. I will ask for this information and will give notice of question.

MR. COAKER—I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance will consider that the members of this side of the House have certain rights to all the information that the Government can give. We are not going like a lot of sheep to vote away four million dollars without knowing what it is voted for. We are kept in the dark about it altogether. Of course I do not know much about these financial matters, and am prepared to support any bona-fide ones the Government may bring in. If they did not try to hide it we would pass it and take it for granted that there was nothing to hide. The Budget will show us what state the affairs of the country are in. What is their reason for not giving us the information.

We want it and will wait here till we get it. What has been done here to-day? Nothing. Just because the Government will not give us the information asked for. If the business of the House has to be prolonged until the middle of June, it will make no difference. We are going to stay here and wait until the House closes to get this from the Government.

We are now voting to the Reid Newfoundland Co. the sum of \$250,000 to subsidize them for running steamer and mail service through the colony. Now the least I think we ought to have for that is efficient service. Several contracts are awarded out of this House, and it is at least our duty to see that the parties who get them live up to them. I am sorry to have to refer to this, but I have just received a letter from some passengers on the S.S. Bruce. The letter is dated April 22nd, and is an important one as it refers to the accident of the other day. In view of its importance I will read it to the House.

(Editor Mail and Advocate.)

Dear Sir.—We, the undersigned passengers and others of the train that was wrecked near South Branch desire to publish a few facts concerning all the accommodations afforded the travelling public by the Reid Newfoundland Co. and also the unsafe and dangerous condition of the road we travel over.

Since the old shed at Brigus Junction was destroyed, passengers have been forced to seek shelter in an old car, that sometimes will hold only hold about half the passengers. Men, women and children are all bundled together in that stuffy old car, filled with tobacco smoke.

Then again there is an old dump at Whitbourne where passengers, often women and children are obliged to wait for hours. There are no seats

no fire, or anything to afford the slightest comfort.

But, Sir, the most brutal act perpetrated on the travelling public, who pay extreme and extortionate rates for conveyance is the gross negligence of the company to take even the most necessary precautions to guard their safety by making the track firm and secure.

The railroad track through the country is in such a rotten and shaky condition that it was necessary to be tied in one's berth in order to stay in them, and the rocking and bolting of the train kept people in constant fear.

In regard to the condition of the track where the wreck occurred, we beg to state that the sleepers were so rotten that some of them could be kicked to pieces, and spikes pulled when rail leaned over under the heavy weight. Consequently the train was precipitated over the embankment. The outer rail near this steep embankment was much lower than the inside one and when the section men came to repair it they found it necessary to raise it several inches to right position.

In our opinion, it would seem almost impossible for trains to pass such a place in safety.

You may imagine our predicament when the whole train of six cars toppled over, some bottom up, over the embankment, which was sixty or seventy feet deep. All fully recognize that it was only through the providential care of a merciful God that all are living to tell the story and only a few are injured. There was very little excitement for the greater number kept cool as Newfoundlanders generally do, and before long, by the quick assistance of the men, the women and children were got out through the top-sides or wherever a hole was available.

Now, Mr. Editor, we think it is high time for every inhabitant of our Island home to stand up in his own shoes and demand better conditions. How long are we going to submit to such a tyrannical system? Many of us lost our lunches in the wreckage and now in this boat, the Bruce, we have to pay twenty cents for a pitcher of tea alone and some were absolutely refused even that for their wives and children.

The Reid Co. may treat this affair as lightly as they treat most of the things which concern the public. They may try to shift the blame on whomever they may. They may claim that it was an unavoidable accident, but we claim that it was the fault of the road, and though we may not all hold the same idea on politics, we feel, Mr. Conker, that you are the man (MR COAKER—They weren't far out) to give the public a genuine view of the treatment which is accorded the public by the Reid Company. We understand that the section men's pay has been reduced and the number diminished, so that it seems impossible for them to cover the whole distance and keep the track properly repaired.

This is a contemptible state of affairs and we trust that you will give it your immediate and earnest attention, and that whatever steps you take to improve conditions and benefit humanity will be supported by every intelligent and honourable Newfoundland.

Kenneth M. Mercer, Bay Roberts; Wm. Bellin, Bay Roberts; Wm. Butler, St. John's; Richard Mercer, Bay Roberts; Hayward Eowering, Colby's Point; Jas. A. Vokey, Bay Roberts; John H. Yetman, Bryant's Cove; Joe Snook, Carbonara; Ed. Sullivan, Hr. Grace; Mike Walsh, Hr. Grace; Jacob Snow, Bay Roberts; John Cleary, Hr. Grace; Peter Butler, Hr. Grace;

Eliot George, Heart's Content; Sandy Roberts, Brigus; Ed. Murphy, Winsor Lake; Ed. Kehoe, Hr. Grace; Stephon Shea, Hr. Grace; Elijah Sellars, Western Bay; Amellus Fry. — Gordon King, Western Bay; Jas. Fowler, Clarke's Beach; John F. King, Western Bay; Ernest Tucker, Elliston; Ernest Kelloway, Perry's Cove; Bernard Ronan, Adam's Cove; Solomon Kennedy, Western Bay; Jabez King, Perry's Cove; Bernard Guilfoyle, Hr. Grace; Walter Higgins, Hr. Grace; P. J. Coady, Hr. Grace; Wm. Morris, North River; Frank Russell, Hr. Grace; Mrs. A. Fry, Charlestown, B.B.; Mrs. M. Hiscock, Whitney Pier, Sydney; Mrs. S. Kelly, Carbonear; Mrs. Joa. Snook, Bay Roberts; Mrs. Richard Mercer, Bay Roberts.

On board S.S. Bruce, April 22, 1915.

Now what's the Government going to do about that?

RT HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—I will see that this matter is immediately investigated, and will report immediately to the House.

MR COAKER—This is a very serious state of affairs and one which the Government should take a day or two to have investigated very carefully. There is no need to be too hurried in the investigation.

I was myself a little time ago obliged to go some distance along the railway track and I found the tracks there in a rotten condition. Fully one third of the sleepers I found were rotten. Now the average life of a sleeper is supposed to be 8 years, and after that time ought to be replaced, but when one-third are found rotten it does not seem as if the tracks were looked after very carefully.

Now sir there is another very serious matter to be considered, and that is the spending of public monies on Executive authority. The Auditor General is very serious about it. He

says, "I called attention to this matter in 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914."

Now Mr. Chairman, Are we going to come here year after year and have the Auditor General sending in reports like this. If the Government intends to live up to the privileges of this House why do they resort to the voting of monies like this on Executive responsibility. If the Government had to expend \$4,000 or \$14,000 why did they not vote that money last year. What is the good of the House if the Executive can on its own authority take charge of the finances and spend it as it likes without the consideration of this House.

Now, the members on that side of the House should not forget that they do not represent all the people. There is a strong opposition and these represent a large factor of the people. We are here to represent them and see that monies are properly spent. Why then in the face of that do you do what you can do against the law of the land.

The Auditor General is in that office as a safeguard, and it is his duty to watch the expending of the monies, yet you get him to accept things that are not correct, on Executive authority. He was not justified moreover in authorizing this payment.

I suppose some of my hon. friends opposite regard me as always finding fault. Well, I don't like to have to find fault, but this long list of overdrafts as given in the Auditor General's report does not look any too good.

The voting of this money to the Sealing Disaster is alright, and is justified by Sec. 33 B., of the Audit Act. Sec. 33. B., however, does not authorize the spending of monies off next year's vote to pay this year's expenses. In any case, whatever is done, a detailed statement should be furnished.

There was \$100 to each of all the applicants of the relatives of those who lost their lives at the seal-fishery, and then appropriations had to be made to look after the survivors who came on the Bellaventure. All this is in the Auditor General's report and totals there, I think, about \$19,500. The overspending of \$6,325.00 by the Agricultural Societies is serious, and is due to the fact that a bad bargain had been made in connection with the importation of hay.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman: With regard to this matter, it is well known that during the autumn of 1913 the whole country was threatened with a hay famine, and the Boards throughout the country were deluged with petitions from people whose cattle were starving. The Secretary of the Society in St. John's entered into negotiations for the importation of a large quantity of hay to save the cattle from starving, and the loss quoted by the hon. member resulted. The order for the purchase of the hay was made in such a way that the sellers naturally regarded the Colony as the purchaser. There is a bare possibility that if the matter had gone into Court the Colony might have been held not to be liable, in which case the sellers would be obliged to go without their money. Such a course would have given the Colony a black eye. There is no question that the hay was imported by the Board, and used by our people.

MR. DWYER.—Mr. Chairman: I wish to make a few remarks about the matter now under discussion. It happened to come under my notice that some of this hay was taken away without the knowledge of the officials in charge, and in many cases the people who took it did not pay for it. They regarded it as Government hay, and in consequence they were justly entitled to use it and save their cattle from starvation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I do not think the hon. member is perfectly correct in his assertion that people took hay and did not pay for it. I am bringing in a report to-morrow of the Auditor-General on this matter for the information of the House.

MR. LLOYD.—The position of the Government in connection with the hay is the same as their position with the estimates. They did not give the House a statement as to the manner in which they were going to raise the money to meet the supply bill. A few days ago we brought to the attention of the Government the desirability of furnishing financial statements before proceeding to vote four million dollars as asked for under those estimates. The answer that was given at that time was that it was not customary to show beforehand how the money was to be raised. I have before me statements furnished by the Minister of Finance showing the expenditure and the bank balances up to the end of March. This statement is prepared by the Bank of Montreal, which does the financial work of the Colony, and must not be regarded as the report of the Finance Minister himself. The Colony has to provide about \$520,000 at the end of every six months as interest for the bond-holders, or a little over one quarter of a million dollars every three months. The statement which I hold in my hand shows that at the end of last June the Exchequer Account was overdrawn to the amount of over three hundred thousand dollars. That was the burden with which we started the year on the 1st day of July last, or in other words the balance standing against the Colony on Current Account on that date. That debit balance was wiped off by taking \$301,000.00 from the reserve of one half million dollars which was lying in the Bank and known as, I think, the "nest egg." This I gather from

the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. After collecting the revenue for nine months, that is from the 1st day of July last to the last day of March, we find that the Exchequer Account is overdrawn by the sum of \$364,000, whereas it should have been in credit by at least a quarter of a million dollars. There are also a number of spending departments which draw on that account for their requirements. On March 31st every spending department had overdrawn its account. The overdrafts of the spending departments amount to about \$175,000, so that we are overdrawn on Exchequer account up to the 31st of March over \$539,000. If the Government spend at the same rate until the 30th day of June, they will be over \$200,000 in debt on the year's running account. With such a showing as this it surely behoves us to consider what we are doing to scrutinize every statement of a financial character before voting for these estimates. We would like to know how the Finance Minister expects to get out of this difficulty. There is only \$200,000 left of the nest egg to meet a deficit which will probably exceed \$500,000. There are only three ways by which the Finance Minister can meet this deficit. The first is by cutting down expenses \$300,000. You have refused to do this as shown by your estimates. The second is to meet this deficit by a loan. If so, your estimates are out, because you have not provided for the payment of interest on that loan, and the third course is to raise extra revenue by further taxation. I do not know whether this latter course is worthy of serious consideration, when we consider the result of the past two years' experience. A fortnight ago I asked, Sir, certain information from the Minister of Finance, a part of which I received a few days ago, the balance I received this afternoon. I may say

that I agree with the hon. member when he says that I received them promptly under the circumstances. This information shows exactly what may be expected from new taxation and new tariffs. It will be remembered that in March of last year the Minister of Finance introduced a set of new tariffs, in addition to which he imposed the 10 per cent. surtax, stating at the same time that he believed the surtax would be dropped during the year, as he would have sufficient revenue from the other new tariff. Notwithstanding this extra taxation, and the imposition of the 10 per cent. the Finance Minister has been unable to get sufficient revenues to meet his expenditures. The Minister of Finance calculated that the new tariffs and the surtax would bring him in about \$720,000 a year, and about one-third of that sum, or \$240,000, up to the end of June last. These figures relating to the revenue had nothing to do with the war, because no one in the House had the slightest conception that we were going to be engaged in war. The depression in trade of which we have heard so much from the Minister this session, was not existent, as the exports show clearly. But the extra taxation did not produce the revenue up to June 30th, the Minister anticipated. Instead of receiving \$240,000, he received only \$114,000; receiving only \$27,000 from alcohol, instead of the usual \$110,000. In short, the result on last year's revenue of putting on new taxation from March 11th to June 30th, was actually to decrease the aggregate revenue. The experience shows how careful a Minister must be in dealing with tariffs, even in good times.

The Chairman of Committees left the Chair at half past six of the clock.

The Chairman resumed the Chair at half-past eight of the clock.

MR. LLOYD (Cont.)—Mr. Chairman, when we rose for recess, the idea I had in my mind was to direct attention to the fact that the Government had not seen its way clear to take the House into its confidence in reference to our financial situation, more particularly as to how they intended to carry out what was foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech from the Throne. You will recollect, Sir, that these words were put into the mouth of His Excellency:—"The estimates for the public service will be laid before you at an early date. In view of existing conditions, they have been made to meet only indispensable requirements. I invite your consideration of them." You will see, Sir, that our consideration was invited of the estimates that had been prepared "to meet existing conditions." And the extraordinary affect that while we are told that they are prepared to meet the existing situation, they absolutely decline to tell us what that situation is. Now, Sir, I contend that the Government is not dealing with the House fairly, "in view of existing conditions." What are these conditions? Why does the Government refuse to reveal these conditions? That is all we ask for—a statement of existing conditions. We ask for no more than the Government calls our attention to, in relation to the estimates. Why are the estimates prepared to meet only "indispensable requirements?" We do not know what the existing conditions are, except in so far as may be revealed by the preceding paragraph, to which the attention of members is directed by the Government itself. I am impressing this point in order to show the unreasonable attitude of the Government in refusing to give the information on what we are invited to consider in connection with the estimates which are before us. We are told something in the

Governor's Speech that "The revenue of the past fiscal year shows a deficit." That statement is proved by the Bank statement. This deficit has no connection with the war, because it is a deficit that existed on June 30th long before the war commenced. And we are told now that the deficit occurred because of depression that had existed at that time. I should like to draw the attention of the House to the rosente view set forth by the Minister of Finance in his last Budget Speech. There was no talk of depression then. Everything was flourishing. No indication was then given of the Colony being on an eve of depression, or even on the eve of it. On the contrary, the outlook was set forth as quite rosy. But now an excuse is needed and that excuse is sought in depression of trade. An excuse which is not founded on fact. The reason why the revenue did not come in, was not owing to depression of times, but was due to the fact that before there had been an electioneering budget passed, and the electioneering budget cut off duties on articles which would have responded to taxation. And the Minister found himself unable to meet expenses because the rosy view that he took in the election budget were not realized. And to rectify his bad shot—his bad shot financially.

I notice that the Premier smiles broadly. He smiles, I suppose, because it did the trick after all, and put him back in office and has kept him in the seat he now occupies. But although this shot was a good enough one to put the Premier and his friends on the other side of the House, it was a bad shot for the country. It muddled up the accounts of the Colony, and from an Sirrhequer standpoint, it was a complete failure. The returns of revenue from the election tariff and the new tariffs, both before the war and since the war, and the long list of adverse

balances to the current accounts in the Bank of Montreal on March 31st last, establish this proposition completely. Freak financing met with the result that might well have been expected. My chief complaint against the Minister of Finance and his colleagues is that they did not profit by the mistake of the election year, but continued to blunder in the Budget succeeding the election. They did not have the pluck to retrace their steps. They went on with freak financing, and met the inevitable result on June 30th 1914, and found themselves with a deficit of over three hundred thousand dollars in times of plenty, of thriving trade, and before the troubles came on us from the great war. The remarkable thing about the financing was that the only part of the taxation that yielded well was the surtax; although all the changes made last year brought in \$146,900 up to June 30th, \$55,900 of this came from the surtax. All the rest of the taxes did not bring in \$30,000. If the other taxes had been levied in the directions they ought to have been, the Minister could have realized \$100,000 on liquors, but by this freak financing he only realized \$8,000. Unfortunately the war came on! The Minister immediately tried a little sounder finance. The freak finance of March last year, which he assured us would bring in \$720,000, brought in only \$273,000, showing that the Minister was \$500,000 out in his calculation. By increased taxation from September to March 31st, we realized \$222,000. Then this September tax was imposed in the middle of war, and yet in spite of this fact, the September tax was far more responsible than that of the previous March.

I have been dwelling on these points for the reason that we are asked to do so in the Governor's Speech. We are asked to review and deliberate

upon the estimates, having regard to existing conditions; and these are the existing conditions, and they show that on June 30th last year there was a large deficit, and that there is a still larger one foreshadowed for this year.

In this very connection we are told that in order to reduce this adverse balance, the nature of which I spoke this afternoon, certain proposals will be laid before us. We are told that every spending department of the Government was at March 31st last overdrawn to the extent of \$170,000, and that the department to which these departments are to account was itself overdrawn to the extent of \$300,000. These are the matters we have to consider, and yet in the face of these facts the Government refuses to give any additional light on this matter, for the remedying of which they are expecting us to cast our votes. And they tell us that they will not do this because it is not customary, and yet they ask us to vote and have regard to existing conditions.

Now, Sir, I have pointed out that the taxes applied last March and last September, and I dwell upon the fact, that these taxes were not responding anything like what the Finance Minister led us to hope they would in the Budget last year. Of course it is only fair to remember that war conditions are new, and that war was not contemplated by the Minister of Finance at that time, and so far as the war is connected with the finance of the year we cannot attach any blame to the Finance Minister. But he is to be held responsible for his miscalculation, as was shown before the outbreak of the war. The experience we have had shows how utterly difficult it is for us to raise money by playing with the tariffs. Experience has shown us that they cannot be made to respond. What are we going to do to raise the neces-

sary revenue? Repeatedly we have asked the Government for information and repeatedly they have declined to answer our questions. Now they refuse to inform us, although leading us to the hope that the Estimates we will be asked to consider will be made to suit only absolutely necessary and indispensable requirements. This led us to believe that economy would be practiced. We look at the Estimates to prove the Minister's statement. We find the Estimates are greater than those of last year, and this in spite of the fact that last year the expenditure was \$500,000 more than the revenue. The expenditures of public moneys at March 31st exceeded the Government Estimates by \$500,000, and there is no reason to suppose that there will be no further expenditure during the remaining three months of the year.

And in addition to this there will be wanted the sum of \$520,000 to pay interest on moneys lent to the Colony, and so the Finance Minister is going to find himself short at the end of the year, even if he does use the balance left of the nest egg the Government tampered with last year. The Finance Minister looks at me! It is time the country was looking at the Finance Minister. He expresses the wonder as to what would happen if he did not have my advice. If he had followed it, he would be dealing in sounder finance than he is at the present time, and he would be telling this House that the finances of the country are a good sight better than they are now. The trouble with the Finance Minister and his finance is that he did not take our advice. He would not take our advice or the advice of his own office, or the advice contained in the figures of his office, or the bank statement. He wouldn't take any advice but went blindly, and now finds himself in the deplorable

condition that he is in today. Unfortunately the country has got to pay for it. The country has got to pay for the Minister's disregard of the figures supplied by his own bankers. As a result of his financing we are today invited to consider only what he considers indispensable requirements. Now, Sir, I am glad of the opportunity of listening to the Minister when he reported that he had taken advantage of the Audit Act in supplying money necessary because of the war in reference to the expenditure of \$20,000 for war expenses, he justified that expenditure because the Audit Act permitted it, and it was admitted on this side of the House that the Minister of Finance had taken the proper course, and I endorse that view. This is what the Audit Act is for. He took advantage of it in making expenditures that could not be forecasted in the Estimates for the year, but we criticize the Minister because he made expenditures which could have been foreseen when the Estimates were being prepared, and which were unlawful because no grants were voted for such payments. That is the reason of our criticism. We cannot cover all the expenditures under the provisions of the Audit Act. He made expenditures which are lawful and permitted under the Audit Act, but that is no reason why he should make expenditures that the Audit Act absolutely forbade. The Auditor General makes no bones about it. He says:

I have to report that the following payments for increases in voted salaries, salaries for new offices, and other expenditures for which there is no legislative vote, have been directed by Order-in-Council.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Give me time and I will give you the information you ask for.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, my friend the Minister of Finance inter-

rupts me. Well Sir, I relish interruptions, because they afford an opportunity of pressing a point. He questions that and so I will prove it. The Minister is an old parliamentary hand and has been a long time in this House, and knows how to defend himself, and he knows when to make any objection to what is being said. I recognize the Minister's action in trying to interrupt me. Now, this is what follows the extract I just read, and what the Finance Minister did not want me to read:

"All these payments are contrary to the provisions of the Audit Act."

That is the point I was coming to and the statement I was going to read when the Minister interrupted me. That is why the Minister interrupted me, but I have had a little experience in such tactics, and take advantage of them to press a point home, and that point is that the Minister is making expenditures contrary to the Audit Act, and the Auditor General says so. The Auditor General continues: "and I have declined to pass them. All of them have been made from the Letter of Credit Account of the several Departments indicated below, and as I have refused repayment from the Exchequer Account for them, they stand as an indebtedness of the said Departments to the Bank of Montreal, unless and until covered by Supplementary Supply."

That explains the Minister's interruption. The Auditor General refuses to give the necessary credit, and if he did it would only show the action in a worse light. Now I would invite the hon. member to repeat what he was going to observe at that inopportune time. I would invite him to repeat his question.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—What question? I told him

I was prepared to inform him on that point.

MR. LLOYD—Because in my understanding he said that I did not know his business.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I would not try your attention.

MR. LLOYD—The hon. member said the amount refused credit was only \$1,200. Well, I can account for a larger amount than that.

Take the Colonial Secretary's Department I find these increases amounting to more than that. Under that department we find \$20 to Edward Collins, \$100 to E. Lodge, \$100 to S. G. Thompson. This makes \$220 for that department alone. If the Minister wants it driven in further I can do it. This brings up the fact as to what the Audit Act is for. What is the good of the Estimates being passed every year if other sums are expended without passing through in these Estimates? These Estimates represent actual expenditure and yet the accounts are always overdrawn, and every year the Auditor General refuses to pass certain items. If I have understood the Minister of Finance aright, he told us that there were some increases in the Education vote. The Minister nods, and therefore I accept it that the statement is correct.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Not over last year.

MR. LLOYD—I have the Estimates of last year as they were tabled.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—By some error these votes did not appear in the Estimates as tabled. There was \$100 to each of the Assistant Superintendents of Education.

MR. LLOYD—The Minister of Finance says that the vote was not included in the Estimates by a printer's error. By a printer's error \$200 which

was to have been voted was not authorized.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes, and you made the same speech about it then as you are making now.

MR. LLOYD—I enjoy interruptions, Mr. Chairman. As I said before, I try to use them to make my point clear afterwards. If this vote was left out last year by a printer's error, why is it left out this year?

As the Minister has not answered I will repeat my question. The Minister has pointed out that the extra \$100 was missed out last year by a printer's error. We knew about it last year, and further, according to the Minister, I made the same speech on that occasion. How is it that he made the same mistake in these Estimates which are now before us? Why has it not been added? How is it that after it was missed out last year, and after I made a speech on it then, the same speech the Minister says as I am making now, the same mistake has been made this year. I have dwelt upon this point somewhat, but this only leads up to the main point I want to call attention to. The Minister said we could not find \$200 paid out improperly. Well, in this one department alone we find \$220. Now I notice in his own department that some salaries are increased. G. G. Hann has got an increase of \$150. And this is over and above the \$220 I spoke of before, so it is clear that the Finance Minister does not know what the increases amount to. There is a namesake of my friend whose salary is also increased. This official has got an increase of \$90. There is another increase of from \$300 to \$330 in his Department. So that in his own Department, outside of the Colonial Secretary's Department, my friend has increases of \$150 and \$290.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—What is that for?

MR. LLOYD—I am not in a position to say what it is for, I don't pretend to be able to read the mind of my hon. friend and tell him why he makes these increases. I am dealing with the facts, and showing that he does not know, when he is talking about increases what he is talking about — does not even know his own Department.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—It is too paltry to talk about a few hundred dollars. Talk millions while you are at it.

MR. LLOYD—When I talk millions the Minister is not satisfied. I am now talking the hundreds that he introduced himself and he is not satisfied. But I would point out to him that in the way of pensions, increases in salaries and new salaries, there is no need to talk in hundreds; we can talk in the ten thousands; for we find that the Minister and his friends have authorized the expenditure of \$25,000, contrary to the Audit Act, and protested against by the Auditor General, and in spite of the fact that the proper place to deal with these matters is not the Executive Council, but this House. The Minister and his friends are arrogating to themselves powers that don't belong to them, and that have been reserved for this House; and so far as I can I will resent that arrogance on the part of the Finance Minister and his friends in making expenditures that the Legislature and the law of the land do not contemplate. But that is not all, Sir. Not only do they make these expenditures in connection with increases of salaries and pensions without any authority, but they take money and use money against the expressed provisions of this House and the Audit Act. The Auditor General says: "I have to report the following expendi-

tures in excess of the votes indicated, all on services for which no vote has been taken", and then he goes on to speak of them. He says in reference to them: "I have disallowed all these charges and they constitute a debit balance against the respective Departments." Now, Sir, this statement of the Auditor General and similar statements which have been laid on the table of the House from year to year, show the inadequacy of the Act. Though we pass votes to the amount of \$3,900,000, that sum will in the ordinary course, be exceeded next year in the same way as the votes which have been passed here in previous years have always been exceeded. And that brings us up to the question. What are you going to do to meet these expenditures? What are you going to do to meet the \$4,000,000 that you have asked us to vote? It is clear enough that extra tariffs will not respond to make good the deficiency; there is no "nest-egg" now to cover any deficits; it is clear from your estimates that you are not cutting down in any way commensurate with your income. And therefore, what are you going to do? There are only three ways of meeting the difficulty. You must do one of three things. You may economise—which you refuse to do; you may put on extra tariff, but you cannot make the revenue come in—you cannot compel people to import goods; and there is only one other way: You have to borrow, if you can. I believe you can, but you do not say how you are going to do it. That is my point in connection with these Estimates: that they do not take into account the loans that the Government will have to seek immediately this House closes. You are making no provision whatever for them in the Estimates. I say, Sir, that you are treating us light-

ly, and that you are treating the situation lightly. The position that you are putting up in refusing to declare the course you intend to pursue, is unworthy of you and of those who sit in this House. I have been told already this session that I am the Cassandra of the House—the Prophet of Evil. That is the answer which the Prime Minister deigned to make—

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—
I don't think I went as far as that. I say that you appeared to be playing that role.

MR. LLOYD.—Well, my rt. hon. friend is an adept at splitting hairs. I will amend my statement and say that I have been told that I am playing the role of Cassandra. Well, if playing that role is repeating in this House plain statements of fact furnished by members of the Government then I am content to play that role—if that is the interpretation put upon it by the Leader of the Government. But it is no answer to a deficit of \$300,000 to say that the man who points it out is playing the role of a Cassandra. If I am a Cassandra for quoting that, then the Minister of Finance is a Cassandra for furnishing it to me, and the Bank of Montreal is a Cassandra for furnishing it to him. Now, these statements are furnished to be dealt with intelligently, to be considered, and weighed. The whole trouble with the Government in connection with its finances during the past six years has been that they will not face the facts. They rush blindly ahead, whether in connection with railway financing or any other kind of financing, and will not face the situation; they won't make calculations and see what is before them; they persist in going blindly into everything. Now, Sir, I repeat that I am prepared to emphasize these statements which have been furnished by the financial agents of the Colony and by the Fin-

ance Minister, even though in emphasizing them I am taunted with playing the role of Cassandra.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—

Mr. Chairman: Just one or two words in reply to the hon. member. I have listened to him with attention for the last hour and a half. The hon. member can make a very good speech, and he has done his best this evening, as a lawyer, to put up a good case against the Government. He first criticises me because, he states, I have refused to give any information as to what the Government is going to do in the future. Well, I have answered that charge already. My answer is, that if he will put the request for any information which he desires, in writing, I will furnish it to him to-morrow, if possible; but if he wants me to come down and make the usual financial budget statement to this House, I am not going to do it. It is unusual. It was never asked for before in this House, as the hon. gentleman well knows. I have been in the House twenty-three years, and I have never heard a Finance Minister come down and give a financial statement to the House before he came down with his Budget Speech. We have tabled the public accounts, we have furnished several statements which have been asked for by hon. members on the other side, we have given the total expenditure for the nine months and the total revenue for the nine months; now, what other information does the hon. member want? If he wants any statement in reason, I am prepared to give it to him. Of course, I know that the members on the other side are not prepared to get up here and make speeches in favor of the Government, but at the same time their criticism and requests should be reasonable. The position of this Colony to-day is no worse than that of any other British Colony in the Empire. We have heard a lot about the \$300,-

000 deficit at the end of the fiscal year. Well, what does \$300,000 amount to? It looks large in the eyes of some people, but it really doesn't amount to anything. Look around you at the depression which is in evidence all over the world—in Canada, in the United States, in England—for the last twelve months. Why, take Canada, the most prosperous country in the world. Last year they had a surplus of over \$30,000,000, and the Finance Minister, in his statement the other day, told the House that this year he will have a deficit of \$10,000,000. How has that come about? Was it not due to the depression which has been felt in Canada during the past year? Now, we were told here to-night that at the end of the fiscal year, on the 30th June next, we will be faced with a deficit of \$800,000. That is not so. It is correct that our deficit last year was \$201,000, but we had the so-called nest-egg in the Bank of Montreal to meet that; that is what it was there for. This is not the first occasion when we have had deficits in Newfoundland, and we will have them again, but the blue ruin that has been painted here to-night is not going to happen. For the last nine months our deficit, according to the figures furnished here this evening, amounts to something like \$500,000, but what has been the condition during the last nine months? Why, there has been practically nothing imported into the country during that time, except food-stuffs. That cannot go on, and when we get back to normal conditions, things will right themselves again. We are not going to have this blue ruin that has been painted. It is quite true that we have had a deficit of \$500,000 in nine months, but it does not follow that for the remaining three months we will have a proportionate deficit. I take it from what I can see and learn that we will make up a certain amount of that during the next three

months. We imported no dry goods last Fall; we imported nothing at all since last August, except food stuffs, but these dry goods will be coming in during the next three weeks, and at the end of the fiscal year, in June next, even if we have to face a deficit of four or five hundred thousand dollars, what is the position? We are not going to lie down and say that the country is gone. We were told last year, in August and September, that two-thirds of the people were going to starve during the winter, and what happened? I have not heard of one case of starvation in Newfoundland, not one; in fact, there is no starvation in Newfoundland. But the false prophets told us last year there was going to be starvation and ruin, that there was no hope for us. The truth of the matter is that this Colony is in as good a position as any other Colony in the Empire—is better off than any other Colony. I know that there are people amongst us, and right in this House, that are prepared to give the Colony a black eye. Why should we send out to the world to-night that we will have a deficit of 2,000,000 at the end of June. It may so happen that between now and the end of June our revenue may increase by \$100,000 or \$200,000, and instead of our having a greater deficit than we had at the end of the nine months, it may be very much less. Why, when Sir Edward Morris came into power in 1908 and 1909, we had to face a deficit of \$130,000, and blue ruin was then painted because Sir Edward Morris was in charge, but the Colony revived, and the following year we had a surplus of \$250,000; the year after that we had \$420,000 of a surplus; and, as we were told here the other day by the Premier, after four years we had surpluses amounting to practically \$1,000,000. Now, if Newfoundland was at low water in 1908 and 1909

and if she revived in four years to the extent in which she did, may she not do the same thing within the next year or within the next two years? As I have stated before, depression is all round us—in America, Canada and everywhere else, but they are not painting blue ruin in those countries. The Minister of Finance of Canada painted no blue ruin, when he made his statement the other day that he expected a deficit of \$10,000,000. He didn't say that Canada was lost and gone forever, as we have been hearing from the other side of this House. But, Sir, you will find that the old ship will right herself again. You will find that next year, when things become normal again, we will have, not a deficit, but a surplus. I am sick and tired of hearing the story that is being told by the other side of the House, by men who should have more interest in Newfoundland than to be speaking in this manner and sending the story of ruin broadcast as they are doing. We will have a deficit, the hon. gentleman says, of \$500,000 on the 30th June. How does he arrive at that amount? Even if I admit that we have a deficit of \$500,000 after nine months, where does he get the other \$300,000?

MR. LLOYD.—Do you ask me that?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Yes, I do.

MR. LLOYD.—Well, I will answer you.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—You will have lots of time to answer it. We certainly will have to import a certain amount of dry goods within the next three months that we were short of last Fall, from August. In August, nobody that I know in this city could foretell what was going to happen. A certain number of men went around denouncing the banks, and so made Water St. afraid. They

made statements that induced people who had money in certain savings banks in Newfoundland to come here and draw it out; and very little business was done. Of course, I know that the hon. gentleman was talking from an Opposition standpoint and not from an intelligent, serious standpoint; because all you have to do is to take it as a business proposition. Take a \$4,000,000 business. If it is short at the end of the fiscal year \$200,000, it is a very easy matter for the management to curtail its expenses, put the business into shape, and make up that quarter of a million dollars within twelve months. Is that going it blind? The hon. gentleman asks what provision have we made for the loan, if we need a loan, which will have to be made on the 30th June? Well, my answer to that is that when we come to that bridge we will cross it. What sense would there be in our figuring on \$800,000, or half that amount, while it will be quite an easy matter, when the 30th June arrives, for the Government to arrange to pay the interest on whatever amount may be needed to square the account on that day.

Now, I would like the hon. gentlemen on the other side to be reasonable and fair. Certain of them have got up here and said that they wanted this financial statement, that we are hiding something. Now, I want to tell them again that I am hiding nothing. I have told them the story as it is. I have told them that our deficit was \$301,000 at the end of the year, and that up to the present moment it is between four and five hundred thousand dollars. That will not increase within the next three months. If our revenue does not increase within that time by one or two hundred thousand dollars, that will mean that we will probably have a deficit of between two hundred and fifty

and three hundred thousand dollars at the end of the fiscal year; but we are not at all ruined; we are not at all bankrupt or in a hole such as the hon. gentlemen have stated we are in.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman: This discussion has, to some extent, elicited the information for which we have been asking. We know now for the first time what the Minister of Finance is depending on. We have, for the first time, a clear outline of his calculations. One part of his speech deals with the financial condition of the colony and the way in which to meet it. Because of the reasons given here to-day, he anticipates a revival in the revenue. It is a question whether that hope is justified by anything that he says. I said earlier in the session that we should not talk too much about the bad condition of the colony; but the member for Trinity has raised the question, because he was forced to he could not get the information otherwise. It is not lack of respect for or faith in Newfoundland that makes us ask, how are we going to raise enough money to pay off the deficit? It is respect for Newfoundland. Nor is it lack of faith in the future of Newfoundland that leads one to say that he should take in some sail. The man who appeals to that sort of sentiment shows his lack of respect for the intelligence of the people of Newfoundland, to think that he can stampede them in that way. The minister tries to say that we are on our feet in the colony. Let us see if any sane man should anticipate anything of the kind that is going to put us in a sound financial condition. There are merchants who will inform you to the contrary. One of our biggest merchants in the Upper House gave his opinion that fish prices cannot be expected to continue as high as at present. I refer to the

Hon. Mr. Harvey. We must provide for a stormy day. I presume that Mr. Harvey was speaking the opinion of merchants as a whole, and that therefore he was chosen by the Government to make that Speech. Of late there have been speeches in the Council on the Labrador Fish prices Bill which I had the pleasure of introducing. The opinion expressed in these speeches was that the outlook for Labrador was very poor. And every merchant said that the outfit would be smaller this year than ever before. A certain merchant had refused supplies to seventy crews whom he had supplied last year. The hon. Finance Minister said that because there are 2,000 tons of goods on their way here from the Old Country, we are going to have an increase of revenue. It is true that we have not been importing very much during the last few months, but there is now a large stock of dry goods in this country, which has been on the shelves for months. One would think to listen to the Minister of Finance, that the people had been wearing out all their clothes and never in dire need of more, there being none imported. But allow me to say that while the importation has been small, the consumption has been smaller. The shops required to import only a little goods in order to keep them well stocked so that there is not the smallest reason to think that there is going to be any increase in revenue during the war. Where is the prospect that even after the war there is going to be any revival of trade. Millions of men will be thrown out of employment when the armies are disbanded. As a result of the enormous numbers of deaths and the destruction of property all over Europe every man will be trying to rebuild his country again; all these millions of men who

come back to civil life will have to have employment. This colony depends for the sale of its cod-fish, on the poorest people of Europe. Should we go on voting just as much money now as in times of peace? That kind of talk which we have heard does not strike the right key. There is another thing which I have heard mentioned here, that is also false. The Minister of Finance makes reference to the Bank Crash of 1894, when the trade went on as usual. But he forgets this, that we are not now in the position that we were in then. We had an expenditure then that was not more than one half of what our expenditure is now, and the interest on our public debt was not one half of what it is now. The present Government came into power with abounding prosperity and revenues. But it was not long before they had spent it all. Their Estimates exceeded by a million what it had been when they came in. The expenditure was advancing faster than the revenue. A great deal of the expenditure is uncontrollable. If you take the Estimates of this year how few things there are in which you could make a cut. There are many things however from which not a cent can be reduced. There is the education grant, which amounts to \$366,000; that may be said to be uncontrollable. There is the collection of customs which amounts to \$250,000.

The result is that when depression comes you have to cut down these amounts. There is only about \$1,000,000 that we can control and upon which we could cut down if we wanted to. It is with regard to this that we ask that serious thought be given to the question whether we ought to grapple with a reduction instead of voting more money than ever. The Minister wanted to know how my

learned friend made up the deficit which he calculated. I think that what has been said by the member for Trinity, has been very nearly correct. The shortage of revenue amounts to \$355,000, an average of \$51,000 a month to the end of March. But there was no falling off in the months of July and August last. The deficit was an average of \$51,000 per month. If that continues for six months more, we must add \$300,000 more to the deficit. I notice that the Minister shakes his head at that. Business and trade may change it is true. But that is the only answer he can make. Will there be a continuance of the enormous expenditure which has been going on during the past months? We have provided you with interest on \$1,000,000, which may carry us to the end of June. You will have to provide interest on the increased amount just as on the other amounts. You have borrowed one million and have authority to borrow two million. That is another \$150,000 added to the burden during the coming year. You have only got to look around in order to see a lot of accruing obligations. And it is apparent that the condition of this is very serious, and one which cannot be met by empty hopes. What is the condition of affairs on looking at the public debt? A sum of \$250,000 was borrowed from the Bank of Montreal at 5½%.

MINISTER OF FINANCE.—\$100,000 is the amount.

MR. MORINE.—You can not get it at less than 5½% and I do not think that you can get it at that. This is the highest rate that has ever been paid to the Bank of Montreal for a temporary loan. The bank used to charge you 4½% and raised it to 5½%. It is not a market of very great stability in this colony. In the face of that, how are you going to carry on affairs during the next few months?

If the Bank of Montreal said to-morrow, "We cannot lend you money," you would be lost. I ask you if you will tell me where you will raise it. To say that it can be raised, is no answer. Why pay 5½% if another bank will give it to you for less? If the bank said that it would not let you have any more money, what would you do? You would have to appeal to the British government to help you. That is the answer that you would give us now. You ought to try and deal with it in a manly and statesmanlike way, and make a cut in these expenditures.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman, Early in the hon. member Mr. Morine's speech he said that our position in 1894-97 was much better than to-day. In 1894 the amount of our people's cash savings in the banks was two million dollars and to-day there is eleven millions or more in the four Savings Banks. He made that statement without thinking. Besides savings and other forms of investments, such as local industries and life insurance, our people are to-day in possession of twenty-two million dollars and hence are much better off than 1894-7.

MR. MORINE.—But we do not know how much of your \$11,000,000, which is now in the banks was at that time in trunks and stockings.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The tariff is no steeper to-day than it was 20 years ago.

MR. MORINE.—Oh, it is double what it was in 1897.

DR. LLOYD.—I want to deal with a challenge. A challenge thrown out to me by the Minister of Finance. He said, I have no right to make a statement that he will be faced with a deficit of some \$800,000 and may I tell my friend, I was very conservative when I said that—I was giving him the benefit of the doubt. That I was

not over-estimating, but underestimating.

The Finance Minister stated that the Canadian Minister would show a deficit for the coming year. This was caused from circumstances over which he had no control. But the Canadian Minister had a surplus last year while our Minister showed a deficit.

If the hon. Minister will look at the bank account he will find that for nine months there will be a deficit of \$500,000.00, and in order to meet the deficit on that date, that is the sum that we will require.

MR. MORINE—How does the Minister of Finance substantiate his point here? He is \$200,000.00 or over behind on the last day of March. Assuming that the revenue keeps up to what it was last year you still have \$450,000.00 to carry on. Dr. Lloyd's point is that in that expenditure the Finance Minister has not allowed anything for interest to bondholders which has accrued in the end of March although the half-year's interest is not payable until the end of June. Assuming that the revenue goes on at the same rate as the past six months how are you going to pay this interest? In the face of that fact the Minister is now falling back upon an expenditure which averages \$51,000 per month, which is based upon that of the last six months.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman: No matter how hon. members opposite may turn and twist matters this statement shows that the deficit which we have to pay includes the interest on the debt. In all probability we will collect nearly one million dollars during the next few months and out of this we will pay our six months' interest on the debt as usual. That half-year's interest will amount to about \$514,000. We will be able to decrease

our deficit of \$500,000 on the 30th of June by about \$200,000 from the revenue collected to that date, so that at the end of the fiscal year after reducing the money in the Reserve Fund, we will only have a deficit of \$300,000.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I desire to say a few words at this stage in order that there may be no misconception on the part of anyone as to what our deficit will be on the 30th day of June. I would like to put the Committee in possession of the facts in relation to the statement and figures of the bank as quoted by the hon. member Dr. Lloyd this evening. That hon. member stated that in his opinion the deficit on the 30th of June would amount to \$800,000. You say there will be a deficit to the Colours of \$300,000 after deducting the 'nest egg.'

MR. LLOYD—Yes. I was reckoning that there would be a deficit of \$800,000 allowing \$500,000 on account of extra income.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You estimate it will be \$800,000 on June 30th.

MR. LLOYD—Yes, if you get \$250,000 out of the revenue for the next three months and use the 'nest-egg.'

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I understood the hon. member to say that if there is no improvement in the revenue there would be a deficit of \$800,000.

MR. LLOYD—No. I say that last year you had a deficit of \$300,000. And if you have an extra response of \$250,000 in the revenue you will still be \$500,000 to the bad after using the "nest-egg."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You estimate there will be a deficit of \$800,000 if things go on as they are going. I think the hon. member will find that in that estimate he is astray. I do not suppose that anyone

is interested in making out that the financial position of the Colony is any worse than it is. I submit these figures to the Committee, and I think if you will examine these figures you will find that there is not the danger which you anticipate. This is a statement obtained from the Auditor General and made up to March 15th. He begins by showing that on June 30th, 1914, there was a deficit of £301,000. The current expenditure up to December 31st was £2,079,000. The current revenue for the same period was £1,597,000, leaving a deficit of £482,000 for the six months. That is in addition to the £301,000 of the previous year. The estimate of current expenditure for the present six months including interest, is £1,900,000. The total current revenue estimated by him on the basis that there will be no increase is £1,555,000 showing a deficit to the end of June for the second six months of £234,000. The Auditor General drew up that statement at my request, and I afterwards had it endorsed by a gentleman in the Custom House. Now if you put these three together you will find that the whole deficit including £301,000 from last year amounts to £1,017,000. And against that you have the 'nest egg' of £500,000, or in other words, a deficit on June 30th next of £500,000. So that according to the Auditor General if the very worst happens, if there is no increase in revenue, the very worst will be a deficit of £500,000. You have heard the Finance Minister say that there is good reason to expect that matters will improve. If he is correct in his estimate we must assume that there will be an improvement of from £150,000 to £200,000. That would bring the deficit down to £300,000. And when you take the twelve months through which we have passed, I think that it is a very good financial position even though we will

have lost our nest egg. That is what it was put there for. That is the only justification for over-taxing the people in order to get the nest egg. Because there is no justification for calling upon the present generation for one dollar more than is necessary to run the country, and once you exact a dollar more than is necessary you are violating the recognised principle of taxation. But it was considered wise although we had deficit after deficit in the old days, that we should have this nest egg for a rainy day, and now that the rainy day has come we are using it. This nest egg was started out of a balance of £250,000 out of a loan and it has gone on increasing until it reached £500,000. And now bad times have come to the country and we are going to use it, and we are glad it is there. We are very glad that government after government have resisted the temptation to use it before. After all if there is a deficit of £500,000, that does not amount to a very large sum in connection with the Colony. It would be very large in the business of an individual. Why the whole interest on £500,000 is only £20,000. If we came down and asked for an increase of £20,000 in the pauper relief, or £20,000 for old age pensions there would not be a word said, because it would be popular. It would be a vote catcher, but it spells slow ruin when we have to meet a deficit and if we raise a loan to meet the interest on that loan. If the deficit is only £500,000 we shall only have to provide £12,000 a year. But deficits have been met in the past. In 1909 there was a deficit of £199,000 left behind by the government that went out of office. That was a deficit partly on current account and partly in relation to public buildings. We met that deficit, and for the next few years not alone did we have no deficit

it but we collected \$500,000 in surplus revenues. It might be asked why we did not put some portion of that with the 'nest egg.' The reason was that we considered \$500,000 was sufficient and it would have been sufficient if we had not had this European war. We will be told that before we had a European war we had a deficit and that it was brought about by what my friend, Dr. Lloyd calls an election budget. In other words that the putting of pork, tea, sugar, and other items on the free list brought about the shortage. Well, suppose we admit it. Suppose we admit that if we had left these duties, on we would have no deficit. How could we have done otherwise. We had gone to the country pledged to take of these duties. We had told the people that in addition to the other matters, the railways, old age pensions, light houses, telegraph extension etc., we would reduce taxation. We were asked here session after session why we did not reduce taxation. Our answer was that when we had cleared the docks, when we had carried out our obligations in other respects and found the money to carry them out, we would reduce taxation. Then in the last session, when we had provided for everything, when we had provided for 1,200 old age pensions, when we had provided for the interest on \$5,000,000, when we extended the telegraph service and built the lighthouses, then we put these articles on the free list. What better justification could we have had than that for the three years previous we had had large surpluses. The first year that we came in we had a deficit of \$139,900. This was certified by the Auditor General. The next year we had a surplus of \$450,000, and the next year \$170,000. The following year we had \$240,000, when we had provided for all the other public services.

What was better justified than that we should reduce taxation on these articles. It was an election budget if you like, but it was the fulfilling of a solemn pledge. My friends on the other side say that we cannot lay last year's deficit to the door of the war. Well, if it was not due to the war, it was due to bad times that had arrived. The country was already going through a period of depression, that had affected the imports. When I was listening to my friend, Mr. Morine tonight, I could have closed my eyes and fancied myself back 25 years, listening to the same speech. There was no change whatever. Every argument he made was the same. He argued that Mr. Cashin's estimate was wrong, and that although we were in a similar difficulty in 1856 there were not the same conditions and different circumstances. My answer to that is this. If we have a large expenditure today, if we have doubled the expenditure, even though the increase in our population has been small, yet we have to remember that the earning capacity of the country today has doubled. In the days referred to by the hon. member, the laboring man was earning eighty cents a day, and fish was sold for three dollars. That has changed. The earning power of the people has doubled. At that time our exports were not more than \$7,000,000 or probably less. The exports last year were \$16,900,000. The exports of pulp and mineral from Grand Falls and Bell Island of necessity mean more labour, higher pay and consequently an increase in revenue. So that I think we can tonight look into the future without any fear whatever, despite the premeditated have been uttered here. I entirely agree with my friend Mr. Morine when earlier in the session he stated that it should not be the policy of anyone to make out the financial position of the

Colony to be worse than it is. I am sure that no one here desires to make any statement that will have a bad effect on the Colony outside. We should remember that a debate here not alone affects the Colony at home and abroad, but may have a marked effect on the supplying for the fishery. A most important question tonight is where are we going to get supplies for the people this year. It is not a question of catching the fish or exporting it and finding a market so much as a question of getting the importers to take the risk in supplying. My friend, Hon. Mr. Harvey, made a statement the other day in relation to the price of fish. I do not agree with him. I do not think the price of fish is going down. I believe, on the contrary, that the price will be higher next year than ever, and everything points to that fact. And if we have a good fishery and a good price, we can confidently expect a return of good times.

There was a great deal said tonight in relation to the Audit Act, and to hear the remarks one would imagine that something had been done that was never done before. I think my hon friend Mr. Morine will bear me out when I say that never a year passes that the Auditor General does not draw attention to the very same matters that were discussed this evening. Cases arise which have to be dealt with by the Government and if you take up the Auditor General's Reports for 15 years you will find no one report in which the same points have not been reported as are reported here tonight. It is not a question of the responsibility of the Government; it is a question of necessity. Of course, there are cases when it is a question of the expenditure of a large sum of money, when it is necessary to come into this House. That is not disputed. But there are

cases that arise where it is necessary that they should be dealt with at once. They are not serious violations of the Act although they might be held to be a violation of its spirit. There are some of these in relation to pensions. I do not remember when there was ever a pension granted in this House in the first instance. The Minister has come down for the past twenty years and told us that pensions had been granted during the year, and asks the House to endorse the action of the Government, and very properly so, because after all the Executive Government is a Committee of this House. Once they fail to carry out the work for which they are appointed, then they can last no longer. The Government is a Committee of the House. They grant pensions and make emergency payments only, because they feel that they were carrying out the wishes of those of whom they are a Committee.

I make bold to say that there has been no government, or session since that Act was introduced and placed on the Statute Book of the Colony, but that charges were made that this Act had been violated. But I have never yet once heard of a serious resolution to the effect that this practice be discontinued. It has its disadvantages, but they are over reached by the good that it is able to accomplish.

Now Mr. Chairman I think the point suggested by my hon. friend, the member for Twillingate, Mr. Clift, was very well taken, and that the passing of the Estimates will be greatly helped as a result. There are plenty of offices in the country which are now underpaid. Hardly a day passes now but that the Government is asked to increase hundreds of salaries not in St. John's, but in the outports. There are cries of how the civil service, light house keepers and police are underpaid. Then we look at some of

the other branches of the civil service. I doubt if by going through these salaries tomorrow we could find a way to save one dollar. It has been tried, but was found not to work.

Then there are the public institutions. Take the Hospital for instance. There are clothes, medicines and other things that cannot be properly estimated. Though we vote seemingly a large sum yet we always find at the end of the year the vote is over-expended. This is no fault of the Government.

We have in the Hospital down there buildings which are always holding two are three hundred patients. The staff there totals nearly 100. There are four buildings, and in these steam must be kept up all the year round.

Then there is the post office; seven or eight thousand dollars is annually voted to the upkeep of this institution. There are the contracts for coal, etc., and the salaries of the post and telegraph clerks. Then there are the educational grants. Nothing can be saved in this Department, and so in hardly any department of the Government can any material saving be effected. So I agree with the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Cliff, that little can be accomplished in the way of reducing the estimates, and with Dr. Lloyd when he dealt with the matter as to the impossibility to do anything in the way of increasing taxation. I do not think after all that the Minister of Finance refused to let this House have a statement of what the deficit was going to be. Rather I think that it would be very difficult to have this done, as the standing can only be determined after all returns have been recorded.

Now I think Sir, that with this information which has been furnished this evening, we might pass the Estimates as before us.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I shall

be very pleased to accept what the leader of the Government has stated. If the Government could have let us have the information before, a lot of time might have been saved. We know, and the Government admits, that there is going to be a deficit on June 30th. What we wanted to know is what the Government was going to do. The Premier has told us, and his answer is perfectly satisfactory. But the matter has been raised as to who was out in his statement of this afternoon. Was it the Minister of Finance or the member for Trinity?

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I took down the figures as read this afternoon, and if there are no objections, I will read them to see if I took them down correctly; and so see if it is the member for Trinity or the Minister that the Auditor General says is right. The Prime Minister says that the Minister is right, and bases his statement on the figures of the Auditor General. Now I take issue with him and desire to point out something to him. The deficit of June 30th last year was \$301,000, the deficit at December was \$200,000. Now from that it is not unreasonable to suppose that there will be a large deficit. According to the estimates there will be an expenditure of \$1,500,000 in the next six months up to June 30th. This will leave a deficit of \$234,000.

He justifies what he says by the Auditor General's returns. Now I shall be very sorry if the Auditor General ever signed any statement such as what the Premier has quoted.

Now Sir, if we had to pay the six months' interest due on June 30th, this will amount to \$520,000. That will pay the interest for the six months, and merely that, without expenditures by any departments during the months of April, May and

June. There is therefore the three months' expenditure and the interest to be met, and yet in spite of this we have the spending departments of the Government receiving increased estimates.

Check the expenditures of April, May and June of last year and we get the total expenditures of \$1,400,000, and out of this \$1,400,000 which was needed last year for these three months, \$1,100,000 is this year already spent. By working up these figures it will be found that there will be a shortage of \$600,000 at the end of June. The Premier is entirely and absolutely lost in this financing, in spite of the very simple facts. I would just make a remark or two more, Mr. Chairman, when I intend to ask for an adjournment. The Prime Minister tried to defend the custom of voting money under Executive responsibility by referring to the journal of this House I have here the Journal for 1900, and I can find no amount voted here by Executive responsibility. The only thing that passed under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act was an emergency case, and this was accompanied by a certificate. The practice has grown now of passing orders through this section and it is about time to have it stopped. It is too late now to continue to discuss this matter, so I would suggest that the Committee pass the vote, and rise and ask to sit again on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed a Resolution and asked leave to sit again.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS TO GOVERNOR.

Mr. Morine gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the following Resolution:

"RESOLVED: That an Address of this House be presented to His Excellency the Governor respectfully protesting against the practice of expending public money on the assumed and illegal authority of the Governor-in-Council, in violation of the express provisions of the Audit Act, 1898, and in derogation of the ancient, exclusive and undoubted rights of this Assembly."

Mr. Morine gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 28th at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. MORINE.—I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from Rev. A. E. Tulk, the Rector at Salvage, and other inhabitants of Salvage and locality, asking that a sum of \$50 be allocated for repairing the road there. I would ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Public Works for its attention.

Also, Mr. Speaker, one from Moses Tulk and others of St. Chad's, asking for an elective Road Board. I would ask that this be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary for attention.

QUESTIONS.

MR. TARGETT.—I beg to call the attention of the Government to the fact that my question of April 13th

has not yet been answered.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This answer is in course of preparation. I may also say that the answer handed to Mr. Coaker yesterday, which appeared incorrect, has been looked into, and it has been found that an error had crept in. The amount paid the Judges was \$1,900 and not \$2,500 as was stated. Also, I would like to hand Dr. Lloyd the figures asked for by him yesterday.

MR. ABBOTT.—I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that two of my questions have not yet been answered.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—These answers are being prepared. I hope to have them before the House closes.

MR. MORINE.—I asked the Premier the day before yesterday for some information about the debate for today.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This is being prepared.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE.—The answer to the question of Mr. Abbott is being prepared.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to table answer of question of April 24th, for information about the Exploits Valley.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I beg to table answer to question of Mr. Coaker.

MR. COAKER.—I would like to remind the Premier that he promised us the evidence of the Hospital Commission for perusal. We have not yet received this.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I will see that the evidence is passed to the hon. members for their perusal.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I beg to table answer to question of Mr. Halfyard.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg leave to table evidence of the enquiry into the affairs at the Lunatic Asylum as asked for by Mr. Coaker.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns of all moneys, allocated by his department, to Thomas Devine, King's Cove, during 1912.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—These returns are being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the amount of \$75,000 for buildings and machinery, and \$73,000 for material, shown in the statement recently tabled of the Reid Newfoundland Company's claims for extras, under the Branch Railway Contract.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—That statement is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the contract for the erection of the recently erected Public Building at Harbour Grace.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—That statement is being prepared.

MR. CLIFT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all expenditure made on the Government wharf in Bay Roberts, during the years 1912, 1913, and 1914, together with copies of vouchers for all purchases made on account of the same.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—I would like to ask the hon. member what wharf he refers to?

MR. CLIFT.—The public wharf.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—There are a number of public wharves. What particular one do you refer to?

MR. CLIFT.—The one recently repaired.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—There have been no repairs to any of them for the last two years.

MR. CLIFT.—The one on which expenditures were made in 1912-13 and 1914.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES

—The three wharves had repairs made to them in 1912 and 1913.

MR. CLIFT.—I have to ask for particulars of all.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES

—I will have them to-morrow.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the names and ages of all persons in the Districts of St. John's East and West, who have received the Old Age Pension since July 1, 1914, to date; also, a statement showing the names and ages of those in each of the said Districts who have applied for the Old Age Pension but are not receiving it, and giving the reason why it is not paid in each case.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—That is being prepared.

MR. MORINE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table a statement showing (a) On what services \$748,441 was paid in February, 1915; (b) On what accounts \$892,947 were collected in June, 1914; and will ask him if the interest due at the end of Dec. 31st, 1914, was paid then out of Consolidated Revenue Fund, or was borrowed from the Bank of Montreal, and, if so, what rate of interest was paid.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—That is being prepared.

MR. MORINE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table a statement showing (1) the amount of authorized loans not yet permanently raised; (2) the estimated amount of obligations for branch railways not yet covered by any borrowing bill, included under the previous head; (3) the total amount of floating liabilities, if any, to the banks not included in the two preceding heads.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—That is being prepared.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon.

the Premier to lay on table of this House all correspondence, memoranda and letters, that have passed between Hon. J. Alexander Robinson, acting on behalf of Edward C. Robinson, or any other person or on his own account, and the Government or any Department thereof, in reference to the grant proposed to be made by the Government or Legislature, of Muskrat Falls or other water power on the Hamilton River, and to inform the House if it be true that an arrangement has been effected between the said Hon. J. Alexander Robinson, acting on behalf of Edward C. Robinson, or any other person or on his own account, and the Newfoundland Product Co. or their representatives, by which the said Hon. J. Alexander Robinson, acting as aforesaid, has been secured in a franchise of fifteen thousand horse power, or any other amount out of the said water power on the Hamilton River, and if such an arrangement is in writing, to lay a copy of the same on the table of this House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No correspondence, memoranda or letters whatever, of any description, have passed between Hon. J. Alexander Robinson, acting on behalf of Edward C. Robinson, or on his own account, or with any other person on his account or on behalf of any person, and the Government or any Department thereof in relation to the grant proposed to be made by the Government or Legislature of Muskrat Falls or other water power on the Hamilton River, or any correspondence whatever in relation to the subject matter of the same, or any personal interviews whatever in relation to the same. The Government has no knowledge of any arrangement having been effected between the said Hon. J. Alexander Robinson, acting on behalf of Edward C. Robinson, or acting on behalf of any person or on his own account, and the

Newfoundland Products Corporation or their representatives in relation to the securing of a franchise of fifteen thousand horse power or any other amount out of the said water power on the Hamilton River, or any arrangement whatsoever. No communication has taken place with the Government or any Department of the Government, either in writing or orally. Neither Hon. J. Alexander Robinson, nor any person on his account have had any correspondence with the Government at any time in relation to timber rights or water powers either in Newfoundland or in Labrador.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of this House all correspondence, memoranda and letters, that have passed between the Hon. W. C. Job or the company of Job Bros. and Co. and the Government or any Department thereof, in reference to the grant proposed to be made by the Government or Legislature, of Muskrat Falls or other water power on the Hamilton River, and to inform this House if it be true that an arrangement has been effected between the said Jobs and the Newfoundland Products Company, or their representatives, by which the said Job has been secured in a franchise of fifteen thousand horse power or any other amount out of the said water power on the Hamilton River, and if such an arrangement is in writing, to lay a copy of the same on the table of this House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The same thing applies to this question.

MR. MORINE.—Will the Premier undertake to find out from the Products Corporation whether any arrangements have been made concerning these water powers?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Certainly.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman: These resolutions, as the members of the Committee are aware, contain matters of very great importance, matters which deserve at the hands of this Committee the very greatest consideration that they can possibly give to them. They ought to remember in dealing with these resolutions and the agreement which is annexed to them that they are here as the trustees of the people of Newfoundland; that the interests of the people of Newfoundland have been entrusted to them to guard, protect and look after. It is our first duty here to remember that we are the people of Newfoundland assembled in deliberation so as to best conserve the interest of Newfoundland. Now, looking at these resolutions from that point of view, I would ask the members of the Committee to try to forget in considering them any Party divisions that may exist. The matter is too important; it is too fraught with consequences to the future of this Colony, to be trammelled by any artificial bonds such as the Party system would involve. I would ask the members of the other side in particular who may regard it as their duty as members of the Party supporting the Government of the day, that in bringing their minds to bear upon these resolutions they lay aside for once any obligations which they may con-

sider to devolve upon them because of these party alliances. We are here as trustees of the people who live in Newfoundland to-day and for ever hereafter, and we are dealing with rights that will extend into centuries—into a time when Newfoundland, we hope, will be a great country, will be one of the greatest countries in the world, and we should endeavour to find out what the consequences of these resolutions will be in remote periods such as that—whether they will have the effect of retarding or forwarding the progress which we hope Newfoundland will make. In approaching these resolutions, we should first of all consider who this Corporation is, what they are securing, what they already possess in this colony, and what powers they have. These are matters that deserve consideration at the hands of the Committee. I am very sorry, that the Committee is not more fully informed on the matters covered by these resolutions. Practically, as far as the resolutions are concerned and the matters contained therein, we are without any information, except a statement or an analysis of the contract itself which was made by the Premier here the other day. In a matter of this kind, every effort ought to be made to supply the House with the fullest detailed information regarding the areas, the rights, the powers, and the possibilities of the properties that are dealt with in this contract. I asked the other day whether any independent survey had been obtained by the Government in relation to the properties contained in this contract, and I was informed that there was no independent survey, except that which the Government had obtained through the ordinary Departmental information. That means, to my mind, that there has been no check, no special effort

made, to ascertain what these resolutions mean, what their effects are, what is the extent of the powers that they may give. A matter of this importance, involving a large amount of money and dealing with rights that may have so great an influence over the future development of this country, deserves, before committing the colony to any agreement of any kind in relation to it, that the Government should have been in possession of all the information that it was possible to obtain, independent altogether of those who are interested in promoting the interests of the corporation. I am sorry that no enquiry was made and that no information was secured beyond that which was in the possession of the Government Departments. The Government should come in here prepared with full detailed reports on every matter relating to the powers referred to in it, the rights conferred by it and the concessions made in it, and on every other topic on which the contract has a bearing; but on the contrary we have no information beyond an analysis of the contract which the Premier made here the other day, not critical analysis but a mere digest of its provisions and a statement of the process which it was proposed to carry on in connection with one of the industries which the Corporation may develop in this country; a business, which I would like to point out here, there is no obligation whatever from one end of the contract to the other upon the Company to enter upon. Mr. Willson's name has been mentioned in connection with this. He has had experience which was outlined here the other day by the Premier, experience in special lines, in connection with promoting companies, in connection with certain inventions in connection with chemicals and fertilizers, and matters of

that kind. The Corporation which is securing these rights is not Mr. Wilson, as far as the papers show he has no interest whatever in it. The Corporation is simply a Company which has been promoted by the Directors of the Reid Newfoundland Company, a Company which already owns large interests in the colony at the present time—a company whose interests are already too large in this country—a company which has such powers in the country at the present time that I don't think you will find a parallel to it in any other country in the world. Now, in the present Corporation, which as I say, is promoted by the Reid Newfoundland Co., you are giving them more extensive powers and more concessions, which, I propose to show, will certainly not be advantageous to the people of this country. The Company is registered in the Colony of Newfoundland. It is registered under the Companies Act of 1895. The Memorandum of Association is signed by H. D. Reid, Vice-President of the Reid Newfoundland Company R. G. Reid, a Director of the Reid Newfoundland Company, and Mr. W. Furlong, a Director of the Reid Newfoundland Company. The witness is Mr. A. H. Plimsoil who, I am informed, is an Auditor of the Reid Newfoundland Co. I am not quite certain on that point, but I am so informed. These are the people who have signed the Memorandum and Articles of Association. The Articles of Association provide, among other things, for a Board of Directors. It provides that the Directors shall not be less than three nor more than nine. The first Directors are named in the Articles, a usual course in the formation of companies. They are: W. D. Reid, President of the Reid Newfoundland Co., H. D. Reid, Vice-President of the Reid Newfoundland Co., R. G. Reid, a Director of the Reid Newfoundland Co., and

Martin W. Furlong, another Director of the Reid Newfoundland Co. These facts are material and the Committee may approach the consideration of this contract and of these resolutions in view of the fact that it is a company organized, promoted and registered as a subsidiary company to the Reid Newfoundland Co. Now, when I ask the Committee to consider this matter in this light, I don't wish it to be understood that I am in any way reflecting upon any of the gentlemen who have signed these papers. If the concessions are to be made, under all the circumstances I would just as soon grant them to these gentlemen as any others of equal repute, but I wish the Committee to consider it in the light of the immense interests which the Reid Newfoundland Co. have in this Colony, at the present time, and to decide whether it is right or proper in the interests of the colony and of the people to extend these rights and interests beyond what they have already obtained. At the present time, the Reid Newfoundland Co. controls, as every member of the Committee knows, over 4,000,000 acres of land in this colony, perhaps the most valuable land in the colony. They have the absolute fee simple right to this large grant of land, and they have had it now for nearly twenty years. They have control of all the railway system of the colony, and they have control of the greater part of the Bay Mail Service. And now you are giving them in addition thereto control, under this contract, of all the valuable water powers in the colony and on the Labrador. When you consider this contract and the return which the colony is getting for the concession of such valuable rights, you must be convinced that we are getting nothing at all commensurate with the value of the interests which we are asked to give away. The

Newfoundland Products Corporation are under their charter of incorporation as to the business in which they may engage, the operations which they may carry on, and any other matters in which they may deal, outside the province of this Legislature. They have filed these articles of Association under the Companies Act. They may change their memorandum of association, they can increase the number of objects which the Company may carry on, the different kind of business which they may carry on, at their pleasure, provided they get the sanction of the Court. I think, as a condition at least of this contract, ought to be that the charter of incorporation of this Company ought to be under the control of the Legislature; it ought not be changed or varied at the will of the Company in future years. It should be set out in the Act confirming the contract. At the present time they have large powers under their Memorandum of Association. They have power to apply for, obtain, purchase or otherwise acquire waters, water powers, and rights in and upon any of the rivers and lakes in Newfoundland and its Dependencies; to carry on the business of manufacture of Phosphate of Ammonia and fertilizers of all kinds; and to carry on the business of manufacture of explosives, nitrates, and other similar articles. Then follows a number of sections in the Memorandum of Association of the Corporation which empower it to do various matters which are subsidiary to or contribute to the objects previously set forth and are intended to be used only as subsidiary to the substantive purposes of the Corporation. For instance:

"To carry on any other business, manufacturing or otherwise which may be deemed by the Company capable of being conveniently carried on in connection with the above or calcu-

lated directly or indirectly to enhance the value or render more valuable any of the Company's property."

The clause is very far reaching when linked with the purposes contained in the first clause relating to water powers. It opens up unlimited possibilities as to the fields of business in which the Company may engage. Then the next section of the Memorandum provides that it may purchase or acquire land "freehold or leasehold" or other property, easements, buildings, factories, mills, works, wharves, roads, railways, etc., necessary for or which may be conveniently used with or enhance the value of the property of the Company. It is next authorized to build, construct, etc., ways, tramways, railways, bridges, waterworks, sewers, reservoirs, offices, telegraphs, telephones, electrical works, saw mills, timber cutting works, etc., etc., which may directly or indirectly conduce to any of the objects of the Company and to contribute to, subsidize or otherwise aid or take part in any such operations. It is given the right to acquire patents and patent rights, to acquire any business of any person or firm carrying on or proposing to carry on any business the Company may conduct and to pay for the same in shares or debentures of the Company, to improve, lease, sell or mortgage all or any part of its property. Amongst the substantive purposes set out in its Memorandum are:—

"To buy, sell, import, manipulate, prepare for market and deal in merchandise of all kinds and to carry on business as tin-smiths, assayers, chemists, chemical manufacturers, iron-founders, brass-founders, copper-smiths, storekeepers, farmer's carriers, provision preservers, packers, printers, advertising agents, mechanical engineers, builders and contractors."

"To under transact and execute all

kinds of agencies, business and also trusts of all kinds and form, constitute and promote Companies, syndicates, associations and undertakings of all kinds"

"To promote any other Company or for the purpose of acquiring all or any of the property and undertaking any of the liabilities of this Company or of undertaking any business or operation which may appear likely to assist or benefit this Company or enhance the value of any property or business of this Company and to place or guarantee the placing or underwrite, subscribe for or otherwise acquire all or any part of the shares or securities of any such Company as aforesaid."

"To sell or otherwise dispose of all or any part of the Company's undertaking either together or in portions for such consideration as the Company may think fit, and in particular for shares, debentures or other securities of any Company purchasing the same."

"To distribute moneys to the members of the Company in kind, any property of the Company and in particular any shares, debentures or other securities of other companies belonging to this Company or of which this Company may have the power of disposing."

There are quite a number of businesses which the Company may carry on under its constitution as at present contained in the Memorandum of Association, but it must be remembered that the activities of the Company, if it ever gets down to business, may be multiplied indefinitely, provided it can get the sanction of the Court to any extension it may desire and the Court will approve any proposals along these lines which will be advantageous to the Company. The Legislature practically abandons all right to limit its operations. It can only do so by Special Act to be passed hereafter and as this Agreement, if its

terms are enacted into law, becomes a legislative contract, it can only do so on condition that the Company is compensated if its interests are thereby affected or curtailed. I have referred to the objects for which the Company has been formed in order to show the scope and meaning of the words 'business and operations of the Company' which occur so frequently in this Agreement, and that as you read the Agreement you may have in your mind the wide extent which you should give that phrase, as it affects the rights, privileges and concessions made to the Company. Broadly speaking, the Agreement deals with the principal water powers in the Colony and on Labrador with the extensive rights, powers and privileges and exemptions attached to them and the Company's business. The areas affected by these concessions and selected by the Company or its promoters show that while the Government neglected to make the inquiries and investigations it should have made, and the surveys they should have undertaken or to gather the information it should have obtained, the Company and its promoters were very vigilant in this direction and knew exactly what they were doing, the exact areas they wished to obtain rights over and the exact limits they should place to these areas in order to secure to themselves the full advantage of the concessions they were looking for. The rights and privileges proposed to be conferred upon this Company relate in the first place to the water powers in and upon the Humber River and in and upon Junction Brook. A lease of 99 years renewable in perpetuity is granted of these water powers. It is further provided that within the drainage area of these rivers—that is over that immense territory or stretch of country through or over which water flows, directly or indirectly, into these rivers—the Company will have the right

to divert, stop or dam up the streams, lakes or waters which flow into the Humber, including Junction Brook, which itself flows into the Humber and connects it with Deer Lake. The Company may exercise any of these rights for the purposes of its works and operations, and it is not limited to any particular kind of business or operation, but it is given generally and is unlimited in extent or object. If you will look at the map of Newfoundland you will notice the Humber is one of our most valuable rivers, capable of great development and draining an immense area. Junction Brook is a tributary of the Humber. The Reid-Newfoundland Company owns practically all the valuable land on both sides of this river. It is possible they own the soil under the river where they own that on each side. Their grants will show if that is so or not, but they have only the natural right to use the waters of the river that flows between the banks. The only area of value along the river which they do not own is that lying between their blocks No. 22 and 23, and that remaining block of land is granted away to the present Company under this Agreement for no consideration whatever. The map of Newfoundland which the Premier handed us the other day indicates the vast extent of the areas included in the drainage of the Humber. It extends up the Humber to Deer Lake, includes Junction Brook to Birchy Pond and all contributing streams and rivers. It extends into St. Barbe District as far as and beyond Bonne Bay, it takes a circular line through the interior of the country, and includes Grand Lake and its feeders. This country covered by this drainage area is only one of other sections of the country which come under the operations of this Contract. In addition to the water powers on the Humber and the rights attached to them the Company is giv-

ing the right, if it acquires within 21 years from the date of the Agreement any water power or powers within a distance of forty miles of its factories or power houses at the Humber's mouth, to hold that power or powers under this agreement and to attach to it all the rights and privileges that I have described and all others given the Company under the Agreement for the purposes stated in the agreement, except those in clause 18 relating to appropriating private property to which I shall refer later. The area included in this circle, having a radius of forty miles from the Company's factories at the Humber, will extend from Flat Bay in St. George's to above Bonne Bay in St. Barbe and extend into the interior as far as the middle of Red Indian Lake. It covers such rivers as the St. George's River, Harry's Brook, the Serpentine River and the drainage area relating to them. If the Company acquires any water powers in that area the rights under the Agreement attach though they are idle and undeveloped on its hands until it can dispose of them profitably or retain them undeveloped to enhance the value of its own concessions elsewhere to their own profit and the cost of the public and its competitors. There is a third section of the country over which the Company is given rights. It is given the same rights as those given within a radius of forty miles from its factories at Humbermouth, over a drainage area extending from Hall's Bay across Notre Dame Bay, and extending from near Freshwater Bay in Bonaville Bay to the middle of Red Indian Lake, where it links up with the area I have just dealt with. If the Company acquire any water powers in that great area within 21 years from the date of the Contract, they are to be held under this Contract, and except those relating to private property, the rights and privileges created by it apply to all

its works and business for the purpose stated in the agreement. There is a proviso annexed to the rights given in relation to this East Coast area, that if "at the expiration of five years after acquiring such last named water power in the said area on the East Coast" (not the other areas—this proviso only applies to the East Coast area) "The Company shall not develop the same or any of them, then the provisions of this agreement shall cease to apply to any such water power undeveloped." In other words, if it acquires and does not develop a water power on this East Coast area within five years after acquiring it, and that may be twenty-six years from now, because it has twenty-one years within which to acquire it and it retains the right to develop it for five years after acquiring, so as to prevent a forfeiture of the provisions of the Agreement, then only shall the provision of this agreement cease to apply. The development required is not stated, and any development of any kind will protect them against any such forfeiture.

The nature and extent of the rights and privileges ceded to the Company under this agreement are very ambiguously expressed. In the contract one right is so dove-tailed into another, one privilege is so allied and linked up with other privileges and the application of them so confused and mixed up, that you require to give very close attention to the wording to discover the meaning that should be properly given them. In an agreement of this kind every sentence and every right should be defined in clear cut language. If it took 10 pages of printed matter to describe a single concession, it would not be too much, provided the rights be expressed in clear propositions, in clear cut paragraphs, and each one kept separate and not be confused by

references to rights here and to privileges in other places, to attach to concessions equally mixed up in its language. They may be curtailed in some places and extended in other places. I think the whole agreement shows that it is either carelessly drawn, or drawn with the intention to perplex those who approach it and try to interpret it. I referred to the provisions that the rights and privileges granted by the agreement attached to the powers in the 40 mile area and in the east coast area. It says: "Such water power or powers shall be taken to be held under this agreement." It is very difficult to see what that means. So far there is a demise for 99 years of the water power of Humber River and Junction Brook, granted with rights annexed to them. I presume the intention is, that whatever title a water power in these areas is acquired under, will be title of the kind created by the agreement, or it may be that the rights and privileges attaching to this agreement will attach to these water powers, no matter what the title is, whether by demise, fee simple, freehold or any other title whatsoever. "The rights and privileges," that probably means the rights referred to in this paragraph such as the right of damming up, and making and construction of dams, water-courses, and other matters referred to in the early part of the agreement. It also refers probably to such rights as those relating to the import of materials and of freedom from taxation, and the appropriation of Government property, etc. But, the thing is not at all clear. It is not as clear as it should be in an agreement of this kind, dealing with so great and so far-reaching interests. The next concession given by the agreement is a right to have the water powers on the Hamilton river and on the Northwest River on the

Labrador, held for the Company. They are bound to begin a survey within two years from the date hereof. They are bound to begin a survey, but they need not finish that survey for five years after they begin it, or they have seven years in all to complete it. Then within ten years from the date of the agreement, they will have to spend not less than \$5,000,000 on the extension of its business in Newfoundland or its dependencies. I should like to point out to the Committee here, that this expenditure may have nothing at all to do with the powers on Labrador, but it may be spent in a manner which I propose to deal with later on. The expenditure of this \$5,000,000 within ten years, and upon the expenditure of which the acquisition of the complete title to these water powers on Hamilton River depends, need not be made upon the development or at all on the powers that are the subject of the concessions. It may be made in connection with the business and operations of the Company in Newfoundland. After ten years, provided the Company has in the meantime made a survey and spent \$5,000,000 on its business and operations, either in Newfoundland or on the Labrador, acquires a title to this property. It is then that the grants will issue to it. After the grants have been issued there is an obligation placed upon it after it has acquired the property, to spend \$10,000,000 to develop the property itself, subject to forfeiture. In connection with these powers, it will be noted that the Government undertakes not to grant for a period of five years, to any person any water power or water powers on the Hamilton River or the Northwest River with the drainage area mentioned. In other words, no power will be granted on either river for 17 years from the date of this agreement. When

the Company makes the selection of the river it desires to retain, whether it be the Northwest River or Hamilton River, no power can be granted to any other person upon that river for a further period of five years from that date. In other words, as regards the river that is ultimately selected to develop no person can acquire any rights in that for 22 years after the date of this agreement. That is what it means, although it does not say so in straightforward language. The Company does not forfeit its right unless it fails to make the required expenditure within five years of the issue of the title to it. After it acquires and is entitled to retain the areas, it gets a fee simple indefeasible title thereto, and afterwards of course, no person can acquire any right, or interest, or property in it except by purchase on such terms as the Company may demand beyond the limited concession that is in section 3 of the agreement in relation to the supplying of a certain quantity of horse power; that is a provision under which the Company agrees to furnish at any of its power houses on Labrador to any company engaged in any industry or employment, not concerned with the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia and other articles mentioned therein, and the bye products, and within one hundred miles of the power houses to the extent of 50,000 horse power, upon terms and conditions to be settled by agreement if possible, and if not by arbitration. What that means, none can say, except an expert who has studied it. These are matters that the Government should have taken means to obtain expert opinion upon, and to have supplied all this information to the Committee before proceeding with the consideration of the Resolutions. This information should cover all

matters relating to development on these rivers, and as to what is really meant by a concession of fifty thousand horse power to the persons described in the section. The Government also grants to the Company a mining grant of an area of land of roughly five square miles, which is practically surrounded by land of the Reid Nfld. Company, and which is on the Humber just above Humbermouth, and which the Premier stated the other day, contains marble.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Limestone.

MR. KENT.—This area consists of the block of land intervening between the Reid Nfld. Co.'s blocks on the north side of the railway at Humbermouth, and I presume the Company will acquire the rights of the Reid Nfld. Co. over the adjoining areas. There is no return whatever to the Colony for the grant of this valuable area of land. The next paragraph provides that all the land, waters, water powers, buildings, erections and all property whatsoever of the Company, shall be exempt from municipal taxation. The next provides that the stock, dividends and other securities of the Company shall also be exempt from taxation; and the next that all construction material and machinery for the Company's mills, factories and works, and for the purpose mentioned in clause 1 hereof, both for the original installation and further extension of the same, but not in substitution for old, shall be admitted duty free. Now these rights are unlimited as regards time. They give the Company exemption from municipal taxation for all time, for all its property of whatsoever kind. Suppose the Company were to own property in St. John's. The taxes that citizens have to pay for the upkeep of the city, will never be payable by

the Company. Now let us suppose that a town or city were to develop at Humbermouth. The Company's property there would be free from all municipal taxation and the citizens probably the laboring men and the working men employed by the Company would have to pay for the maintenance and upkeep of the civic institutions and the streets and other works of such a town. The next proposition is that the stocks and debentures of the Company are free from taxation forever. We passed here the other day an Act which imposes a tax upon the debentures of every company doing business in the Colony. We compelled them to pay death duties on their debentures and shares and stocks, but this company can go into any business it may wish and it may alter from time to time in the manner I have described, and may carry on that business, and while other individuals or companies may be competing with it in business, its debentures and stocks and shares will always be free from taxation, although a heavy burden of taxation may have to be borne by others doing business along similar lines. For instance, supposing for a moment that this company in the next 10 or 20 or 50 years decided to go into the ordinary general business of the country and compete with such firms as Bowrings, Jobs, and Harveys and other firms of that kind, Bowrings, Jobs, Harveys and the others could be taxed upon their debentures and stock and shares, whereas this company could carry on the same business and not be taxed in this direction at all. Competition under these circumstances is not fair competition.

Another unfair advantage over its business rivals this Company will have is that if it were doing business in St. John's or elsewhere where the municipal taxation may be collected

its property would be free from municipal taxation. The Company is also given for all purposes except in so far as any powers that it may acquire in connection with the east coast area the right to appropriate the lands of private individuals. Section 11 of this contract sets out that "If the company shall be at any time or times desirous of acquiring lands incident to flowage right or rights of way for telegraphs, telephons, power transmission lines, railways, tramways or roads or sites for mill works, factories, warehouses or for wharves, pier docks, or other shipping facilities not belonging to or not in possession of the Crown and in connection with the Company's operations for the purposes aforesaid and within fifty miles therefrom, and shall be unable to agree with the owners or occupiers of such lands as to the purchase money or compensation to be paid therefor, the Company with the consent of the Governor-in-Council may enter and take such lands and the purchase money or other compensation to be paid by the Company to the owners or occupiers of such lands shall be settled by arbitration in manner provided by Section 55 of the Crown Lands Act. And upon payment to the owners or occupiers aforesaid of the amount awarded in such arbitration, the said lands shall become and be the absolute property of the Company." That right, sir, is given within 50 miles, within an area of 50 miles of the Company's operations. What is meant by within 50 miles of the Company's operations is very difficult to say. Suppose the Company establish a power house on the Exploits River. Does it mean that it will have a right to acquire property within 50 miles of those factories or if it has operations in any other part of the

country within the areas covered by its concessions or outside these areas covered, because there is no limitation in it, has it the right to acquire land within 50 miles of the factories or power houses? The contract is not at all clear. There is no limit to the lands that may be acquired if it is shown to be for any of the purposes specified. If the contract is accepted by the Committee this concession should be defined clearly and precisely. It should be limited and its nature and extent should be placed beyond peradventure. Under the agreement as it stands at the present time there is practically a universal power to expropriate. Lands of private individuals throughout the country required for any of these purposes if the company exceeds its operations may be expropriated. If they do acquire private property the Bill here is insufficient on the subject of compensating the owners. I think the remedy for private holders ought not to be the mere arbitrary price of the property or the purchase price of the property. Purchase money has been defined as the market value of property taken, and does not include incidental injury. Different words are used in another part of the Contract dealing with submerging property through the operations of the Company, in which case, if any such property is injuriously affected, the injury is to be compensated and paid for; but where property is taken under Section 16 of the provision, the Company simply takes it and pays the purchase money for it. If any other property of the individual or others in the same neighbourhood should be injuriously affected, there is no compensation provided.

The next section to which I will refer is section 14. If you notice, it strengthens the position which I have made in the be-

giving of my remarks that the new Company is subsidiary to the Reid-Nfld. Company. By this section the Company is to become a feeder for the services of the Reid-Nfld. Company as against its competitors engaged in the business of carriers. For example, take Bowring Brothers' coastal service. They do not enter on a fair competition on the carriage of any output from these works, because section 14 provides that "The Company hereby undertakes that it will at all times sell at the Company's works at the wholesale export price and deliver at all railway stations in Newfoundland and will also deliver at all ports of call of the Reid-Nfld. Company's steamers." The intention is to make this Corporation a subsidiary and feeding corporation for the Reid-Nfld. Co. I object to the next section in relation to the rights of private individuals and the manner of assessing damage done to the property of private individuals. I think that if the Company does damage to any individual in the exercise of its immense powers, that such person, whether great or small, should not be compelled to establish a special tribunal to have his rights arbitrated upon. The right of action for damage done to a man's property ought to be safeguarded, and he ought not to be compelled unless he is willing, to submit to arbitration. I shall now briefly refer to Section 18. This clause provides that "The Company undertakes to begin actual construction work upon its undertaking within two years from the date of these presents and to expend the sum of \$5,000,000 within the Island of Newfoundland in and about the business and operations of the Company within five years from the date of these presents and if the Company fails to begin such work or expend such money within the times mentioned, this agreement shall be void." The

first condition is that the Company must begin actual construction work upon its undertaking within two years. That may mean anything and it may mean nothing. "Begin." What is meant by beginning actual construction, and what is meant by beginning actual work, and what happens if they begin actual construction work and do not continue, does the agreement then cease? Who is to be the judge of how far the work is to proceed in order to avoid a forfeiture of the agreement? Then the Company is required to spend five million dollars within the Island of Newfoundland in and about its business and operations. What does that mean? We know the Company is acquiring properties and rights and certain interests of the Reid-Nfld. Co., and others on the Humber River, Junction Brook, and Grand Lake regions. For instance, it is acquiring the land bordering these water powers and the forest areas of the Reid Nfld. Co. at Grand Lake. It will have to purchase these and have to pay the price asked for them. Is the expenditure so made to be included in the money spent for the purpose of acquiring property for the purpose of carrying on its business and operations? Is money spent in and about its business and operations just as much as money spent on construction work or acquiring machinery? "In and about its business and operations." What does that mean? Does not that mean that acquiring property for the purposes of carrying on its business is money spent within the \$5,000,000. If they are to acquire the pulp areas and forest areas of the promoters around Grand Lake and the fee simple mining properties in the neighbourhood of the Humber, and if they are to get control of other interests that are there, how much of this five million dollars will be left? It will probably be entirely exhausted and the

agreement means that by a slight manipulation the value of concessions made by this agreement are attached to properties already held by the promoters. I would like to again point out that the Colony is getting no returns whatever for this, no rent, no tax, no bonus, nothing. Take the last clause referred to. Suppose the Company fails to make this outlay, or suppose this \$5,000,000 is included in the acquisition of properties from these parties, and there is no actual cash spent in construction and development work. The water powers would be theirs, and they could retain them even though privileges of this agreement should cease to attach. This is noticeable particularly in the words used in reference to Labrador and the words used in reference to Newfoundland. In the words used in the case of Labrador, if they fail to make the expenditure there within five years after they have acquired the title to the water powers, they then forfeit the powers themselves. The grants are void. But it is different in the case of Newfoundland. The grants are not void. They still retain the properties. Newfoundland gets no return. The question of labour has been referred to by the Prime Minister. There is no provision in reference to labour in this agreement. In former contracts it was usual to have a provision regarding labour. But there is no provision in this. Of course the Company is going to get its labour as cheap as it can get it and going to get what labour it can in the cheapest market it can get it, whether it be Chinese labour or other labour of that kind. There is no provision as to the rate of wages or as to the amount to be paid, and supposing it constructs its works and gets in outside labour, the money that is spent on the labour will not necessarily benefit Newfoundland. These laborers will come in here and

while they are working they will send their money to their families in foreign countries and afterwards return home and help to spend it, and the Newfoundland labour market will be unaffected if labour is provided at such a rate as not to pay a Newfoundlander to leave the fisheries and go to work in competition with foreign labour for the corporation, and then Newfoundland gets no benefit from the work. There is another feature which ought to be borne in mind by the Committee in connection with these resolutions. Under this agreement, if this Company ever establishes itself, it is not to be subject for taxation as other corporations and other individuals are. The power to tax it for the ordinary purposes of the Public Services of the Colony will be limited. It is controlled by this contract. This will throw more and more upon the people themselves the burden of taxation which this Company, if it does business, should share with them. Again, it should be borne in mind that if this Company does establish itself, the effect of cutting off as it were the works and properties and debentures from taxation means that you are curtailing a means which should be legitimately opened to you to raise a revenue in the interests of the people. This Company under the provisions of its contract is hedged around with provisions protecting it against taxation forever—not for five years, or ten years, or fifteen years, but for ninety-nine years renewable forever. As I said in the beginning, we ought to approach this contract in the interests of the people of Newfoundland. It is our duty here to see that the rights of Newfoundland and the interests of the Colony are protected. I believe it is desirable to hold out every legitimate encouragement to people desirous of investing their money in this country, but we should learn to value the assets we have to deal with

and see that we get full returns for concessions. We ought to hesitate and think seriously before we put this contract on the Statute Book as it exists at the present time. We ought to remember the immense interests which the promoters have in the Colony at the present time. We ought to remember that the Company may be too powerful, with safety to the public interests, and that we ought here to exercise our duty of protecting the interests of the Colony in every direction. Members of the Committee should consider the agreement as a whole and consider what in reality the Company is contracting to do. There is no obligation within the four corners of this contract or the resolutions calling upon the Company to establish any kind of a business. I would ask them not to be carried away by figures; not to be carried away by the hugeness of the figures named here by the Prime Minister the other day, but to try and get down to the kernel of the matter and analyze the mutual undertakings in the agreement, and they will find we are giving everything away and getting nothing back in return. We are losing control over the most valuable assets the country possesses to-day which have not already been parted with by the country to other corporations. The various sections will, of course, receive more minute consideration as we go through in Committee, and I shall then take the opportunity to point out to members of the Committee many discrepancies and irregularities and defects which the agreement shows in its various clauses.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, This matter now before us is one fraught with such tremendous possibilities that one approaches the discussion of it with a feeling of despair as to one's ability adequately to set it before the House. We have to deal with resolu-

tions confirming an agreement already made and it is not possible for this committee to alter the agreement without the consent of the Company to that alteration. It is not possible for you to cross a "t" or dot an "i" within the schedule of these resolutions. But you can and I trust you will have a say with reference to the alteration of the resolutions themselves before you finally confirm the agreement. It is unfortunate, and I think the misfortune will appear to hon. members of this House that the agreement and resolutions have been framed by the counsel for the Company and have not been adequately criticized by an equally competent man for the Government. The counsel for the Company is a director of the Reid Newfoundland Company, and nominally one of the shareholders of the Newfoundland Products Company Ltd. It has been admitted here that these resolutions which are now before us were drafted by him, and I have no hesitation in saying that there is no man on the Government side able to criticize his work; and I venture to say, I am as certain as I can be, that if the Government had a counsel to look into this case with the ability, the acumen and the interests of the gentleman who framed this bill, we should not have such resolutions before us at this present time. I am so certain of this that I venture to declare that the Government will say that this is not the agreement that they intended to support, and consequently the resolutions will not in my opinion receive the support of this House, that these resolutions mean something more, something that would be terrible for the future of this Colony, something that no Government in its sane senses would bring down for legislation. I will venture to say that the Government does not realize what construc-

tion can be put up on them. If these go through, it will be in a very different form from that in which they now stand.

The Premier adopted an unjustifiable tone when introducing this agreement. He exaggerated the good results which might follow its adoption; he kept out of sight all possible evil effects. He adopted and gave circulation to the figures supplied by the promoters, and had made no inquiry as to their correctness. It was the company promoter we heard through the Premier's mouth, not a responsible statesman. In the agreement, it is said, for instance that those persons who now have rights on the Humber have assigned them to this Company, and it is on this basis this committee is asked to confirm the agreement, but the Premier has told us, when questioned closely, that no such assignments have been seen by the Government, and I am now in a position to say that the statement is false. No assignment has been made by anybody or agreed to be made unless it be the Reid Nfld. Co. Then, again, I have this fault to find with the Premier's speech that you may search it from end to end and find no adequate warning to the people of this country as to what they are called upon to surrender. The Premier never told them that they were called upon to surrender the right of taxing capital, debentures and mortgages of this Company, as the debentures and capital of every other Company doing business in this Colony are taxed. I think you will look in vain to find any statement whatever in his speech that they were free from municipal taxation. There was no attempt whatever to point out that this was a freedom from municipal taxation not only with regard to the main object of the resolutions and the agreement affecting the Humber pro-

perty, but that this freedom of municipal taxation and taxation upon capital, debentures and stock applied to every one of the operations of the Company which they carried on in this country or on Labrador as contemplated in this agreement or which can possibly be carried on by this Company, whether referred to in this agreement or not. As Mr. Kent has very well pointed out that this is an agreement with a Company whose charter is not the subject of an Act of Parliament defining what it may do, but that we are conferring these powers upon a company incorporated under the General Companies Act, which may have the widest possible objects and may carry on any form of business whatever, and, if it is not already covered by Memorandum and Articles of Association, it can get them changed in the ordinary way, and that the Company may, under the General Companies Act, carry on any kind of a business, from the making of a pair of shoes to engaging in the fisheries of the Colony.

Properly construed, these two sections relating to taxation mean this, that the Newfoundland Products Corporation may carry on any business of any kind in Newfoundland free forever from all forms of taxation which is imposed upon everybody else in this country carrying on similar business. That is handing over the country and its business men and its future interests, bound hand and foot, to the Newfoundland Products Corporation.

That is one reason why I say that if the Government had put this matter before competent counsel, those resolutions would have been qualified—If, indeed the Government wishes them to be qualified—by words restricting these privileges to some definite property, either on the Humber,

or on Labrador, or wherever it might be, and to some definite time, say ten or twenty years.

As Mr. Kent has pointed out, if you had a charter before you, and if you had the powers of the Company entered on that charter, so that they could not be altered—if you had something definite in that respect—then you would have these resolutions of freedom from municipal taxation and from taxation in all forms upon the property applying to a definite class of work; but as it is at the present time, it applies to all kinds of work for ever, and practically hands over a very large section of the country to one corporation free from all the obligations which other people have, and forces upon this country this position, that the country will develop its public service around the property of the company, as years go on, while the property of the company contributes nothing to the taxation which pays for the development.

Take, as my learned friend has said, the case of works at the Humbermouth. They will involve large expenditures by the country in the making of roads and all the other municipal services. If a city grows up down there, composed of the operators in these works, and the many other lines that will grow up in consequence the people who are there will have to keep up that city; they will have to pay municipal taxation; while this Company is to be entirely free from that form of taxation for ever.

Now, then, am I right or wrong in supposing that the Government do not want this and that the supporters of the Government will not assent to it, and that before the resolutions go through they will be so altered as to specifically point out the particular works of this Company which are to be free from taxation and limit the

time within which that freedom shall last?

Now, by way of showing that the Premier does not understand this agreement (and if he does not, it follows that his Government does not understand it) I mean to read some extracts from his speech in reference to the money which is to be spent. I assume that this misleading statement was not deliberately misleading. I do the Premier the justice to suppose that he would not in this House attempt to mislead, and therefore that he stated what he construed to be the true meaning of the words. The Premier says:—"The Company undertakes, in addition to an expenditure of \$5,000,000 at Bay of Islands, to expend an additional sum of \$5,000,000 in Newfoundland within ten years, and the further sum of \$10,000,000 within five years in developing its Labrador plant." That is all wrong and misleading. The Company does not undertake to expend a dollar at Bay of Islands specifically. As to the amount the Premier refers to in this way, the Company merely undertakes to expend it within the Island of Newfoundland, (Sec. 18). It is not even confined to the kind of work which it is said Bay of Islands is to have, but is to be spent "in and about the business and operations of the Company" in the Island. As to the additional sum of \$5,000,000, its expenditure is not confined to the Island, but may be made in Labrador. (Sec. 2).

The Premier says: "In the event of failure to so spend, (referring to the whole twenty millions,) the grant of water power on the Labrador shall be void."

Wrong again. The provision is "the Company shall spend the farther sum of ten millions, and if the Company do not expend the said sum, the grant shall be void."

Now, Sir, I say that I assume from statements of that sort that the Premier has not read the contract carefully; has not considered it with the aid of able counsel to point out to him what it may mean; but he has taken it upon its face, casually as it were, and has relied too much upon other people. Now, there is another matter which has been mentioned by Mr. Kent, but which is worth dwelling upon for a moment, Mr. Wilson has been exploited in this House. We have been told of his great weight, of his great experience—and much has been made of that. Now, we search the Memorandum and Articles of Incorporation in vain for any mention of Mr. Wilson. He is not a shareholder of the Company at the present time. There is no agreement on file to show that he has any connection with the matter. There is absolutely nothing that we can find from one end to the other of the agreement or the articles to show that Mr. Wilson has, or intends to have, a dollar's worth of interest in this connection. It is a Company at present with no shareholders except the three or four for qualifying purposes, and they are all Directors of the Reid-Nfld. Co. It has no capital. I asked if any money had been invested—if any shares had been issued—and "no" was the answer of the Premier. We have at the present moment the Colony entering into a contract with a paper corporation, without shareholders, without money and without obligations. They are assuming no obligation to spend one cent, until they please, and we are giving them options, tying up water powers, giving them indirect powers they may exercise for some considerable time, without spending one copper in this island. Now, you may believe what you like, you may hope what you like, you may think in your own minds that Mr. Wilson is behind it and perhaps

in it, and that everything will go lovely; but surely, no matter what in your private minds you may be sure of, it is not too much to ask that the obligations be put between the four corners of your contract; that it be not one-sided; that you should not put the Colony into such a position that by and by it may be laughed at by somebody who has not a dollar at stake in this matter. Those who are making this contract are getting a large number of immensely valuable franchises; they are getting a large number of franchises that will be tremendously troublesome to the Colony by and by; they can sell all that they are getting by this agreement for any price they can get, because there is nothing to prevent the shareholders of this corporation selling out at any time, nor the corporation itself selling out or handing over its powers to men whose names we don't know and whose reputations we don't regard in the same light as we do that of Mr. Wilson: there is not a single word in the four corners of the agreement, or the resolutions to prevent that being done.

Now, surely, gentlemen who are charged with the responsibility of this—surely, it is not too much to ask that while you are conferring so much, you should conserve the country's rights by proper safeguards. These men don't trust you, they don't trust the Colony. They ask you to enact everything that you are going to give them; and surely you should also enact something that they should give the Colony.

Agreements of this sort are not entered into with paper companies usually. The companies are organized, the capital is put up, the Directors are named, and the government of the country knows whom it is dealing with; but in the present case the Government of this Country have no

thing of that kind before them, or at least it has not been put before us in Committee.

This agreement gives to this paper corporation the control of all the valuable water powers in the Colony; and when I say all the valuable water powers of the Country, I admit that there are other rivers, but their powers certainly do not come in the same category as the Gander, the Exploits and the Humber.

We have perhaps in the Northwest and Hamilton Rivers one of the greatest water powers in British North America, and perhaps the only free water power at present on the continent; and you are proposing to hand that over without a dollar compensation, without a single attempt to assess its value; without advertising it through the world and asking for bids upon it, without attempting to turn this great asset into money for the discharge of the public debt of the Colony.

At the present time water powers are growing immensely more valuable day by day. We see in the Province of Ontario that the Government are refusing to grant a single water power, and they are acquiring back powers which were granted before, because it is felt that these powers ought to be free, or ought to be under government control, and made as free as possible; and yet we are here lightly handing over the one great water power controlled by Newfoundland without the slightest enquiry being made by our authorities as to what can be done with it, as to what is its value, as to what disposal can be made of it.

We propose to hand over in fee simple, as a clear gift, for nothing at all, an asset that in the course of the next five years, or ten years, or twenty years, at the rate at which the value of water powers are increasing

today, might be worth a sum which would pay off the public debt of this Colony.

I say here now that in the course of the next ten years, in view of the advances that are taking place in electricity, in view of the new discoveries that are being made, that water power might be sold for a sufficient sum to pay off the public debt of this Colony.

The gentlemen opposite who laugh at a prediction of this kind will at least admit that the Government of today have taken no steps whatever to find out from scientific men, from men of adequate knowledge, as to what the possibilities are within the next few years. The possibility is there, and if it is, then you have no right whatever to take this great asset away from this Country, and throw it to a paper corporation like a bone to a hungry dog.

And we are passing over something more. We are giving powers with reference to the East Coast section which extend from Hall's Bay upon the one side to the East side of Gander on the other, and right up to the head waters of the Gander and Exploits.

We are passing over a section of the country that, I am told, has the greatest mineral possibilities of any part of the country. We are passing over the area which contains the copper and the phosphate—a section of the country that must have great possibilities. We are, I have been told, granting no land there.

But I wish to point out this (and I shall go into it more fully in a moment): That we are giving the Company powers which they may exercise in connection with any water power they take over which will practically make them lords and masters of that whole section.

I believe then that is a matter

which the Government and the supporters of the Government have not adequately grasped, because we have been very easily told that that was not the case—so mixed-up is this agreement, so cleverly or so stupidly (whichever it may be) has the true meaning of this agreement been hidden in the words which are used.

Anybody who will take this agreement and carefully look through it—the resolutions are a mere reflection of the agreement—will conclude that it is either the most stupidly-worded, mixed-up document that was ever brought before a Legislature or that it is the most clever and deceptive one that was ever formulated; because there are things there that, if meant, show tremendous cleverness, and if not meant, show tremendous stupidity; and I am bound to assume, from what I know of that document, that it is cleverness, and not stupidity, which is at the bottom of it. But either are equally dangerous. Whether it is great cleverness or great stupidity, they must be followed by similar consequences in any document passing through this House. Now, let me, for a moment, draw attention to this document, and let me begin by pointing out that it deals with three main subjects. It is three contracts rolled into one, and not three separate contracts. Now, I agree with Mr. Kent that for the sake of clearness, for the sake of letting the public know what we are giving, the greatest care should have been taken, and therefore I say that this contract ought not to cover in one agreement, three subjects having no necessary relation to each other. Why did not the Government come down here with a contract dealing with what may be called the Humber question, so that we could have seen the conditions that applied to that, so that we could have criticised those conditions and put proper re-

strictions upon them? Another contract, if they wanted to, with respect to the Hamilton River? And a third one with reference to that most difficult and interesting subject, the rights of this Company in the Gander and Exploits region? Why did we not have three contracts before us, each of them carefully expressing what were the rights of this Company with reference to each other? As I have said, Sir, it could not have been looser, and it must have been deliberate intention to so mix up this matter that ordinary men, and some extraordinary men, could not quite determine what it meant. If what I have suggested had been done, we would know what was meant in the way of expenditure, for instance. When the Premier told us in his address here that the Company were to spend \$5,000,000 at Bay of Islands, I presume he referred to section 18. Under section 18 I find that the Company undertakes to begin actual construction work upon its undertaking within two years, and to expend the sum of \$5,000,000 in the Island of Newfoundland in and about the business and operations of the Company within five years, and if the Company fails to begin such work or expend such money within the times mentioned, this agreement shall be void. Now, if that were in a contract dealing with Humbermouth and with the Humber River, then we would have some idea of what was to be spent in that region, but it does not apply to that work any more than to any other work, because it says that it shall be spent in and about the business and operations of the Company in the Island of Newfoundland. If it were intended that this amount should be spent at Bay of Islands, why is it not so expressed, and why does it not say "in and about the construction of its works at Humbermouth and in the drainage area of the Humber?" And

then I turn to section 1 and what do I find? I find this: That it is agreed that if at any time during the currency of this agreement and within a period of twenty-one years from the date hereof the Company shall validly acquire or become legally and properly entitled to any water power or water powers in this Colony or its Dependencies within a distance of forty miles of the Company's factories or power houses at the mouth of the Humber River, or within the drainage area on the East Coast of Newfoundland comprised within certain limits such water power or water powers shall be taken to be held under this agreement (except clause 10 hereof) in respect of the rights and privileges granted to the Company, shall apply to all works and business, and the materials for the construction and operation of the same, which may be constructed and carried on in connection with such last named water powers for the purpose of the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia and other fertilizers, carbide of calcium, cement and their by-products." Now, that means all the operations of the Company on the East Coast. And then section 18 says that they shall spend \$5,000,000 on their works and operations within the Island of Newfoundland. That does not bind them to the expenditure of that money at the Humbermouth. Now, there is another thing which may not have been intended, but which, I submit, is clearly meant by the agreement. And this shows the difficulty that arises from this attempt to cover two or three great main subjects in one document. I will just read section 1: "The Government hereby demises for a term of ninety-nine years from the date of this agreement to the Company (so far as the Government can consistently with any grants, leases or licenses heretofore made and actually

subsisting demise the same) the water power or powers in and upon the Humber River and in and upon Junction Brook and for the purpose of its works and operations the Company shall have the right to divert, stop or dam up any stream, lake or water course, within the drainage area of the Humber River, and to make, construct or maintain any dam, water course, culverts, drains and reservoirs in said area for any of its said works or operations." Now that is clear—positive. It applies to the Humber River. But the same section goes on to say: "And it is agreed that if at any time during the currency of this agreement and within a period of 21 years from the date hereof the Company shall validly acquire or become legally and properly entitled to any water power or water powers in this Colony or its Dependencies within a distance of 40 miles of the Company's factories or power houses at the mouth of the Humber River or within the drainage area on the East Coast of Newfoundland; such water power or water powers shall be taken to be held under this agreement, and the provisions of this agreement (except clause 10 hereof) in respect of the rights and privileges granted to the Company, shall apply to all works and business, and the materials for the construction and operation of the same, which may be constructed and carried on in connection with such last named water powers." Now, is that power which is expressly given to "divert, stop or dam up any stream, lake, etc., in the Humber area," intended to be given also in relation to the East Coast area? I think it is impliedly given. Is it intended to cover the two, or only one? Is it intended to cover—I take it that it is—the forty mile section in grants of other people, which they find around the Humber River? Why are not these matters made plain? We shall

probably, when this matter is in Committee by and by, have members upon one side or the other disputing as to the exact meaning of this clause, one saying that it means this, and another saying that it means that, and these disputes will be sufficient justification for the argument which I am making now. Then, again, Sir, when we come to No. 2, which deals entirely with the Hamilton River, we find that instead of getting a lease the Company is getting a grant and becoming the owners of it in fee simple, provided they do what is stated at the end of this clause, and then, after that, they are to have, apparently, during the term of this agreement and while it is not forfeited, very many of the rights and privileges which are given in this agreement. In the first place, this gives them the right to the water powers on Hamilton River; it gives them the right to take a water power on the Northwest River, if they elect to do so; and then the Government undertakes that during a period of five years it will not grant any water power on either of these rivers to any person whatsoever. They find themselves with an absolute right to these rivers, in exchange for which they don't give a ten cent piece. Now, take that alone. Why should you hand over to any corporation a great water power such as there is down there, and tie up the development of those rivers for at least five years? Why should you do this without consideration of any kind, not even the price of a postage stamp? You find a provision that the Company shall expend in the development of the said water power the further sum of ten million dollars, and if they do not spend that within five years, then the grant of the said water power on the Labrador shall be void. That money is not necessarily to be spent in construction of any works. It may be spent in the making of a water power there. None of the money

expended comes to the Colony itself in compensation. None of the expenditure may ever come to anybody in Newfoundland. There are not many of our people living there, or who desire to live there. If they put works there out of this, ten million dollars, a very large proportion of this money will be spent on these works and on the machinery, and not one dollar of the amount which is spent may ever come to anybody in Newfoundland even for labour, because they are much more likely to get foreign labour and bring it down there, and no advantage can come to us except from the amount of the Customs duties which may be collected from time to time on the articles which may be brought in by the people down there. All the goods that go to Labrador are to be free from duty, and all the construction material and machinery of the Company are also to be entirely free from duty, and therefore the Colony itself will be getting nothing whatever back in the form of Customs duties on the small amount that the labourers expend. And you are passing over, in such consideration, one of the greatest water powers, as I have pointed out, on the continent, and the greatest that Newfoundland has any control over whatever. You are tying up for a period of five years before you can say that the Company have defaulted.

I have before me a return showing the amount of timber lands held on the drainage area of the East Coast Reservation. I find that 2,837,920 acres of land are covered by timber rights of persons and companies other than the Reid Newfoundland Company on that area.

Now, then, look at section 1 and notice there again that within that area all the rights and privileges of this agreement shall apply except section 10, which is the section which deals with expropriating private

property. If this Company obtains any water powers within that section—if they shall validly acquire or become legally and properly entitled to any water power or water powers within the section of the East Coast named in the agreement—then what may they do? Then such water power or powers shall be taken to be held under this agreement, and the provisions of this agreement shall apply to all the work and business of the Company. Now, what are some of the provisions that would apply. Here is one of them. If they obtain any water power on the Gander or Exploits, they may in the course of their work and operations divert, stop or dam up any stream, lake or water course within the drainage area, and make, construct or maintain any dam, water course, culverts, drains and reservoirs in the said area for any of the said works or operations.

Now, that is one of the terms or provisions of this agreement. Is it that the agreement does not clearly express what it means? Will anybody on the other side say that that does not apply? Certainly, if they do say it does not apply, care should be taken in the resolutions by and by to see that it is clearly stated that it does not apply. If there is no doubt about it and if it does apply, what is going to happen, what must inevitably happen to the owners of three million acres of timber lands? Why, it means that this soulless corporation can destroy and drive out all the other operators and all the other owners of water powers or timber lands within that whole great section because it can so injure them, make it so difficult for them, that they will be glad to sell for any price, or for no price. It will be a case of scuttle out with what you can get, because your lord and master, the Products

Corporation, has got this power over you.

What are we told in section 20: "Notwithstanding the grant of the water powers herein all persons shall have the right to the temporary use of the said waters for the purpose of passing to and fro in small boats, and for the purpose of floating logs and lumber belonging to such persons to their mills, provided that such use shall not interfere with or prejudice the business or operations of the Company."

That is to say, the owners of three million acres of timber lands upon that area hold as subordinates to this Company the minute they obtain one single water power in this whole area. I may be told that this is not the intention. My reply to that is that I am seriously putting that construction upon it; and I am not making that construction; I have consulted various independent lawyers outside this House, who are not in politics, and they put exactly the same construction upon this as I do. And if there is a chance of differences of opinion, then before these resolutions go through it should be provided that everybody shall not be placed within the devouring maw of this monster which you are creating. A company without a share, a company without a dollar, a company getting valuable concessions for nothing, a company to which you are giving away the greatest water power that this Colony has, a company with powers which were never given over such a wide area to any other company in man's lifetime.

I find that in the Humber area there are 1,413,000 acres of land held by other people or companies. It cannot be denied by anybody whatever that this agreement confers upon this paper company the right over that area to dam and divert and stop and

Invoice

exercise all the powers over every part of the Humber area. Now, if the holders of this land were here to say that they assented to that, that it had been agreed upon, then there would be some justification, but while a man who holds a single acre of land over these objects, what right have you to take away from him all the great natural, common powers which he has over the streams and lakes? What right have you to hand them all over to this company and say: Squeeze the life out of him and make him give up his rights whether he wishes to or not. I find with regard to the Hamilton River and Inlet there are nearly 5,680,000 acres of land held down there by different parties. Some of these men, of course, may have agreed to sell their interests, some of them may not have agreed, and very probably have not. Now, what right has this House to proceed with this agreement regarding the Hamilton River one step further than we have got at the present time until we have given every one of these owners the right to say what he thinks about this infringement of his rights.

Because I want to point this out, that while in section 2 you assume to give these people only a power on what is called The Muskrat Falls on the Hamilton River, you are at the same time giving to them rights to dam the streams and conserve the energies not merely in this vicinity but in other parts, of such a general character that in the exercise of them they can tie up the Grand Falls or any other power on those rivers, and make every other power on those subsidiary to themselves. And in this connection I may draw attention to a question which I asked in this House, and to which I have got a partial answer, for correspondence showing whether Hon. J. A. Robinson

for himself, or his brother Mr. Edward C. Robinson, or Hon. Mr. Job for himself had obtained from Newfoundland Products Corporation a contract giving them the right to a certain portion of power. This Act provides that 50,000 horse power of that which is developed upon the Hamilton River shall be furnished to the public; but if I am rightly informed, before this goes through the House, before the Products Corporation get the slightest powers, two gentlemen have secured an agreement that 30,000 horse power out of that 50,000 shall be theirs and not the public's. Now, the idea is being held out that there must be 50,000 horse power developed there that may be taken from time to time by industries upon that river, and that the public must get it, and yet, if the statement which I have made is correct (and I wish to say here now that I have not got it upon such authority as I would like to have it, and I am asking questions about it), 30,000 out of that 50,000 has already come under the control of two members of the Legislative Council, two supporters of the Government, who will be asked to vote upon this matter by and by in the Upper Chamber. Now, it is the duty of the Government to find out if that be true. The Premier told me this afternoon that they had no correspondence about it and had nothing to do with it. I gathered from the tenor of his remarks that nothing was known about it by the Government. I have asked him to enquire and find out whether the Products Corporation have entered into such an agreement as that, and he has promised to do so.

Now, I want for a moment to refer again to the concession giving this Company freedom from local taxation. Mr. Chairman, we have no right, in this Legislature, to bind posterity as

to the exercise of the proper functions of Government. We might come into this House properly and say: Here is an industry which is to be established; it is going to take five years or so to put up its buildings and start its work; it might take five years longer for it to get properly into business; and during the time that it is being established and initiating its business we will give it freedom from local taxation. That is not an unknown thing in other countries. We might, I think, fairly go forward into the next ten years and provide something of that kind, but what right have we to bind the Government and the Legislature of this Colony for ever and ever to freedom from local taxation for this Company with reference, not to any particular work or any particular factory, but with reference to all their industries, all their factories, works and all the property which they may hereafter own? What right have we got—what constitutional right have we got—to do that? Why should we confer rights upon them which Legislatures in the not distant future may have to buy out at the expense of millions of dollars? Supposing we do what we ought to have done long ago, and what we were talking about a few days ago in this House—incorporate the whole country into towns and villages and county councils, and hand over to the people of the country the power of local taxation. Have we the right to prevent ourselves from doing that fully and freely? I pointed out here the other day that if you want to save this country,—as some of you profess to do,—from Confederation with Canada, with your customs duties so high as they are now, with your expenditure so great that at the present time the Minister of Finance is to tell us that he is going to borrow money to pay for a deficit on current account, that you must look for-

ward in the near future to a devolution of the right of self-government to incorporated councils, you must look forward to the time when the cost of the work undertaken on roads and services of that kind will be raised by local taxation; and with that prospect before you, staring you in the face—a prospect which you are being invited to put into law, which you ought to put into law—because the future of this country, the economic salvation of this country demands that you hand over local self-government to the people—what right have you got to say that this corporation shall for ever and ever be free from municipal taxation, no matter how much of the community it occupies; that the roads shall be kept up, that the lights shall be kept up, that street railways and all the various public services of the kind shall be kept up, and that the laborer, the small men, the independent householders, shall pay the whole cost, while this great corporation is for ever to go scot free? This is a Company incorporated with twenty-one millions of dollars, whose promoters say that they expect that within a few years it will manufacture more than any other concern of its kind in the world. We were told some time ago that a similar corporation in the United States had watered its stock over and over again, and on that watered stock was paying 10 per cent dividends, and this concern is expected to be more valuable than anything either in Canada or the United States.

What right have you to give a company of that sort, which according to the promises of its promoter will be paying millions upon millions, I say what right have you to give that company freedom from local taxation? What right have you to take from the people of the country the power of taxation? What right have you to de-

prive future Legislatures of the constitutional power to tax? They will have the power to tax, if you like, by paying this company to give up its rights. Some day or other the Legislature which desires to tax these people will have to go to them and pay them millions of dollars to relieve them from this provision which you so carelessly ask us to put in here today. Now, gentlemen, I appeal to you as Newfoundlanders, born in this country, if you like, and professing because of that to have more patriotism than I have, I beg of you not to mortgage your country to any corporation in this manner.

Why should you do it? Why should you permit this great Company, with the twenty million dollar outfit which they are going to have, and their stock, their debenture stock, their mortgages and other securities, freedom from taxation of all kinds for ever and ever, amen. I say, Sir, why should the stock and the dividends and the capital of this Company be free forever, when every other company and man doing business in this country, has to pay taxation? I am not speaking now of municipal taxation, but of any taxation. Why, it was only a day or two ago that this House was taxing that very class of security with reference to dead men's estates. At the last session of the Legislature (when I was not here) you passed an Act, and amended it this session, providing that securities of this kind should pay taxation. And now you come in here and provide with reference to this great twenty-one million dollar corporation, which by and by, if it starts on the Hamilton Inlet, may be a forty-million dollar corporation, and may be if it goes on, eventually a sixty or sixty-five million dollar corporation, that they, forsooth, shall be free from taxation forever upon all their debentures and all their capital, while

everybody else who carries on business in this country must pay. Now, if that were confined to any particular business, in which they had no competition, one could understand a provision of that kind, but when you understand that this Company may carry on any kind of business they like and compete with everybody carrying on business in this country and that they are to be free from taxation—do you really mean to give these people this concession? I cannot believe it, I won't believe it. I believe that you who are supporters of the Government, and I believe that the Government themselves, have not understood the true position, and that it was in your mind that the work at Bay of Islands alone was meant. I believe that you did not see the broad sweep and scope of this. And that is why I say that in negotiating this matter you should have had able counsel to advise you because once an Act of this sort is passed it is too late to amend it, and for every change you make in it you must be prepared to pay the solid dollars of the people of the country.

Now, let us look for a moment into section 8. One has only to look at this agreement to note that the imaginations of the promoters of this corporation ran riot, and that they had no doubt whatever of their capacity to get anything they asked for—and it seems to be a question whether they were right. Take, for instance, this provision:—"All construction materials and machinery for the Company's mills, factories and works for the purposes mentioned in Clause 1 hereof, both for the original installation and further extension of same, but not in substitution for old, shall be admitted duty free into the Colony." Now I think anybody who thought about it at all would have said, we will place a limitation of some kind upon that;

Memo

we wont bind future Legislatures for ever; we will give these men the right for five years or ten years, or sometime or other, to bring in their machinery, but we will limit the time. And when I turn to the Act dealing with the Anglo-Nfld. Development Company, section 4, from which this very paragraph is taken to some extent, I find that their right is limited to a period of twenty years. The Anglo-Nfld. Development Company Act says:—"4. All construction material and machinery for pulp and paper mills within or in connection with the same, or for the purpose of manufacturing the products of the same both for the original installation and the further extension of the same, but not in substitution for old, shall for a period of twenty years from the date of this agreement, the schedule to this Act, be admitted into this Colony free of duty." Now, that section is copied into this agreement word for word, except the limitation of twenty years, and therefore we have departed in this from the only precedent which we had in this country I say their imagination must have run riot. I can imagine the promoters' solicitors writing that, and I can imagine their coming up and presenting it to the Government with a covert smile; but that they could have got a body of Ministers, men claiming to be representatives of the country, to approve of that would have passed my imagination if I had not seen it. I can only conclude that the gentlemen opposite have not looked into it closely, and that they will not support it; and I hope that my conclusion will be justified.

Now, to show the looseness with which this contract has been drawn, I want to repeat a point made by Mr. Kent, that while it is provided concerning the Hamilton River that a failure to spend the \$10,000,000 within five years will result in the grant becoming void, the lease—demise is the

word used—provided for in section 1 with reference to the Humber does not necessarily become void on any default by the Company; only that if they fail to spend the \$5,000,000 provided for in Section 18 within five years, this agreement shall be void. The agreement and the demise are two things. Now, I say here that Section 1 of this Act creates a demise of the water powers on the Humber River not held by other persons the moment the Act becomes law, and that that demise is an assignable one; that the Company may sell it to another Company; and that the failure to expend the \$5,000,000 would not vacate the lease. That is to say, they may acquire this demise upon the Humber River; they may dispose of it to the Reid Nfld. Co. or anybody else who may desire to acquire it from them; they may fail to expend the \$5,000,000 which is provided for under Section 18; and all that results is that the agreement becomes void and not the demise. The agreement becomes void with reference to municipal taxation and other forms of taxation, the right to bring in goods without paying Customs duties and all that sort of thing. But the point I wish to make is that the expenditure of the \$5,000,000 is not a condition attaching to the demise and which travels with the property under the demise. The demise does not become void because the agreement becomes void. The other may have been the intention; I am bound to assume that it was the intention, because I cannot conceive of men intending anything else, but, if so, it is another proof, of which there are many, that the preparation of this ought to have been carefully scrutinized by lawyers acting on behalf of the Government, men of high repute about whose opinion on the matter there could have been no doubt.

There is only a little more that I wish to speak about at this stage. The

Premier referred to the possibility of these works in giving labor to the people, and to the great benefit which would be derived by the people and by the revenue of the country as a result of that labour; and he gave, at my request, at a later time, some data which he had obtained from the promoters as to the amount of labour which would be given. It is, unfortunately impossible to contradict the data, but any sane man will hesitate to accept it. It is advanced by a promoter—that ought to be enough. It is advanced for the purpose of attracting public opinion in favour of this deal—that ought to create suspicion. It ought not to be accepted by anybody in this House without being submitted to some authority; perhaps the Government Engineer would be the best authority whom we have here for the purpose of finding out whether it is accurate or not, or approximately accurate. It ought not to have been given here, as it did not come from an authoritative source, but from one interested to a dangerous extent, but let us take it as it is. The Premier, in his statement here, referred to the possibility of five thousand families of our labourers obtaining assistance from this work, and he went on to argue that the earnings of these labourers expended in imported goods would add a very considerable sum to the present Custom duties of the country. Well, if we got five thousand men who are neither earning, working nor spending in the country, that might be true; but if you take 5,000 men and put them at work here, surely you must take them from some other employment. Surely, what they spend now will be lost and only replaced by what they spend then. Will we not only get Customs duties on the excess of their earnings—the difference between what they

earn now and what they will earn then? And if we have to import them into this country, if they are foreign laborers, as very many of them will probably be, then, as Mr. Kent has pointed out, their whole expenditure in this country is likely to be very small, unless they move their families after them, which foreign labourers are not in the habit of doing; the most of their earnings will go out of the country and will not contribute to our revenue. And then we must remember that the service in the country in connection with these great works will mean additional calls upon our expenditure. When these works are established anywhere, we shall have to follow them with all modern improvements, and our expenditure will probably be increased as much as our revenue is increased. And then let us ask ourselves, after all what is it we are striving after in this matter in the way of labour? We are trying to take our people out of the fisheries of the country, in which they are specialists, in which they hold a monopoly, in which, I contend, they can earn as good a living as they can in any part of the world with equal effort. We are, I say taking them out of the work to which they are specialists, and putting them into competition in the ordinary labor of the world with men who know as much about that labor as they do. We are taking a qualified Newfoundland fisherman and tempting him to enter into an industry in which he is no more qualified than a Hungarian, or a Pole, or a Silesian, who may go to work there. We are subjecting him to a competition with all the labour of the world and taking him out of an avocation in which he has no competitors whatever, because he is lord and master of the fisheries—the great industry of this country, if we only spent the

money and devoted the time and the brains in trying to develop the fisheries that we give in trying to coax industries to come here to this country, the results would be far greater as far as the advancement of the people of the country is concerned. I say that it is not necessarily a great thing for this country that men should be taken out of the fisheries and put into industries of this kind. A few of them may become specialists, a few of them may work up into the higher branches and may get a better wage than they could ever hope to earn at the fisheries, but they will be very few. The most of that five thousand which have been talked about will necessarily be common laborers, the handlers of coal and coke, the class of labour that is being performed in Sydney to-day at the steel works; and I say that we are not conferring a gift upon the labourers of this country when we take them out of the fisheries and put them into work of this kind. They would do far better at their natural avocation. Then again, you have not said here that there will be a fixed rate of wage, as you said in the railway contract. Why not do that? You have not said that foreign labour shall not be imported while labour can be obtained in the country. You are enabling them to bring all their labour from across the water to work in the Bay of Islands, and yet you are handing over to them all or most of the franchises of this country that are left. You are giving this great paper company all sorts of improper advantages; you are mortgaging the future; you are taking away the right of self government from our municipalities; you are taking away the constitutional right of this Legislature to tax; and you are creating a great industry, if you like, a great company in any case,

which will be a great competitor of the other business people, who will be unfairly taxed, not only to maintain the ordinary services of the country, but to maintain the services which this industry will create.

Mr. Kent has already pointed out as an evidence—and there are thousands of them—of the looseness of this contract, that there are no restrictions whatever. The Company undertakes to begin actual construction. The driving of a single nail will be a beginning, and having begun, there is no provision whatever that they shall continue, except the provision that within five years they shall expend \$5,000,000. Having begun, they meet the first condition, and then they can stop, and they can wait, and hold until the last day of the last year without going any further. There is no provision that they shall go on working; there is no provision that they shall expend so much per year; there is no attempt whatever to safeguard. It is impossible to conceive men with the worst possible intentions, drafting an agreement that is looser, that is less guaranteed by safeguards, than is this. There is not a safeguard worthy of the name from the beginning to the end of this agreement; and while I do not say for a moment—while I don't want to believe that the Government of the country ever had any intention whatever that a loose agreement of this kind should be foisted upon us, yet it illustrates again and again my statement that it must contain a good deal that the Government never thought of, and that the Government must have thought a good deal was in it which is not in it; because the agreement in its present form is the most infamous document that was ever placed before a Legislature. And, therefore, I say that I hesitate to accept it, I don't ac

cept it at the present time, I am prepared to accept the statement that its looseness is unintentional, but I am not prepared to accept the statement, or the argument, that looseness is not there, that the possibilities are not there. In its present form it is the most extraordinary contract that was ever placed before a Legislature in a civilized country. It has not only not got the safeguards which it ought to have, but it has not, as I pointed out, the ordinary safeguards which you find in the other contracts from which this to some extent was copied, and must, therefore, have been within the sight and within the comprehension of those who drew this. Take, for instance, the Reid contract with reference to their lands. I think (I am speaking now from memory) that the provision there is that the lands shall not be taxed until they are improved, but after they are improved they are taxable. This Company's rights are never to be taxable, so that even the Reid Company contracts form no precedent whatever for this. And then the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. Act, which I opposed in this House at the time it was passing, and for which, therefore, I am not responsible with regard to a single word of it, contains precautions limiting the time during which they are to be free from taxation, limiting their rights over others, and such like. On reference to that contract you will find that before it was passed the Legislature deliberately put in a provision in Section 6 protecting the prior rights of people who were on the same waters, while in this contract there is not the slightest provision of that kind; on the contrary, there is an extraordinary, an almost insulting provision that they shall have the right provided they don't interfere with their lords and masters. They may live, they may, if you please, pass

along, while this Company lords it over them and is superior to them in the exercise of the common, proper rights that were always enjoyed by the people of this country.

Now, I am satisfied that every consideration will be given to the objections which I have advanced. I have studiously avoided this afternoon putting them forward in a partizan way as against the Government of the country. I am, as I have said, prepared to accept—and I am sure the Opposition will be prepared to accept—evidence of good faith on the part of the Government, and of their readiness to accept resolutions of one kind and another which shall qualify and modify until this assumes proper proportions, and something is evolved which will not be a drawback to the future of the country.

At 6.30 the Chairman left the Chair until 8 p.m.

The Chairman resumed the Chair at 8 p.m.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman: I was just speaking to the Premier about the possibility of having this debate adjourned until Friday, so that more time may be given to the members to intelligently think over the resolutions. I have been speaking with several of the members about this question, and they are all willing and would prefer an adjournment. I know Dr. Lloyd would like to speak on the subject and is not in a position to do so to-night. I would ask that an adjournment be taken until Friday.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am not at all unwilling, and would be very glad to accommodate the hon. members. If they wish it, they might have farther time. It is the desire of the Government to have this question considered as completely as possible so that at the end of the debate the bill may be as near perfect as possible.

MR. MORINE.—Will you put it first

on the Order of the Day?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes; this will be put first on the Order of the Day for Friday. The Government has no desire whatever to rush this matter through.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on Friday.

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

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES.—

Mr. Chairman: Some little while ago, at the time of the opening of this House on the recommendation of the Commission appointed by the Government, a Sealing Bill was brought into this House for its consideration. After reading the Bill over, the House thought it wise to send it to a Select Committee. That Select Committee was composed of Mr. Coaker, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Young, Mr. Jennings, Rt. Hon. the Premier and your humble servant. We took the bill as it was formed when it came here first, and went through it section after section and made several alterations in it. After going through it carefully we arrived at a point where we thought and where we believed we had something to bring before this House, to lay it there for the criticism of the Assembly. In the first section here, there were several chan-

ges made from the first Bill. Several things have been taken out and added, and so all through the bill.

The history of the country shows us that the sealing industry is one we have to look after. Not only the fishery itself, but those who prosecute it. My own opinion, Sir, is that too much legislation might be the means of throwing a great hindrance in the way of its prosecution. Last year there was a bill brought into this House for the protection of crews engaged in the fishery. That bill was considered here, amended and sent to the Upper Chamber. Parts of the bill were struck out, and others did not pass, except with amendments. These I cannot say were alterations made in this House. I don't think they were.

We cannot always agree with one another on matters such as these. We have done everything we could for the betterment of our fishermen. As I have stated before, the accident last year put everybody thinking. This accident opened the eyes of the Government, and also of the Opposition. It has brought them together now at this session of the Legislature and has caused them to give of their best talent in framing this bill now under consideration. The Commission that was appointed by the Government to investigate into the loss of those poor fellows at the seal fishery, after taking the evidence of so many sealers, has set in their recommendations to the Government.

1.—It shall be unlawful to kill any seals or to remain upon the ice in charge of any seal pelts except between the hours from daylight to dark; and no person being a member of a crew of any steamer engaged at the seal fishery shall, without lawful excuse, be or remain upon the ice or away from his ship after one hour after dark or before daylight. Any person committing a breach of this

section shall be liable to a penalty of \$100, to be recovered in a summary manner by any person who shall sue for the same. This section shall not apply to the strapping and hoisting on board of seals, and in any prosecution under this section there shall be no conviction unless it is proven that a complaint was made to the Master, and the facts entered in the log of the steamer within six hours after the offence was committed.

As to Section 1, I may say that the Judges recommended "from sunrise to sunset"; but in the spring the evenings are long and consequently that wording was altered. The second half of this section has been altered considerably to what it was in the first place.

2.—The right of property in seal pelts arising from the killing of seals and taking the pelts thereof into possession, shall cease if the pelts be not taken on board the steamer by those by whom the seals were killed within 24 hours of the killing of said seals. Thereafter the pelts shall belong to the owners of the sealing steamers on which the said pelts are placed, or whose crew or some member thereof have actual possession of the pelts.

Now the argument may be raised against the words, "24 hours." What is fair for one crew or captain is fair for the other. The law is the law for everyone.

3.—No steamer carrying more than 150 men shall be cleared for the seal fishery unless the Collector of Customs is satisfied that she carries with such crew a competent medical practitioner.

We consider that where there are 150 men it is necessary to have some person with a knowledge of the ailments of mankind, to look after them

4.—No steamer shall be cleared for the seal fishery unless there is on

board a duly certificated Master or Mate in some capacity.

We do not say that no man can go to the seal fishery without a ticket of competency. But where there are so many men on board a ship it is necessary to have at least one man with a ticket of competency.

8.—Every steamer engaged in the seal fishery, whenever any of her crew is or are absent after dark or in fog, mist or falling or drifting snow, shall make with her steam whistle or other steam sound signal, at intervals of not more than five minutes, a prolonged blast, under penalty of \$400, to be recovered in a summary manner by any person who shall sue for the same. Each steamer shall be provided with fire rockets of a class to be approved by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and they shall be fired when any of her crew are absent from the ship after dark, either in fog, mist, or falling snow, under a penalty of \$400, to be recovered in a summary manner by any person who shall sue for the same.

It may be remembered in the examination of last year, that the whistle of a steamship is not always kept blowing. We know that it was not done intentionally. But the consequence was that the men had to remain on the ice. Therefore we thought it wise to add this to this section, and also to fix a penalty.

10.—If at the end of the voyage the work of the cooking has been satisfactory, the chief cook shall be paid a bonus of \$20, and the assistant cooks a bonus of \$15 each by the owners of the ship.

It may be said that these cooks, if they are good ones, will save a lot of provisions for the owners, and are capable of cooking the provisions in a manner that is tasty and the men will be able to eat with a relish. But a poor cook does not get on with the

men. While these men have to work night and day to provide the food for the crew, it is right that they should be encouraged in their work.

11.—It shall be unlawful to kill any Hoods between March 10th, 1918, and April 13th, 1919, or bring into any port of the Colony any seals so killed under a penalty of \$5,000 to be recovered from the owner of such steamer by any person who shall sue for the same.

12.—No seals shall be killed by the crews of any steel ships prosecuting the seal fishery in any year after April 15th.

13.—No wooden ships prosecuting the seal fishery shall have on board more than fifteen rifles.

I may say that last year this House appointed a Commission to make a recommendation to the Assembly in reference to the Labrador fishery, hait fishery, seal fishery, and whale fishery. It is one of their own recommendations and we thought that it might be added to this Bill. These three sections were recommended by the Commissioners.

14.—The Governor-in-Council shall appoint a Board of Examiners consisting of three persons having not less than ten years experience as Masters of sealing steamers. The said Board shall make Rules and Regulations in relation to the examination of all persons intending to prosecute the seal fishery in steamers as Masters, Second Hands or Master Watch, and shall examine such persons and grant certificates. No person shall go to the seal fishery as Master, Second Hand or Master Watch without a certificate of competency, from the Board of Examiners under a penalty of \$5,000, to be recovered in a summary manner from the owner of the steamer in which any such person shall sail by any person who shall sue for the

same. The Governor-in-Council shall make Rules and Regulations as to fees to be paid such Board of Examiners, and as to fees to be paid by Masters, Second Hands or Master Watches in relation to such examinations. Provided that this shall not apply to any Master, Second Hand or Master Watch who has been at the seal fishery for two consecutive years previous to 1916, in any of the said respective capacities. And the said Board shall furnish free of cost certificates of competency to all such parties upon satisfactory proof of such persons having been at the seal fishery as aforesaid.

Now the Committee gave this matter their consideration, and I have no doubt but that by a great many this section will be very much criticised. We must remember that the master of the ship is the ruler of the crew. But we find that there is an uncle's son or a sister's son who signs on and is given a master watch, and for the time being is leader of the men, no matter how incompetent he may be. But as when he has exhausted the captain's orders he is thrown on his own resources, it is necessary that he should be a leader of men, and competent to deal with the situation. I do not for a moment say that he may not be a good man, but a man of experience is needed in such a case. He often has to get advice from one of the gang who has had fifteen, twenty or twenty five years' experience at the seal fishery. If he had been scrutinised by three old sealing captains, I believe that they would put aboard of our ships, men who are capable. Therefore your Committee thought it wise that an examination should take place. Take the firemen who are in those ships. These men cannot go aboard of our steamers without going to the examiners and passing an examination. The

firemen are entrusted with the stoke hold, and have the lives of all on board in their hands. Some years ago the S. S. 'Tigress' was blown up at the seal fishery, and quite a number of our men lost their lives by that ship being blown up. Fortunately there has been no repetition of this disaster, because we have a better class of men as firemen. These fellows are playing their part below as well as those on deck, and I think the time has come when the sealers should be looked after in a proper manner. They should go through an examination to qualify them. And by so doing they would have a sense of responsibility on them which they have never had before. Then it is easy for the law to disqualify them if necessary. This may seem hard, but if we want to look after and keep our men, we have to make some such law.

15.—No member of the crew of any sealing steamer shall be placed on her articles except with the approval of the sealing Captain sailing and commanding the said ship.

I consider that this is a very good addition to this Bill. There are men today who are out to the sea, and the Captain does not know anything about them. I go down to Mr. Job and I ask him to give me four or five tickets. But he has men working on his premises and gives them a ticket or two. They sign on with one of the captains and get outside, and the master watch goes down and says: "all hands out," but these men refuse to move from their bunks, saying that the captain of the steamer did not give them their tickets. The same thing goes on year after year. A captain should be particular what sort of a crew he has with him. There is Capt. William Bartlett—a man who knows as much about the Gulf Fishery as any other man. He left with a lot of fine men, as far as he

knew. But he did not get the seals. The men asked to be put ashore, but there were men among that crew who wanted to stay until the end of the voyage, till the end of May. Many days were lost in bringing these men to port, and the other men lost a good trip of seals.

16.—If it be shown to the satisfaction of the Customs Officer of any port that a wooden ship has landed more than one-half of her crew because the season has become so far advanced that a full crew is no longer necessary, and if the said ship shall not land any portion of her cargo of seals, or reft she shall again be cleared for the Seal Fishery by the said Customs Officer, and shall not be deemed to go on a second trip provided she leaves port before the 10th of April in any year. No ship shall be allowed to land more than once in any season under the provisions of this Section, provided that, in no case, shall a Customs Officer clear any ship under this Section until the owners of the said ship shall have satisfied him that all necessary provisions have been made to convey the portion of the crew so landed to their respective homes.

Now this is the Bill which, I think, I have done my best to explain, and I hope the House will give it their very best consideration.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to be able to congratulate the Government upon this Bill. The Government consented to put the matter to a Select Committee, and consider it. Before the Bill is passed there may be some amendments to some of the sections. This bill is the outcome of the terrible disaster that overtook our men last year. If it comes through, we may say that the loss last year was not in vain. The first section of the bill deals with a wrong action which is punishable by a large

line. This section was sent down by the Commissioners, though not in the form that is before us now. Permission is given to take seals on board at any time, but they cannot remain on the ice to protect their seals, after dark. That section does not include any penalty for the captain, but only for the crews. It should cover the captains as well as the crews. The second clause is an important one which has been discussed for many years in the Colony. The first argument against this is that there is going to be no end of rows. But I do not think that that is going to happen. When the steamer is sailing they usually take a course by themselves. It may be that occasionally they cross one another, but they will not do it purposely. I do not think that there is going to be a big amount of trouble. It will do away with the great evil of sending men a long distance from their ships. The captain will hesitate before he gives that order. That was the cause of the disaster last year. A steamer often lands men here and there on the ice and goes off to pick up some more seals, and is ten miles away from the men. But that will be remedied now. That is where the evil comes in, in panning patches of seals a long distance from one another. I think that a great deal of good will come out of this bill. Another benefit that will come out of that clause, will be that it will give the smaller ships a chance. I think that the whole Committee will agree on this point. There may be some opposition, but give it a trial for a year. If there are sufficient reasons to alter the law, we can do it, and make any necessary amendments. The third section: Everyone will agree to that. The fourth section: That is the usual thing in most of the ships. Section five: If the law is broken there, the offenders have to pay a

compensation of \$1,000, and I believe that it will be one of the greatest safeguards in the bill. They say that they have to run the risk. There has been a lot of risk. I trust that when they come to realise that \$1,000 must be paid, they will be more careful. Section eight: If the fog comes in or there is falling snow the ship is supposed to blow its whistle every five minutes, a prolonged blast, under a fine of \$400. That was the trouble last year, no whistle was heard. But that sort of thing will never happen again. The trouble under section ten is that the assistant cooks are not subject to the chief cook. The assistant cook gets up 3 o'clock in the morning and works till midnight, while the rest of the crew are having a fine time. We want to give the chief cook control over these men, and show them what to do, so that they will not rebel. They should be sent out as cooks instead of as sealers, and if they are paid as cooks they will be bound to attend to their duty. I am sorry to say that this year the cooking has not been very satisfactory. Who is to blame I cannot say, but there has been a lot of dissatisfaction. There was some trouble on board the Erik on account of that. I should like to read the following statement in relation to that:

Bill of Fare on the S. S. 'Erik' for Sealing Voyage, 1915, from March 8th to April 27th.

Fresh beef was served in soup three times during the whole voyage, namely the first three Mondays out.

Potatoes and Turnips served only twice with duffs during the whole voyage.

Brewse served once for the Spring. Beans twice a week for breakfast until the 15th of April. None for breakfast from that time to the end of the voyage.

Bill of Fare on the S.S. Erik for

Sealing voyage, 1915, from March 8th to April 27th:—

Fresh beef was served in soup three times during the whole voyage, namely the first three Mondays out.

Potatoes and Turnips served only twice with duffs during the whole voyage.

Brewae twice a week for breakfast until the 15th of April. None for breakfast from that time to the end of the voyage.

For eight days on the trip from St. John's to Port aux Basques, 1 lb. loaf of bread served to a bunk's crew of three men. The first week the baker was on board, we got no soft bread. The following week on Saturday, Mar. 27th, we got bread, but it was so sour that we could not eat it. We got soft bread once a week after that.

Turnips were served in soup only three times during the voyage.

On Good Friday, April 2nd, the steward refused to give us salmon for dinner. It was the first time we asked for salmon.

On Easter Sunday, April 4th, we had pork for dinner, but no pork was served till Sunday, the 25th.

We did not see any canned meat for the spring.

On April 13th five men went to the Captain and asked that food be supplied the crew according to the Sealing Laws of 1914. The Captain said that the food was not on the ship.

On April 12th the last meal of potatoes was served.

We hereby certify that the foregoing statement is true and correct in every particular.

Arthur Goss, Fred Dodd, Henry Goss,
Joseph G. Murphy, Richard Thorne,
Thomas Hynes, William Butler,
Ben. Legrow, Alex. Lacey.

I am sorry that I have to avail myself of this opportunity to read this statement. But it is my duty to attend to the wants of the people. I trust that these matters will be remedied,

which I believe they will, and that the publicity that this affair has had will prevent any further repetitions of the same practise.

Sec. 11 provides the close season for three years for the killing of hoods under a penalty of five hundred dollars. This clause did not appear in last year's bill, while section 12 provides that no seals shall be killed after the 15th of April by the crews of the steel ships. If I had my way, I would fix April 10th as the date. Section 13 allows wooden ships to have on board fifteen rifles, which was unanimously agreed to by the Select Committee.

For the purpose of more fully explaining Section 14, I beg to read it to the House.

14.—The Governor in Council shall appoint a Board of Examiners consisting of three persons, having not less than ten years' experience as Masters of sealing steamers. The said Board shall make Rules and Regulations in relation to the examination of all persons intending to prosecute the seal fishery in steamers as Master, Second Hand or Master Watch. No person shall go to the seal fishery as Master, Second Hand or Master Watch without a certificate of competency from the Board of Examiners, under a penalty of \$5,000, to be recovered in a summary manner from the owner of the steamer in which any such person shall sail by any person who shall sue for the same. The Governor in Council shall make Rules and Regulations as to fees to be paid such Board of Examiners, and as to fees to be paid by Masters, Second Hands or Master Watches in relation to such examinations. Provided that this shall not apply to any Master, Second Hand or Master Watch who has been at the seal fishery for two consecutive years previous to 1916, in any of the said capacities. And the said Board shall furnish free of cost certificates of competency to all such parties upon satis-

factory proof of such persons having been at the sealfishery as aforesaid.

This Section is founded upon the experience of last year. It provides that a Board of Examiners consisting of three persons having not less than ten years' experience as Masters of Sealing steamers shall be appointed by the Governor in Council. No Master, Second Hand or Master Watch can go to the fishery until he has received from the Board of Examiners a certificate of competency. I have my own ideas and opinions with relation to our experience of last year. No doubt they did what they thought best, but I think this measure prevents the possibility of the re-currence of such a contingency. I am fully aware that a Master Watchman has often received his appointment because he happens to be the son of, or some relation to the Captain. It is however, very difficult to keep a young man, who is in every way competent, back under the former conditions. No one can have any objection to the law as laid down here, and it will completely eliminate further difficulties in this direction. Certainly the last person to object to this would be Captain Kean, because he will be one of the first men whom the Government shall appoint as Examiner. Had this law been passed last September, and he received this appointment, I am fully convinced it would have been a tactful way for the Government to have prevented that state of dissatisfaction from the people which prevailed at the commencement of the present seal fishery season.

Section 15 is a most important departure from the existing law. It is giving the captain the privilege of selecting his own men, a measure which I consider most fair and just. It is, however, a radical step, but I believe we are justified in doing it. This will abolish the existence of that class of sealer, known as the "sea law-

yer," and other people who prefer loafing to working. The captain has the privilege under this section of not taking any man who is useless from the point of view of work. This is exemplified by the case of Capt. Barbour, who gets fifteen thousand, where other men get ten thousand. I have no use, as far as I am concerned, for the man who shirks work at the seal fishery. I am a worker, and I think all men who go to the seal fishery ought to work too.

I think the men ought to have the right to say whether they will go for a long voyage or a short one. A man ought to be given his choice of a long or short voyage for young men can afford to stay out while the old men cannot devote the time that long voyage demands. They grow anxious about the state of things at home, and often become so worried that they are of very little use. Other men will want to go for a longer voyage. These things ought to be taken into consideration because unless the present conditions are remedied much dissatisfaction will remain. The law ought to be most decided on these points. Three or four strikes last year were the result of these conditions and these things deserve the utmost consideration at the hands of the Government. I may say that I am thoroughly in accord with this Bill as it now stands. There is much to be done in the future but we have accomplished much in this Bill. It is only fair and reasonable that we should be satisfied with this. If it shall be found necessary to make amendment and additions, I think it can be done. I am afraid that I cannot altogether congratulate the Government as regards this Commission. I am very sorry that in spite of my opposition last year the Government insisted in appointing the three Judges of the Supreme Court. I felt sorry at

the time that the Government did not see the far reaching consequences of this. I do not believe the Government really considered what they were doing. I, myself have been up before the Court in connection with two or three libel actions. Now I ask you Mr. Chairman, could I expect fair or impartial treatment with these libel actions. Indeed in one case one Judge left the Bench and handed it to the Chief Justice. This was Judge Johnson, and the petition asking for Kean's arrest has been disregarded, although I firmly believe Kean's arrest will be justified. Anyway the position was a very false one to place the Bench in. No doubt the Judges are very sorry now. Trouble was created by that which will not be undone for the next five years. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries recommended a Commission to the Government but the Government simply refused to accede to his request. The reasons they gave have never been explained. In one case before the Court, the jury, were told by the Chief Justice "If I were in your place I would give substantial damages." It is clearly seen that with such a case it is no use to appeal. We can never get fair play. The judges are prejudiced against me, and I will always lose my case, and the Government is to blame. The fishermen all over the Island sympathize with me, as they know that I do not get fair play in St. John's. They say "The Judges are not giving you fair play, you might as well appeal to the Southside Hills" Consequently the fishermen are losing their confidence in the Supreme Court, and who is to blame for this? Personally I have nothing against Kean. He has done nothing to me, he has never hurt me in any way. But I felt I had a duty to perform. It is a matter which I do not think you will ever eradicate

from the minds of the people, but the issue of these things is this Bill. These things alone can be responsible for this introduction. I consider it one of the greatest pieces of legislation that has ever been brought up in this House, and I think it will be so regarded by everybody whom it concerns throughout the country.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Chairman, I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to express my approbation of the measure now before us. I regard it as excellent in every respect. I would like to point out that there is one thing for which I cannot quite account that has been omitted inadvertently no doubt from the Menu card laid down by this Act. Need I say that the glaring omission I refer to is that of pork and cabbage. We have been guilty of lack of patriotism by omitting what may be termed a national dish. I am surprised that the Hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Dwyer, has not called the attention of the House to this. I strongly advocate this addition to the Menu. Another matter to which I would like to refer is that I see from a letter that Mr. Coaker presented to the crew of the "Nascope" a gramophone, which afforded them considerable amusement. Might I ask to be informed whether Mr. Coaker contemplates presenting all the other ships with gramophones. Somehow we think he ought. Perhaps he will explain his intentions. Anyway we cannot doubt but that the Hon. member is doing a great deal for the people in the way of providing them with amusement and is doing it in a way that must afford everybody the greatest satisfaction.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am not in a position to offer a criticism and assistance to the Bill now before the Chair, but I would like to say the

commission that the House appointed to consider this matter is composed of those who are no doubt best qualified to consider subjects of this kind in all their several points. Personally I never had the opportunity of going to the seal fishery and therefore I must present my remarks only as those from the standpoint of an outsider, but while the Minister was dealing with the several sections of the Bill, I was struck with the idea that section 2 of this Bill which provides certain restrictions on the ownership of pelts, is one which is entirely more advantageous to the larger steamers. Supposing circumstances were such owing to fog or similar conditions a small steamer some considerable distance from its pelts has not the same opportunity of taking these pelts into possession as a larger steamer has. The seals might very easily be taken by other larger ships who will have no difficulty in obtaining them. I do not think this case came under the consideration of the Commission and I merely offer it as an ameliorative suggestion, and then as regards section 4 which relates to the necessity of a duly certified Master or Mate in some capacity on board before the steamer shall be cleared for the seal fishery, is one which I consider might be improved by the adoption of a few ideas which I might suggest. Owing to this responsibility I think some provision ought to be made that he shall have an official position, and an acknowledged one in that capacity. This would eliminate several difficulties from the path of his avocation. A certificated Master should go out as a Certified Officer of the crew. This is a measure which has the sympathy of every member of the House, and I think my suggestion ought to be put into practice, as regards compensation. We have the important Work

men's Compensation Act which provides that a workman suffering from accident or disablement during the performance of his ordinary work shall receive certain compensation from the owner who is liable for this compensation. I think this Act is one of the best Acts we can have on our Statute Books and it has been availed of by persons entitled to the privilege of that Act to a large extent although in general practice the employer protects himself by insurance.

We all know that there are local insurance Companies which insure employees against death or accident to their employees in the city and outside. These Companies do a profitable business, and have declared as high as 50 per cent. on the business in a single year. It is a mutual corporation wherein the profits are returned to those who insure. That, of course, is a great advantage over what is done by outside corporations. These outside corporations get a premium for every employee, and no matter whether there is no claim against the Company for ten years, still they exact the full premium. In the local corporation, the premium exacted is very little higher than that charged by outside corporations. My reason for mentioning this matter is that if the sealing owners wish they may insure the entire crews of the sealing steamers, and that without any great outlay a certain amount of protection could be placed round all those who go on that voyage. It would, I think, cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5.00 or \$6.00 per \$1,000. If that is so, the men who go to the fishery can be insured against accident or death. I hope the owners of the steamers will avail themselves of some measure of this kind to protect themselves against the liability that is placed upon them. An accident at the seal fishery might mean a large liability or it might mean a very small one for many years. You

might go on paying insurance year after year for twenty years, and then a year might come when you would have an accident that, even if it were not as great as last year's, might deprive the shareholders of one of their ships. Take the case of the Newfoundland last year. If that ship went out under the liability imposed by this Act, the liability for deaths alone would have been \$75,000. In addition to that, the claims for injuries would have brought the total up to probably \$100,000. In that case the Company would not have been able to meet the liability and therefore the Act would have been unworkable. If you want the Act to be perfect and to be a total security for payment in the case of death to a great number, then you must make the owners or someone else insure the men in some corporation. In my opinion that is the way to do it, and it is the only safe way to protect the men. For twenty years the owners of any ship may be able to meet their liability and then a case might occur which, like last year's, cannot be met. I draw this instance to the attention of the Committee because the idea of this bill is to protect the lives and interests of the sealers.

Another matter referred to by Mr. Coaker was that of landing crews. We have had an instance lately, wherein it was the painful duty of some members of the Government to take steps against men landed from the Terra Nova at Channel. When the ship came in there the Captain had wired me that the men were on strike and he wanted the protection of the law. On the matter being investigated it was found that it was not a matter for the Government at all. The ship had come in and one hundred men had left her. It was entirely in the hands of the owners. One or two days elapsed and the ship was still at Port aux Basques and the men were on shore. The Government could not take any

steps. The men were under the control of the Captain. Then the Captain made a deposition that the men were strikers and would not prosecute the voyage. Then the law stepped in and some of the men were punished. The Government was then put to the necessity of bringing the remainder of these men to their homes, whereas it was really the duty of the owners to have the men looked after. But the Captain got behind the law. The Government had to act and bring home the men. If that kind of thing goes on you will have half the sealing fleet landed at different points in the Island, and the Government compelled to look after them. If a captain can come in and by making a deposition, throw the men on the hands of the Government, then it is time the law was changed. As Mr. Coaker has said, if it is an understood thing in the future that in signing a crew the owners can sign hull for the short trip and then land that half of the crew and send them home, this will not occur again. But this is a case that requires some remedy.

I would like to say one word in regard to the disaster of last year. When we were here last year discussing a sealing bill, we little thought that we would so soon have such a sad aspect of the industry to consider. I had something to do with looking after those who died and those who were frostbitten. And the sight that met one's eyes on the arrival of the "Bellaventure," the frozen bodies, the maimed men, the anxious relatives all drove home to one the terrible danger and hardship and risk undertaken by those who prosecute the industry. It drove home to one's mind the fact that any measure coming before this House on such a question should receive the very serious consideration of every member. We cannot, Mr. Chairman, waste any

time that we spend in consideration of such a measure. I am perfectly in accord with any measure that will either reduce the risks attendant upon its prosecution or will safeguard the interests of those or their dependents who are unfortunate enough to lose their lives or suffer injury while at the seal fishery. The man who goes on the ocean and wrests from nature the means of keeping his family is a hero, as much a hero as the soldier or sailor who faces the guns of an enemy. That disaster was the great blow that this country has received. The loss of 350 of our most stalwart men would be a blow to any large community. It shows the tremendous risks these men have to run in their hazardous calling, and therefore I could not take my seat without making some observations on it, and express my admiration for those who fall in the discharge of their highest duty, the providing for the maintenance of those dependent on them.

One bright feature about that disaster was the splendid response made to the appeal for help, not alone by our own people but by the people of the neighboring provinces, by the Dominion of Canada, by the United States and by the United Kingdom. We are under a debt of gratitude to all those who assisted. The result of it was the collection of over \$200,000, showing that those outside of Newfoundland as well as those within, have hearts that beat in sympathy for those who lost their lives under such circumstances. In Toronto and Montreal and other cities, the Newfoundland Society availed of their Associations for the purpose of raising funds. The cities of Toronto, Montreal and Halifax made large contributions, as did also the Canadian Government, New York and Boston, whilst friends in these places responded very well.

The Prime Minister and His Excellency the Governor did splendid work in this connection in London, and their work in this connection will never be forgotten. Out of the \$200,000, there was one half subscribed in Newfoundland. That, Sir, is a very creditable showing, and I think those left behind will be comfortable for the rest of their days. I hope, Sir, they will live to get over to some extent the affliction which they have suffered.

I have every sympathy with this bill because I believe that it is intended to protect those who are engaged in this hazardous undertaking. Last year if we had had the act since put in force as to the carrying of wireless this fatality might have been averted to a certain degree, and so I say that every bill coming before this House tending towards reducing the risks or alleviating the troubles of those carrying out this industry deserves every consideration at our hands.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the House with any lengthy discussion of this bill. I merely wish to draw the attention of the Committee to one or two of its provisions. I may say that I intend to vote for the bill first because of the principle underlying its introduction, namely, the betterment of conditions at the seal fishery, and secondly because it comes to us upon the recommendation of a Select Committee so constituted as to justify the acceptance of its suggestions by those of us who have not that experience in this fishery that they have. It is quite natural that there should be considerable interest in the present deliberations for the causes which have been suggested as leading up to it. What I shall have to say will be confined to a reference to a couple of sections

that strike me particularly as I look at the bill.

In the first place I would like to say to the Hon. Colonial Secretary in reference to the difficulty which he sees in connection with compensation, that those difficulties will cure themselves for two reasons; first because disasters will have to be of a very serious character in order to raise any financial embarrassment to the Companies, and if insurance is not effected, the other cases will be so small as not to seriously handicap the companies. The old style of prosecuting the fishery is dying out, and it will only be a few years when the class of ship prosecuting the voyage will be so valuable as to be ample security for any demand that will be made.

The next point referred to by my hon. friend from Twillingate was clause 16, I trust that the results of that clause will be as he anticipates. But, Sir, the principle still remains that unless you improve conditions you will have trouble with those that sign on for the long voyage. On the other hand if these conditions are improved then there should be no excuse for the men not keeping up to their Contract. And from my limited knowledge of these affairs, I look more to the improvement of conditions in order to obtain results, than I do to such a clause as that. More will I think be obtained from the operation of clause 15 than from any other. The signing on of crews by the Captains ought to give a better chance of getting the kind of men required by eliminating the class of men that usually give trouble.

What I wish to draw attention to more particularly is the matter of penalties. This bill will, of course, stand on its own bottom, it is an independent bill. It does not rest anything, but stands by itself. Now if the

Committee will look at clause 12 and 13. In clause 12 there is no penalty mentioned. If there is a breach of that section there is no redress. Clause 13 is the same. There is no specific remedy for its breach. Now if we look at clause 8 we find a general penalty of \$400. I think the idea is that that should be a penalty not exceeding \$400, as in last year's bill. Last year we had very much the same kind of provision, and it was thought better in regard to certain provisions that there should be a maximum penalty. I suggest that this be considered by those who have the bill in charge. I hardly think that it is intended that it should stand as it does at present. It is surely not intended that a small breach should be met by such a severe penalty. I suggest the consideration of these aspects. I think these clauses should have a specific penalty.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to draw attention to the question of penalties provided in this bill and I am very glad that my colleague Mr. Higgins has drawn it to the attention of the government, and I hope it will be remedied before it goes out of Committee.

This is a bill in which all the House is interested. It is a bill to provide a remedy for a condition of affairs that was brought so seriously home to us last season when so many of our hardy seafarers lost their lives. When we come to consider the misery and loss occasioned by the disasters of 1914, I think this House will endorse me when I say that we ought to see this bill as perfect as possible in the interests of those who prosecute this industry. The Colonial Secretary has told us of conditions as they are in this industry, and he referred to our responsibility as members of this House to deal with any proposals looking to the remedy of such conditions

as brought about that disaster of last year. It seems something out of the ordinary to have the legislature of the Colony asked to make legislation for the needs of humanity in the law concerning the prosecution of the seal fishery. Heretofore we had been thinking about the season for killing seals and heard about other matters in relation to sealing legislation.

It has now been brought home to us that the obligation rests upon the legislature of this country to protect the prosecutors of the fishery themselves.

Now Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to section 2 of the bill which I hope will be altered. I do not know whether this section is intended to express certain ideas or not, but it ought not to stand as it is now. You notice this first clause in this section. What does this mean? Does that mean that that man is liable to a penalty, and that the captain is not liable to any penalty? If the man remains out without lawful excuse he is liable to a penalty. Now is not the order of the master or captain a lawful excuse? If so why attach the blame to the man. I submit to the Committee that that ought to be changed so that the captain or officer who sends the man on the ice, or who permits the man to go, will be liable to a penalty.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—No captain or officer will give such an order. The captains say that men go of their own accord without orders.

MR. KENT—The very point is this: that the man may be found on the ice, he may say that he is there because the captain sent him there. If so he is not liable to a penalty, because the order of the captain is lawful excuse. In that case no one would be liable. No captain would do it. I don't believe any captain would do it,

he should be sent out ought to be protected. What the Minister means is that no captain would be responsible for wilful neglect.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The man might be out looking for seals. He does not know the time. The captain would know it. He should not suffer because the man stays out.

MR. KENT—If he has no control he ought not be responsible. I do not say that he ought to be, but if he can make orders which say to the man that he cannot do so and so he ought to do so to protect the man.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Oh, well we trust to you lawyers to fix up little matters like that. We are laymen, and tell you what we want, and it's up to you to make it legal.

MR. KENT—Thanks. Now, Sir, the next thing in this bill is the absence of penalty. The bill provides a competent medical practitioner and a duly certificated master or mate, but fixes no penalty.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—No man will go without.

MR. KENT—If there is no penalty attached there can be nothing legally to stop a person's going without obeying sections 3 and 4.

Then again, there is section 12. What I want to draw attention to is this, that seals killed outside the three miles limit.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Seals shall not be brought in under penalty.

MR. KENT—In reference to section 14, I would like to ask the Minister as he has not mentioned it to the Committee, as to whether the master, second hand or master watch should receive certificates, if in the opinion of the board, they are not qualified to hold same. If this certificate ought not be taken from him after enquiry

should be constituted in this section. Now as regards the last section, the 16th, I do not profess to have had any experience in the seal fishery, but it appears to me that there will be confusion over this section, as it is at present. A ship may go to the ice with a crew of 200 men. After a certain date a portion of her crew can be landed. The port at which these men are to be landed ought to be taken into consideration.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I believe that this would arrange itself.

MR. KENT—Suppose men want to be landed during the voyage.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—They cannot. It would be a breach of contract.

MR. KENT—I think Sir, that the object of this Section is right, but I am afraid trouble will grow out of it. Some explicit directions should be inserted as to what port or ports crews should be landed at, and if at any port the Custom Officer will be responsible for men landed there. As I say the object of the section is good, and I hope it will be remedied to suit such circumstances as I have stated.

There are some other matters I would refer to, but will take some other opportunity.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I will have these suggestions considered. The general penalty clause penalising the captain has been left out, and it practically applies only to the man who does things contrary to this law on his own idea, and whose action is his own fault.

Section 1 referred to by Mr. Kent, merely provides for the men taking proper care of themselves. As regards section 16, I do not see the point raised by my friend. Any place with a Customs Officer may be considered a port of entry. Now as regards the

suggestion about Boards having the power to take away certificates. Such was not contemplated, but this Board consisting as it will of three captains, ought to be capable of measuring the capabilities or otherwise of master watches. However these slight changes can be put in the bill as it is going through.

MR. COAKER—Let us get sections 2 to 7 out of the way now.

Sections 2, 3, and 4 passed.

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.

MUNICIPAL COUNCIL BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the St. John's Municipal Act" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister presented the following Report:

Speaker's Room, April 24th.

The Select Committee on "An Act respecting the Administration of Local Affairs" beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, and report the following Bill.

Signed.—

E. P. MORRIS,

Chairman.

A. W. PIOCOTT.

J. M. KENT.

W. F. COAKER.

J. G. STONE.

W. B. JENNINGS.

GEORGE F. GRIMES.

THOMAS LEFEUVRE.

On motion this report was received.

On motion it was ordered that the Bill, "An Act Respecting the Administration of Local Affairs," 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, Thursday, April 29th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 29th.

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

QUESTION.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the answer to a question asked by Mr. Morine the other day.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

PETITION.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Victor Rosche and other residents of Alexander Bay, asking that that section may be put under another Road Board than at present. I ask that it be referred to the proper Department.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, with respect to that motion which I have given notice of, and which I intended to move on going into Supply, I am not prepared to go on with it today, but will take it up some day next week.

MR. KENT—Under what Depart-

ment does the Government Analyst come?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Agriculture and Mines.

MR. KENT—His salary should be here then.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think some of his salary comes under Agriculture and Mines, the rest under the Pure Foods Act, and in connection with Dr. Brehm's Department.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—It will be in the Additional Estimates.

MR. COAKER—Who is the inspector of timber limits? And who is the inspector of mill accounts? Who is drawing these salaries now?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Phillips and Mr. Thistle.

MR. COAKER—Thistle occupied one of these positions. One of them is vacant now. There was some report that Thistle was drawing two salaries. Is this so, and which position is vacant?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I will get you the information.

MR. KENT—In connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department there is a question which has come very prominently before the public lately through an action taken in the Supreme Court. I refer to the absence of all control over the waters of the harbor of St. John's. The members are no doubt aware of the case between Messrs. Morey and Co. and the owners of the Stella Maris. The powers of control over the harbor of St. John's are in a most uncertain condition; and I think it would be well if the Government or the Marine and Fisheries Department were to have the harbor of St. John's regulated in some way by Statute as in every port

of the size of St. John's in the world. I think the need for that was brought out very clearly in the argument that occurred in that case. I do not know what the result of the case is going to be; and I was not personally interested in one side of the other; but I heard some of the argument, and it appears to be the opinion of all concerned that beyond a very limited control there is none. I would suggest that the matter be taken into consideration by the Government. It is not possible this session; but next session something can be done.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Some arrangement has been made to have both steamers taken away. Mr Saunders is bringing in some tugs to remove each.

MR. LLOYD—May I ask if the Government has given any consideration to the question of incorporating some board to control the harbour with the usual powers.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER — I think the suggestion of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and also of Dr Lloyd is one that commends itself to every one. Of course the question has become very acute of late by the sinking of the 'Stella Maris'—the question as to who is liable. I have not been able to follow the matter closely myself, not having been in attendance at the Court, but there will no doubt be considerable information in any judgment we may get from the court as to the relative rights of the public in these matters, and as to the rights of the parties inter se.

I agree with what my learned friend said that it is very desirable that in regard to the waters of the harbour the public rights as well as individual rights should be more closely defined; and further, that there should be some proper Board, as there is in cities like Montreal and other cities —

Harbour Boards—that would have control. In the past, of course, we have had very little trouble, and things went along fairly well, but now we discover how imperfect our machinery is when such cases occur. I had taken a note of it, and I shall take the matter up immediately after the session closes; and if I am here next year, I shall be glad to bring in any necessary legislation.

MR. MORINE—I do not think there would be much objection in point of law, and it certainly would be very desirable, if you were to create a Harbour Board, without attempting to define the extent of its jurisdiction any more than over the harbour of St. John's. If you wait till you get a sufficient definition of the legal rights of the public against private parties on the foreshore you will never introduce this Bill. You will never get that, except in individual cases from time to time. It will be quite sufficient to create a Board in which shall be vested the rights of the public without attempting to define these in the Bill and some such general provision as to the removal of vessels which have sunk in the harbor. If a Board were constituted on the lines of the Montreal Harbour Board it would be able to control these matters and protect the interest of the public.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER — I think my hon. friend misunderstood me. I did not mean to convey the idea that it was necessary to await the judgment as to the public or private rights before appointing the Board. I merely meant that the rights between individuals as regards obstruction would probably be more clearly defined. The law as to the foreshore is very clearly defined by several judgments to be found in the Supreme Court Records, and as to obstructing the waters of the harbor, I do not think there is any question as to that

coming under the Harbor Master's Act and amendments. I think the Harbour Master would have full power to remove these obstructions and then look to the party liable for compensation. But even then it may be necessary to have legislation to create a Board and vest the rights of the public in that Board. It may be necessary to give it greater powers as regards obstructions. That can be considered.

MR. MORINE—The Harbor Master in that case would come under that Board.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. COAKER—In this Marine and Fisheries vote there is a vote of \$1,100 for the Deputy Head. Now if we vote that the Government will promise that they will keep that official at his work, instead of having him going from place to place at the whim of His Excellency the Governor, or anyone else who wishes to send him, and we should know if he is still receiving in addition to that paid him as Deputy Head. We find that last year he was receiving two or three salaries, one as Deputy Head, another as Secretary to the Fisheries Board, and another as Secretary to the Governor. He has been receiving a salary of about \$2,500. Now what is the use of having a Deputy Head of that Department if he can spend three-fourths of his time out of the office. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries should inform the House whether the work has been neglected. If not there must be no work there for him at all, and he is not wanted. If you are going to pay a man \$1,400 there must be some work for him to do. If not you don't want him at all. If he receives this salary he should be there all the time attending to his work.

Further, I strongly object to one man receiving two or three salaries. I do not know if it is necessary to pay \$400 for a Secretary to the Fisheries Board. It may be necessary to have a man there to record the Minutes, but in view of the fact that the other members only receive \$100, I would think that the same amount would compensate him. This is a year where we should try to save all the money we can.

Now if you can reduce \$100,000 out of these estimates, by cutting down all expenditures that are not necessary you will be doing something greatly to your credit, besides proving the sincerity of your attitude towards these estimates. For instance, you have the secretary of the Legislative House department drawing a salary of \$1,000. This office has been in existence for only two or three years. Cannot such an office as this be dispensed with? Can not the duties of this official be easily combined with those of some other official? Personally, I regard this position as superfluous. He goes about from place to place, and in his absence his work seems easily to be accomplished by the officials remaining in that office. Then there is the Fishery Inspector, who draws a salary of \$600. What does he do? He writes an annual report I know. But can not this man be dispensed with, even if for this year alone? I know from experience that as far as Green Bay goes, the curing fishery there never sees that official. The fishery there is never inspected in any way, as far as I know, although the value of it is estimated at \$20,000 to \$50,000. I know that the fish there have been inspected by the merchants who bought them, but by no public official. The Inspector of Fisheries receives \$700. Now what is this man's duty? What does he do? Has he anything

to show for the salary he has been receiving? I think he might be dispensed with. Then again the Deputy Minister of Shipping. Everyone knows that his duties are not what might be called arduous. In the course of the year there might be some one or two vessels that he surveys. I think that some other official might take this job, and have his travelling expenses paid by the Government. Besides you have in the Custom house an Inspector of ships and a Surveyor. Can not a more inexpensive distribution of offices be made that will be equally satisfactory? Is the Government really serious in this attempt to economise? I need not enumerate these offices. This would ensure a large saving in this respect alone. If you do not do these things how can you prove to the people that you seriously intend to save their money. These positions have been justifiable in the days when the country was able to afford them, but now we cannot afford to maintain superfluous positions. It will certainly reflect discredit on the Government if they do not avail themselves of this chance to cut down these salaries which are not necessary. I well remember that many a time when I was working down north some Public official, doing nothing in particular, would come around. Can you conceive anything more annoying to people who have to work fourteen hours daily to keep things going having the money they paid in taxes maintaining people in this manner. When these people have nothing to do they go about and succeed in nothing except causing trouble. While we maintain these officials we merely advertise to the people our wasteful efforts of spending money. This is the case of the sub-collectors at Lewisporte. It is the same at Moreton's Harbour, a man absolutely un-

necessary. I can get any day a man that will do his work for twenty dollars. The sub-Collector at Moreton's Hr. has nothing whatever to do, but to torment the fishermen, and create disturbances around the community. If a man has nothing to do, he generally amuses himself at other people's expense. I admire the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think he has done splendid work the past few years, and there is much to testify this. I believe we should dispense with the Deputy Surveyor of Shipping, as well as the Inspector of Pickled Fish. The Department of the Government Engineer is next on the list. Who is the Inspector of Railroads now instead of Mr. Petrie? I hope when this position is filled the Government will not pick up a useless man who happens to be in accord with them politically. These are the sort of things that are difficult to rectify afterwards. I may say when we get to that side of the House any man that we consider does not fulfill his duty in his official capacity we shall dispense with without hesitation. I consider all these positions are not needed and I would be glad if the Government would discriminate between the necessary and unnecessary officials at the present time.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words here in relation to the matters now before the House. I may say that I am thoroughly in accord with the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker with regard to the sentiments he expresses when he says that he likes to see a man work. Now it has been already stated in this House that the conditions of this year are exceptional owing to the state of affairs resulting from the war. I must say from my own personal experience that I have found the Deputy Minister of Marine & Fisheries,

Mr. Alan Goodridge, since he came to this office, a man most efficient and desirable to work with in every way. I may say that I believe every man in my department works well and hard, and thoroughly agree with Mr. Cooker when he says that he believes in hard work. I believe in hard work myself, and I consider Mr. Goodridge has worked strenuously since he has come under my Department. He has treated the public who had sought for information in that Department in the most gentlemanly fashion, and given them all information possible in every way. When the war broke out this year, the Governor's Secretary had to go to the front Newfoundland for the first time, in the course of its history, was called upon to recruit men for the front. The Governor wrote to me asking if I could spare Mr. Goodridge for a few hours in the afternoon or morning as he had a lot of work, code-work etc., to be deciphered, and when I received his letter I was quite satisfied to take my share of the work in his department in addition to my own in order to allow him to spend his afternoons at Government House. I consider he was helping the Colony and the Empire. I do not believe in talking, I believe in doing things. A gentleman friend of mine once remarked to me in Chicago that an ounce of help was better than a ton of prayer. I do not think time ought to be wasted in futile discussion when there is work to be done. Anyway Mr. Goodridge is there today working in the morning or evening with the Governor. His remuneration is a matter between the Governor and himself. I do not know if he receives any money. The "Herald" stated that Mr. Goodridge received twenty eight hundred dollars out of the Government chest; that was thrown broadcast to the country but

the Herald does not state what he himself receives. He is discreetly silent and perhaps judiciously so on this point. After the first Contingent went over, the Naval Reserve had to be sent. Mr. Goodridge was asked by the Naval Commander of the Calypso when they were embarking if he would accompany them, but he answered that he would be unable to go owing to his various duties here. Capt. MacDermott even wrote the Governor asking if Goodridge might be permitted to take charge of the R.N.R. men. He asked me if I was satisfied that he should go. Under the circumstances, considering he was the one asked by the Commander of the Calypso, there would have been very little British blood flowing through my veins had I not immediately acquiesced. When he returned, and learned of the attack that had been made upon him in his absence, he determined that he would refuse to go forward again if he were so asked, and he did refuse when he was asked. I pointed out to him at the time that it afforded him considerable advertisement to be attacked in this manner by the newspapers and would do very little harm, and that if he were asked to go again his duty lay in acceptance. The time arrived when he was again requested to take charge of the reservists. He immediately refused. At length at my ardent solicitation, as well as the persuasion of Capt. MacDermott, he went on board the Mongolian, having first asked me if I was satisfied that he should go. I was quite satisfied, and the officials in my department were satisfied also that Mr. Goodridge should assume these duties. Many people addicted to talking of patriotism would be afraid to do this when you consider the risk he ran of German mines and torpedoes. We must consider too that

he is a married man with a family at home, and that a trip on board the old Allan Line, is far from pleasant that time of year. What happened on board the Mongolian is known to everyone here, and Mr. Alan Goodridge acted as a man among men, and I am proud of Mr. Alan Goodridge who, with the men under him, was the means of saving the ship and bringing precious lives safe back to Halifax. Were he an alien or a stranger he would be getting the praise of Newfoundlanders, but he is only a Newfoundlander himself and I suppose cannot expect to receive the appreciation we would extend to a foreigner. Not many Newfoundlanders have enjoyed the distinction that he has. I think we ought to give him fair play in every way as he is a Britisher.

Now, I explained to the House that before I was in the Department, Judge Frowse was there Secretary of the Fishery Board, a position which brought him in four hundred dollars a year; and when I assumed control of the Department, I asked Mr. Goodridge if he would perform these offices in addition to his own. He did this for nothing and the Judge received the money until the day of his death. Last year the Fishery Board asked the Government if they would not recognize his services for the past four or five years, and the Government gave him two hundred out of the four hundred. So much for Mr. Goodridge. This Department certainly needs a Deputy. Of that there can be no doubt; the Deputy of our office receives the smallest wage of any Deputy we have. If it were only for the services he renders the Government, I am quite satisfied for him to go and help the Empire at this present time, the Clerks are satisfied and we are all prepared to do his work

while he is away. As to the Secretary of the Lighthouse Department, I think I have already informed this House that Mr. Richard White the Lighthouse Inspector certainly is a busy man and has very little leisure to spend in his own home. I might say that Mr. Cornick, is, as it were, the Engineer of the Department, and it takes him all his time to look after fog alarms and the machinery of the Lights. The gentleman who gets one thousand is the only man the department of Marine and Fisheries have to keep account of the office affairs, and the various work that is always coming in. I do not consider his salary too much for the work he does. I would be quite satisfied to pay a thousand dollars if he was a private clerk of my own. Mr. Dee, who is the Fish Inspector receives \$750.00 for work which he performs faithfully and in a highly efficient manner. The complaints that come in about his work are indeed very few and owing to petty jealousies in some instances people would decry their own father if he were receiving a larger income. If this country intends to keep the lobster fishery going, some person will have to look after it, and this is the position Mr. Dee fills. Next comes the Inspector of Shipping. This position is an essential one, asked for by the people of this country who have been greatly inconvenienced since its inception. During Mr. Wheatley's time the surveyor was not supposed to visit any places outside of St. John's where ship building was in progress. Now, it is different and greater facilities are placed in the way of builders in order that they may receive the bounty provided under the Act. Why should we send out \$75,000 and \$80,000 a year to Nova Scotia for the purchase of schooners when that money might be spent amongst

our own people by the proper encouragement of the industry. Our locally built vessels are probably superior to those constructed in the neighboring provinces. It is true that our models may not be based on yacht lines, but experience has taught us that our own-built vessels do not require to be repaired in the same short time as the imported one. When men like Mr. Harris of Grand Bank send \$10,000 out of the country for the purchase of a schooner it means the enrichment by that amount of the country where the purchaser resides, and not one cent of that sum, although earned in this country will be enjoyed by our people. I do not think under the circumstances that we can dispense with the services of this surveyor for I consider him to be indispensable in the interests of those of our people who undertake the work of constructing their own vessels.

There are a number of improvements that we might have and believe if ever my hon. friend gets the government we will have them. Let us keep the money in the country. The Pickled Fish Inspector is Mr. Fitzgerald. He is not a loafer. If he were a loafer he would not be in my department. I am a believer in work and I like to see all those round me working too. If the hon. member ever visits my department he will see that there are no loafers there. When Mr. Fitzgerald is not engaged about his particular business at Bay of Islands I have him surveying the bottom of harbors where the Dredge is working. He earns his salary of \$600.

MR. COAKER—Does he get any additional pay?

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—No. He does not. I am going to send him down to the district of Trinity and get the dredge down there soon. You would not be able to get

a man to do the survey work for the dredge under \$1000 and now it is done for the travelling expenses by Mr. Fitzgerald. He is a very able man. He can draw out a map of the bottom of any harbor he has surveyed. I cannot understand how he is satisfied to stay in this country on a salary of \$600. But then he likes the country. He believes he can get a living here. He has a large family to look after and he gets \$600.

I believe in saving money as much as any man in the country. But I believe in a man being paid for his work I am quite satisfied to do my share of the work. I attend to my office from 8.15 in the morning and it is frequently 12 and 2 the next morning before I leave.

The fishermen of this country are the best class of men in the world. I have the greatest respect for them. In some ways they think they have been neglected by governments in the past. But I have cruised round the world quite a little bit and I know pretty well how fishermen and sealers are treated in other countries and in no country in the world to-day is there more done for the fishing and laboring classes than in Newfoundland. Only a few days ago the Terra Nova came into Port aux Basques and landed 100 fishermen there. Perhaps if they had had their rights they would have been kept aboard the ship and the owners should have brought them on here, but the government out of good feeling for their families spent \$200 or \$300 to bring them to their homes. But the fisherman soon forgets that. We bring them home from the Labrador and if any fisherman is lost we send out to look for him, but the government gets no credit for that. Take a fisherman and put him in a government position and immediately there is an outcry because he has a government job. Jealousy is the

curse of this country. It is ruining the fishery. If a man gets forty quintals of fish they get up a petition to stop that man getting fish next year. I agree with Mr. Coaker in regard to cutting expenditure, but let it be cut from those that have big salaries, not from the men who are getting nothing. If you are not satisfied with Mr. Goodridge take him and make him Inspector General and pension Mr. Sullivan and give me another Deputy.

Last year I had the pleasure of meeting 200 Newfoundlanders in British Columbia, men who had fished on the banks. I asked one of them how the government sent them home—"Forget it"—he says. "The government don't do things like that out here. If you are away from home here you have to get home yourself. When I was in Newfoundland I thought we had the worst government in the world, but since I have been out here for 10 years, I find that Newfoundland is the best country in the world to-day."

I hope I have not delayed the Committee too long, but I could not allow these matters to be discussed without giving some explanation and if I have been too long I hope you will excuse me.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister if he could tell us the number of vessels of over 50 tons built in the country the last two years.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—I would not say off hand, but it will be found in the Report.

MR. JENNINGS—The reason I ask is that in Twillingate, which used to be one of the foremost places in building that kind of vessel, this industry seems a thing of the past. The people seem to be buying these vessels abroad in place of having them built in their own neighbourhood. I was speaking to a master builder a few

days ago, a man who has built some of the best vessels in the bay. Last year he bought a vessel up along. He told me that the reason he did it was first because of the scarcity of timber and secondly because of the price of labour.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I might say that in the Nova Scotia vessels there is not the material nor the workmanship that you find in our own. In many cases you find that you buy a very pretty looking vessel and when you get her down here for a short time she is in for repairs. That is the experience with nearly all the vessels going out of St. John's that have been bought in Nova Scotia. If you ask the Grand Bank people they will tell you that the vessels they get from Nova Scotia have not got the materials in them nor the workmanship either. We have the knowledge here and much better materials when they can be got. Our vessels are much better. They last longer. There is not the same amount of repairs on them and they sail just as well. The price of vessels is going up in Shelbourne every year. Last year Mr. Bartlett had a schooner built there that cost \$6700. The price was \$65 a ton and he showed me a letter from the builders this year saying that that was the last vessel they could build for \$65 a ton. The price from now on would be \$75. That is a big loss to the country. Not only do we lose the cost of the vessel, but there is the loss in the sailmaking and tackle all of which goes up there and does not come back. Then there is a great deal of money always left in these places by the crew, not a cent of which ever comes back into the colony. Our bonus instead of \$8 ought to be \$10 or \$12. We have the timber here and I am sure the men in this country can build as good a ves-

sel as anywhere else in the world.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the hon. Minister. It is a fact that these vessels are being bought more and more from the Nova Scotian market because they can get the vessels cheaper. The last vessel floated down here was the "Renown" It is one of the best vessels ever built. It is a pity that the business is dying out.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, we do not often have the pleasure of listening to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as we have this afternoon. I can assure him that there was no necessity for him to express that modest deprecation of himself, which he did when he apologized for having occupied the attention of the Committee too long. I do not think any member would think that he had occupied our attention at all long. For myself, I was particularly struck with the speech and I think that it would be well for the country if the Minister spoke more often than he has done in the past. I was particularly struck with his vigorous defence of the officials of his department. It showed a very good trait in the Minister's character that he should put forward such a vigorous defence. It showed that there was a very excellent esprit de corps in the department and that he was the man to voice it. But, sir, in listening to his remarks, I could not hide from myself the fact that while the Minister made a vigorous defence, he let his feelings go and those feelings led him a little further than he intended, because he let out that the relations were not altogether harmonious between himself and the Government of which he is a distinguished member.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Oh, I am as happy as a clam at high water.

MR. LLOYD—I am very glad to

hear it. But while I have no doubt that the Minister is happy, still his feeling carried him so far that he as much as told us that his relations with the government itself were not as happy as they might be.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—All right. Go ahead and use it.

MR. LLOYD—Oh yes, I am going to take advantage of it. It would appear from what he says that there are things that could be done if only the government would make up its mind and there appears to have been some discussion with the Government about them because he says that if my friend from Twillingate got charge of the Government he knows that something would be done. It is therefore apparent that he has not been able to get something out of the government. The speech made by the Minister this afternoon shows there is something in his mind about cutting clear.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Not the slightest thought.

MR. LLOYD—And that brought to my mind the words used by his leader in connection with the Harbor Master a few days ago. He said that something would be done next year if he was here. Then you will remember that I asked him what that meant, whether he had any doubts about his being here. Now that is an admission and looks very much as if the government was not going to be here.

The Minister told us that he was in full accord with the matter of reduction of expenditure and would be glad if his department could be reduced, but he did not see where any reduction could take place. I was very pleased as I say to hear the remarks of the hon. Minister in defence of his departmental officers, and I do not wish to attempt to assail the defence so made. I am not going to attempt that. I am going to content myself

with dealing with the position put forward by him. He says that \$200 was paid Mr. Goodridge for services on the Fisheries Board and that the other \$200 was a drop balance. Now Sir, that shows that \$200 has not been used. It is not wanted. The Minister has already pledged himself to economy in any case where it can be effected without in anyway affecting the efficiency of the department. I will accept his word and move that the vote of \$400 be reduced to \$200, removing the unnecessary amount of \$200.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I did not say it was necessary. I said that \$200 was paid for past services and that the other \$200 went into a drop balance.

MR. LLOYD—Then the proposition that I make will really be an economy. You say that in the past \$200 was found unnecessary.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It might be paid to the Commissioners of the Lunatic Asylum.

MR. LLOYD—Then it should be down in the estimates.

On the motion being put it was lost.

The original vote was then carried.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the Minister was given this opportunity to make his defence, because now I know that the officials in his Department are earning their salaries. I am sure that the members on this side of the House are glad that the Inspector of Pickled Fish and other inspectors are doing good work for their money. I did think that these two votes went to one man but the Hon. Minister says they go to two distinct individuals. I cannot, however, congratulate him on his defence of the Deputy Surveyor of Shipping. I am afraid he does not do as much for \$800, as Mr. Fitzgerald does for \$600.

I cannot see how he justifies his stand on the \$200 to the Secretary of Fisheries Board. He very nearly broke the Government on that. The Government was only saved by one vote, and if the Minister had crossed the floor the Government was lost. However, we do not want the Government at the present time. We do not want the troubles that you will have during the next twelve months.

I agree with the Minister that the salaries are earned in his Department, but something ought to be done to encourage the building of vessels at home. At present we give a bonus of \$10.00. It would be worth an effort on the part of the Government to find out what is wrong in regard to this matter.

We have got to look out for some means of having schooner building carried out more in the outports. The only place where schooners have been built is Green Bay, but as no one was serious there the industry soon collapsed. Five or six years ago lots of timber lots were given out, but they were not in places where schooner building could be carried out; they were nowhere near the coast line. What we want is dockyards established and every encouragement and facility in such places as Harbour Grace, should be given those who will carry on the work.

Everyone will admit that the vessels built in Newfoundland are for durability as good and even better than those built abroad. Nova Scotian vessels are not as good. Our people will admit this, but nevertheless they buy them. Green Bay schooners have been known to last as long as twenty years without repair, while the schooners imported into the Colony now are very soon worn out.

In my opinion the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be doing a

good turn for the people of this country if he would have this matter thoughtfully considered by the Government. I believe great good can and should arrive from steps taken in this direction.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I may say, that this matter has been considered by the Government. In my own district I went around trying to get capital to start building with the Government's promise of 5 per cent. for 15 years. When the delegation some three years ago called upon the Premier, they were assured that the Government would do every thing in its power to help on the industry, and would tax imported ships to give local ones an advantage.

MR. COAKER—I would suggest that instead of 5 per cent. for 15 years the Government make that 7 per cent. for 20 years, to encourage the people to take up this industry. Every year between \$75,000 and \$100,000 of our money is spent in Nova Scotia. For what? For vessels which could have been built down here in Newfoundland. The people here ought to be offered 7 per cent., and if the Government would increase their 5 per cent. to 7 per cent. I think that there would not be much trouble in getting people to invest in it. Five per cent. is not good enough. It is not appetising enough. The people can get 6 per cent. for their money easily and will not invest for 5 per cent. Make it 7 per cent. or even 8 per cent. as long as you encourage the industry. Then you can advertise. Advertise abroad the great shipping facilities you are prepared to offer, and thus promote this industry to the material benefit of the whole country.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman, I have had a little experience in ship building, and ship buying, and the

reason I take it that ships are no-built in this country is that without proper organisation the industry can not be carried on with any profit. The absence of proper ship yards renders it necessary to import certain parts, and I myself had to import lumber suitable for the purpose.

What we want here in this country is proper ship yards built, where in the summer months the wood would be sawed up ready for use. Then another objection to having vessels built in Newfoundland is this. A man makes a good voyage and while in good circumstances decides to get a new banker for next year's trip. He has not time to have one built here. What does he do? He goes to Canada and there buys one already made, and as a result is ready to prosecute the fishery at the beginning of the next season.

Then again there is repairing. All these things considered, I would strongly recommend that this subsidy of 5 per cent. be increased to 7 per cent. or even 10 per cent., and I think that this matter is worthy of the consideration of the Government.

MR. COAKER—Are we to come back this evening?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We are prepared to come back. We have no desire to rush this through the House, but it is important that we get it out of the way as quickly as possible. It can be postponed however, if the hon. gentlemen wish it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed a Resolution, 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.

LOGGING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: "An Act to Regulate the Employment of Men engaged in Logging."

The Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Command.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, this bill has been referred to a Select Committee and I would now present to the House the result of its labors. Some objections were raised to the bill by the employers, and these came before the Select Committee which heard their objections, and where they saw fit altered the bill to settle the points disputed upon. I hope the bill as it is now will be accepted. The changes do not amount to any material difference, they only make the various sections clearer and more explicit. Section 1 compels a man to give one week's notice of leave, and if he fails to do this he forfeits one week's salary. This is done in the interest of the employers, and to protect them from those who for frivolous causes take it into their heads to leave. Take a case where they have contracted for 100,000 cords of wood. As it is at present through those loggers leaving without giving any notice the employers often find themselves with only 40,000 or 50,000 to meet their contract. By compelling the men to give one week's notice the employers have the opportunity of advertising the positions, and thus of having the full complement of men continually at work.

Section 2 compels the employer to pay the loggers in cash. It also provides that on the employers failing to pay cash to the men on presenting their cards at the office, they, the employers, will be liable for \$1 per day

as long as the amount shall continue unpaid.

Section 3 provides that within two weeks after loggers are engaged they shall be provided with tickets giving their rate of wages, etc. The previous bill provided that loggers should receive these tickets as soon as they were employed, but this was altered, and the period now must not exceed two weeks.

On every second Saturday the employer shall give to the logger a statement of the amount due him, and a statement of his time. In the last bill it said "Every Saturday," but the Committee taking into consideration the fact that storms might prevent the agents getting around so often, made the time every second Saturday. The Government Inspector under Section 5, shall have to approve of the kind of sleeping berths supplied.

The section referring to the food to be supplied has been altered considerably. By the new version a schedule of food shall be prepared by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and published in the "Royal Gazette" not later than July 1st in each year.

The sections referring to bed clothes and axes and handles are the same as in the original bill.

Section 10 referring to the camps, has been altered, I think the changes here improve the bill.

Section 11 has been unaltered. The amount to be paid for doctor's fees has been fixed at forty cents.

Section 12 provides that Board and Lodgings shall be provided for the Inspector representing the loggers and also the Government Inspector. Last year the Government Inspector was not included. He is thus now provided for.

We define a logger in this bill and say that the term applies to teamsters, drivers, cooks and all others en-

gaged in hauling or cutting logs or any other act incidental thereto. This was done at the request of the employers who said that there was some difference of opinion as to what persons were meant by the term loggers. This definition will make this matter clear.

On section 2 of Logging Bill being read:

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Chairman: It seems to me that an unintentional injury may be done to some small logging men by this section. As I understand the logging business, some men contract to supply logs and hire their own men. Now they may be up in the woods and a storm may come on, and make it impossible for them to get down, and so would be unable to comply with this section by paying cash at the usual place of payment. Of course it won't affect the large companies at all, but it might affect the small men. Would an order on a company be equal to cash?

MR. COAKER—Of course, cheques would be accepted, payable at the usual place of payment.

MR. CURRIE—Then an order on a firm would meet the position. A similar objection occurs to me in connection with anything being wrong with shacks. A company has ten days within which to make repairs. Well, these shacks might be forty miles or more from headquarters, and storms might make it impossible for men to get there to make necessary repairs within the time limited.

MR. KENT—That would be the act of God, and a matter over which the company would have no control. The words used are "in default". That implies some fault on the part of the person; it does not refer to the act of God.

MR. CURRIE—The words used are: "If complaints are not remedied within ten days." It seems to me that it

would not spoil the intention of the Act if a couple or more days were added.

MR. HIGGINS—If the act is not complied with because of something over which the employer could have no control, that would in all cases, under Common Law, constitute a complete answer to such cases as this. If a complaint were not remedied within ten days, and the employer could show that it was physically impossible to do it, that would be a complete answer.

MR. KENT—I think it would.

On section 12 being read:

MR. HIGGINS—Might I ask the gentlemen in charge of the bill what is the idea of that section? I may state that I have no objection, but what is the idea? I take it that the notion would be, so that the men might have a direct representative to look after their rights, but would this agent be a logger, who would be a regular agent, and would visit the camps from time to time?

MR. COAKER—He would be a man who has been a logger.

MR. HIGGINS—The idea would be to employ such a man and pay him wages.

MR. COAKER—Yes.

MR. HIGGINS—And the man would be one who would go to different camps?

MR. COAKER—He would be going around from place to place all the time. That would be his only work.

MR. HIGGINS—Would he be appointed by the men?

MR. COAKER—Yes. He would be in the same position as a delegate.

MR. KENT—I would ask to refer back to section 6 for a moment. The section states that the Government Inspector shall in each year prescribe the manner in which sleeping berths shall be fitted, as required by section 5, and shall notify the employer

thereof not later than the 1st day of September in each year. I think we ought to make some provision there as to the manner in which notice is to be given. I would suggest that "Publication thereof in the Royal Gazette shall be conclusive evidence of such notice".

MR. COAKER—There can be no objection to that.

DR. LLOYD—It has been suggested to me, in connection with that, that the loggers themselves should have some opportunity of seeing what is prescribed with reference to sleeping berths, and that publication in the 'Royal Gazette,' while it might be regarded as conclusive evidence as far as the courts are concerned, would not be sufficient. I think there should be a publication to which the loggers themselves would have access.

MR. COAKER—That objection will be got over very easily in view of the fact that the loggers will have a representative whose duty it will be to see that all the provisions of the Act are enforced. These agents will certainly make sure that all the men shall know what the rules are. And then, again, the hon. gentleman surely doesn't anticipate that the 'Mail and Advocate' is going out of business because while that paper lives, the loggers will know what the rules are through its columns.

DR. LLOYD—That may be a very effective reply, but I would point out that the difficulty was suggested by a strong supporter of my friend.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

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

that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: 'An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery.'

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—**MR. CHAIRMAN**: There are two or three points that have been suggested in connection with this Bill. The first section states: "It shall be unlawful to kill any seals or remain on the ice in charge of any seal pelts, except between the hours from daylight until dark, and no person being a member of the crew of any steamer engaged in the seal fishery shall, without lawful excuse, be or remain upon the ice or away from his ship after one hour after dark or before daylight." Now, it is suggested that this be added: "Nor shall any Master, Mate, or Master Watch of any steamer engaged in the seal fishery, without lawful excuse, order or permit to go on the ice any member of the crew of such steamer except between the hours of daylight and dark".

MR. COAKER—Did you say 'Mate'?

MR. KENT—"Second Hand" is the word used in the Act.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The next is in section 12, which reads: "No seals shall be killed by the crews of any steel ships prosecuting the seal fishery in any year after April 15th." And it is proposed to add this: "Nor shall any seals so killed be brought into this Colony by any steamer under a penalty of \$5,000 to be recovered from the owner of such steamer by any person who shall sue for the same".

Then "here is a penalty for section 12.

DR. LLOYD—Do those who make the rules and regulations also examine? Under the act relating to the C. H. E., the Council can make rules, but they do not examine.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is no objection to that. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

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

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the bill entitled, "An Act Respecting the Administration of Local Affairs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

It may be necessary to explain that the bill before the Committee is the bill reported by the Select Committee to which this bill was referred. It is the outcome of several meetings. The Committee does not expect this bill to meet every possible difficulty, but it would be desirable that our Local Affairs should be dealt with by local administration. But the Committee hopes that this bill will lay the foundation of legislation that will prove an advantage to the whole Island. Although I was not the Chairman of the Committee I would like to say that a great portion of the work in connection with the bill was performed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. We are unanimous in our report. I trust that the bill may be regarded

by the House as an earnest attempt to solve the difficulty. This is not the first time that such a bill has been introduced. This matter was brought before the House on several previous occasions, especially the years 1897, '98, '99. But the Acts then evolved were never taken advantage of by the country.

It has been proposed this year that in future the control of Local Affairs in this country will be by elected Road Boards. The meeting for an election will be presided over by a magistrate. The elections will take place all over the Island, at about the same time, those elected holding office for two years.

It will not be possible to put every section of the bill through tonight before adjourning, but we can pass as many sections as possible, and continue the discussion tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Cosker gave notice of question.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council informing the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled: 'An Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens', without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourns until to-morrow, Friday, April 29th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 29th, 1915.

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

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled First Annual Report of the International Grenfell Association.

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of New Melbourne, asking that the sum of one hundred dollars be granted to improve a road from the Methodist Church to the cemetery. It is largely signed, and was sent to me by the reverend gentleman in charge. I know this is a long felt want, and I hope the Government will give the petition every consideration. I ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the Anglo-Nfld. Development Co., having reference to the matter now before the House contained in a certain agreement made between the Government and the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Ltd. Before making any remarks on this petition I would ask the Clerk of the House to read it. (Clerk reads.) In presenting this petition at this present moment I feel it is unnecessary for me to comment on its importance. It is a respectful petition addressed to this House by the Anglo-Nfld. Development Co., in respect to certain rights which they hold under their charter from this Colony, and under which they now are carrying on extensive operations for the manufacture of paper and pulp. The petitioners set out that this con-

tract entered into with the Newfoundland Products Corporation is of such a far-reaching character that it may seriously hamper the work they are carrying on, and may affect the Anglo-Nfld. Dev. Co. detrimentally not only in the carrying on of work in actual operation, but affect the value of its securities and property generally. I feel sure that the importance of this petition will recommend it to the House, so that the petitioners will be offered an opportunity of laying before the House such matters as they desire to allege in connection with their rights. I ask that this petition be received and taken into immediate consideration before the Bill now before the House is proceeded with.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the Albert Reed Co., operating at Bishop's Falls. It is couched practically in the same words, and asks that they may be permitted to be heard before the Committee when the Bill is being considered. I have also been instructed by the West Coast Lumber and Pulp Company, the Penn Newfoundland Co., the Great Northern Development Co., Trunk Can. Co., the Gander River Lumber and Pulp Co., Messrs. Sherwood, Begant, Hoffman, Harrison and Parker, representing over a million acres of timber lands, who protest against the passage of this measure in its present form as their interests would seriously be effected thereby. I ask that this petition be considered with the one preceding.

QUESTIONS.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—I beg to table the answer to the question asked by Mr. Clift on the 25th. These documents are originals.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to lay on the table, answer to a question asked by Mr. Lloyd.

MR. MORINE gave notice of question.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colon-

ial Secretary to lay on the table all the information in relation to the following questions re Postal Telegraph: A Road, \$77.66, cable houses and expenses. What amount paid for houses and when erected. Was Government Operator Road of Curling employed at such work. If he was employed, did he also draw his regular salary as Operator while engaged at the houses. What was the amount of his expenses, and of what did it consist. Was Road to Bonne Bay with Supt. Stott laying the cable. If so, how long was he there, and what was he doing. What amount was he allowed for the trip. Who did the telegraph work at Curling while he was away from his office. Did the Government pay the Operator relieving him; if so, what rate per day.

HON. COL. SECRETARY.—The answer is in course of preparation and will be tabled as soon as possible.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns of the expenditure of Two Hundred and Thirty Dollars by D. Costello in 1912, on the public wharf at Kitchues in the District of Harbour Main.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—The answer is in course of preparation.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister what arrangements if any, have been made with the Reid-Nfld. Company with reference to operating the Trepassey Branch Railway; why the Trepassey Branch Railway has not been operated to Trepassey, and when they intend doing so.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I may say that there have been no arrangements whatever made in this respect.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement, showing accounts paid ex-Governor MacGregor during his term of office here, for travelling expenses, with copies of all vouchers for the

same.

HON. MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS.

—The answer is in course of preparation.

SUPPLY RESOLUTION.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported a Resolution, which was read a first time as follows:

Pensions \$4,958.96

The said Resolution being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolution was agreed to.

SEALING BILL.

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

LOGGING BILL.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Chairman: Who is to be appointed Clerk of the Peace?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr.

M. A. Devine has been appointed.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: The Premier has just announced that Mr. Devine has been appointed Clerk of the District Court. I understand that that position has always been held by a lawyer. I would like to ask what the Government would do in case of some very important matter coming before that Court, in the absence of a judge. I am aware that Judge Knight is not a man of strong constitution. If at any time he becomes ill, his position will have to be filled by a layman. Well, what condition will you find yourselves in? In a case similar to that happened a short time ago, where the lawyers on either side tore the law to pieces, could a layman be expected to appreciate the legal points of law involved? It means he will simply have to refer to the Minister of Justice for his opinion before acting. I consider it a great mistake putting a layman in this position. I must record my disapproval of this action, as I consider the Government should have put a lawyer there. Could not Mr. Devine be put in Mr. McCarthy's position in the Money Order Department of the Post Office, and Mr. McCarthy be given the position of Clerk of the Peace of the Magistrate's Court? It is bad enough having laymen administering law in the Outports, but here it is too serious. As far as I am concerned, speaking on behalf of the men on this row of the House, I object to the appointment of Mr. Devine.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman: Regarding this matter from the view of general principles I dare say the hon. member, who has just sat down, may be in a large measure correct, but I do not think his statements can prove the fact that a layman cannot fill this office. It is the experience of many men that the best judge we ever had in that Court was a layman, a man remarkable for

his accuracy of judgment. Major Renouf was one of the best judges I ever remember in the country. A similar example was Judge Bennett of Harbour Grace. There was never a case successfully appealed against him. As a general principle, Mr. Coaker's ideas are no doubt very applicable, but a layman can often acquit himself very well. It is only as has been pointed out, in the case of the Magistrate being absent, that the Clerk of the Peace is called upon to act.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman: I agree with Mr. Coaker in taking exception to this appointment. If anything can justify the appointment of a layman to this position it is the selection made by the Government. But the appointment of a layman is a very risky matter. Perhaps after some experience the duties of Clerk would be effectively carried out by a layman, but the administration of law is another matter. As to the case of Judge Bennett, quoted by the Premier, I remember him well. But I do not think it is quite fair to take that as a precedent. This particular Court is a very important Court. It deals with a great deal of business, and now that its jurisdiction has been increased, it deals with claims in large amounts and intricate points that necessitate a lawyer holding that position. I say this without any wish to reflect upon the individual who has been appointed, because as I say, if a layman can fill that office, then Mr. Devine will fill it as well as anyone can. But as I say a lawyer should have been put there.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Chairman: I asked a question last session as to when the Government intended to appoint a Magistrate at Bonne Bay and whom they intended to appoint. I should like to ask the Premier what the intention of the Government is.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman: up to the present time no

appointment has been made. It was very strongly represented to the Government some time ago that it was desirable to get a doctor at Bonne Bay, and it was hoped to combine the work of office and magistrate. There is no doctor there now.

MR. CLAPP.—I think there is. One came just recently.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I did not think that one had gone there since Dr. Mosdell left. In other words, the practice is hardly large enough to attract a first class doctor. That is why Dr. Mosdell left. If we could combine the office of doctor and magistrate, it would be an advantage, because it would induce a doctor to stay there. That is the reason why there has been a delay. The matter is still under the consideration of the Government.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Chairman, I mention that the practice is not confined to Bonne Bay but takes in the whole coast and to an energetic man is worth \$2000 a year. I do not think it would be wise to combine both positions for the simple reason that a medical man is often away for a week or ten days and that might be a great inconvenience to the people of Bonne Bay. If a man who understands the business of the country were appointed it would be a good thing because I think most cases coming before a Magistrate are in connection with the Fishery Rules and Regulations. I think some consideration should be given before a doctor is appointed and the people of Bonne Bay should be consulted before anyone is appointed whom they do not desire.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the combination of Doctor and Magistrate, I do not think it would be at all suitable because the doctor would be running down to the Straits, perhaps forty or fifty miles

away and would have to spend half his time away from Bonne Bay. The area is too extensive for a man to run both offices. Besides it needs a man who understands the business affairs of the Colony to administer the laws.

I asked a question the other day about the authority under which the Deputy Minister of Justice and Judge Knight were paid for the sealing enquiry.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That matter came before the Council in the regular way on the approval and recommendation of the Minister of Justice. There was a considerable amount of work in connection with the matter. Many sessions were held in the night in order not to delay the other work of these gentlemen and to get witnesses away. It is not the ordinary rule to pay the Magistrate or Deputy Minister extra for that work. They are as a rule supposed to hold these enquiries for their salaries, but this was a case entailing considerably extra work, and it was upon that principle that the payments were recommended.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that it is not the ordinary practice to pay extra in these cases, and I am pleased also that the Premier recognizes that such payments are not usual. It is an easy matter to make a claim for extra work and if it were known that the Deputy Minister of Justice and the Magistrate are getting extra pay you would have many claims on the Government for additional services. I am very pleased that the Premier says that this is a special thing and that it will not happen again.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I cannot recollect for seven years any instance where Judge Knight or Mr. Hutchings received any fee what-

over. There may have been a case, but I do not remember it.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for the details of the expenditure of \$34,990 on Tuberculosis campaign. I would like to know how the money was expended last year.

HON. MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS
That is tabbed in the public accounts.

MR. MORINE—Yes, under half a dozen heads. But I would like more details. I would like some statement showing how the estimate is made up.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Prime Minister what it is intended should be done regarding the appointment of Mr. Somerton as Magistrate of Trinity. You will remember, Sir, that I presented a number of petitions to this House on the question, and I would be very pleased if the Prime Minister would tell us what position the Government takes in the matter.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, these petitions have been sent to the Department of Justice and will come before the Government in the usual way, and if possible they will take some action in the matter. I can assure the hon. member that every consideration will be given to the prayer of the petitions and the recommendation of himself and colleagues. The appointment was not made except after very grave and careful consideration. I am sorry the appointment has not given satisfaction. I thought at the time that it would. However the matter will be considered.

MR. LLOYD—Might I ask whether the government has already taken into consideration the representation made last fall in regard to the matter.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Yes. They were before the government.

MR. LLOYD—And what action did the Government take.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—No action.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to find from the Prime Minister's remarks that in all probability the Government will respond to the prayer of the petitions presented in this matter. I have no personal feeling against Mr. Somerton, but it is simply a question of the public objecting to the appointment. If the Government will transfer him to some other place the people along that shore will be perfectly satisfied, but if they do not make some change then this thing will go on and on, and trouble will come of it. I am glad to note that the Prime Minister contemplates some change. I do not think that Mr. Somerton would like to stay there after all this row. Perhaps you could change him with some other man on the West Coast. I do not care what you do so long as you make a change there.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, Mr. Somerton is one of my personal friends, and a man for whose intellect and character I have a great respect. I happened to be down in Catalina when his appointment was made, and I was extremely sorry that he was appointed to that particular Magistracy. It would have pleased me to know that he had been appointed elsewhere. In the case of an outpost Magistrate the man appointed must be particularly above suspicion, and I think it would be extremely difficult for Mr. Somerton to remain where he is. It would certainly be for Mr. Somerton's own good and for the good of the public service that he should be appointed elsewhere. He is a good man to hold such an office and will discharge his duties without any

fear or partiality. But it would be ever so much better if he received a similar appointment elsewhere.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I see a vote here of \$4,000 for travelling expenses of magistrates. Does that include the \$5 a day they get for visiting outside places?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. JENNINGS—I remember getting the information last year that there was one magistrate who got for travelling expenses something like \$500. It strikes me that that is a very easy way to leave open to a magistrate, who after all is only mortal, a very easy way of getting \$5. I am mentioning this matter not for any personal reason, but it strikes me that way.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the case of Magistrate Squarrey. He is one of the oldest magistrates in the Colony, and he holds an office at Channel which entails a considerable amount of work for which he receives only \$150. Considering that he is one of the best and most competent men in the service, I think he should receive a higher rate of pay. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the matter. I spoke about it before. He is an old man and in a few years will likely be pensioned.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, it is a very unwise practice to allow \$5 a day for travelling. It ought to be made \$1. A Magistrate can get along quite well on \$1. Some of the Magistrates are very anxious to get away from the places where they are stationed when they can get \$5 a day. If the Government made it a rule that they were to get only \$1, they would not be so anxious to get away.

In regard to the grant of \$875 for a Magistrate at Grand Falls and \$500 for Botwood. Last year I objected to

these amounts. A magistrate at one of these places is sufficient. The Grand Falls Magistrate spends most of his time in town, while he could very well do the work that has to be done at Botwood and Lewisporte and various other places along the line. But to pay \$500 to a man at Botwood and employ half a dozen other officials that are there, and then give the magistrate at Grand Falls \$750 and \$5 a day travelling expenses is nothing but waste. I have no objection to Mr. Fitzgerald as a magistrate. He is a fairly good man, but I have an objection to two men doing one man's work. Cut out the \$500 and let the man at Grand Falls do all the work. To go on spending \$500 at Botwood is nothing but waste. The man there is unfit for his position, and never ought to have been appointed a magistrate, and very few people have any faith in what he does. The man at Grand Falls will render justice. But I certainly object to paying this \$500 to the man at Botwood.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this matter I would like to ask whether it is intended to continue the state of affairs on the South Side of Trinity Bay as in the past. For the past two or three years the magistrate has been stationed at Broad Cove. That is very inconvenient for the people on the South Side of the Bay. Originally the Magistrate was stationed at Old Perlican, but a couple of years ago he was pensioned, and a man appointed who lives at Broad Cove. He is a very good man and a personal friend of mine, but I do not think it is fair to appoint a man 21 miles away from Old Perlican, and there are a large number of people who think as I do. There are three magistrates who come over from Conception Bay to the South Side of Trinity Bay to administer justice which is not fair, and shows that the

Government has not much respect for the people of the South Side of Trinity Bay. What I want to know is why do you want a man to go from Carbonear to Heart's Content and another to go from Broad Cove to that Harbour. A man on the South Side of Trinity Bay would do both places. I do not want a new appointment. The man at Broad Cove ought to go to the South Side of Trinity Bay. I do not see why a magistrate should go from Conception Bay to the South Side of Trinity Bay. In Winterton there are a thousand people who have to travel twelve miles for every little case. The South Side of Trinity Bay is not treated right in this matter. The question should be looked into by the Government, and a man put on the South Side of Trinity Bay.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, I quite endorse what has been said by my colleague, Mr. Targett. I think his request is a very reasonable one. I do not see why the magistrate should be stationed at Broad Cove. It is not a convenient place to have a magistrate. There ought to be a magistrate for the South Side of Trinity Bay stationed at Heart's Content or Winterton.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, as I understand it the magistrate stationed at Broad Cove has no jurisdiction there. The magistrate at Carbonear has jurisdiction over Broad Cove. The man who was appointed had his home at Broad Cove, and he decided to reside there after his appointment. What ought to have been done was that he should have been asked to reside at Old Perlican. That is only fair to the people of the South Side of Trinity Bay. Since I have been travelling round that coast I have heard numerous complaints about this magistracy. These conditions should not be allowed to exist, and I think now that it

has been called to the attention of the Premier he ought to remedy it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the salary of the man at Fogo. There is only one man for the whole District and he gets a salary of \$600. If that is enough for the magistrate at Fogo other magistrates are getting over paid, while if men who are getting \$1,000 are not over paid, then the magistrate of Fogo is underpaid. It is very unfair to the District. The magistrate at Fogo should get \$900 instead of \$600. All the cases from the whole District go to him. And he should be properly paid for the work.

I quite agree with the remarks of hon. members in regard to the magistracy at Botwood and Grand Falls. The magistrate at Grand Falls spends four-fifths of his time in St. John's. If he spent four-fifths of his time at Botwood instead of at St. John's it would be much better.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, just a word in regard to the situation at Grand Falls, Botwood and Lewisporte. I had a case the other day in which a prosecution was started at Botwood when all the parties were residents of Lewisporte where there is a Justice of the Peace. It was one of those fox cases. There was considerable expense cast upon these people going to Botwood. Botwood is a port of entry, and there is sometimes quite an amount of business done there. There ought to be a good man there, and it strikes me that Mr. Fitzgerald could be appointed to undertake that work with jurisdiction at Lewisporte. You will then have an intelligent man not subject to local influence, and one who will give public satisfaction. This question of the jurisdiction of the Botwood man and the Lewisporte man is still unsettled. The question has been raised by parties as to whether the

man at Botwood had any right to summon anyone from Lewisporte when a complaint is made before the Lewisporte man. He ought not to have any jurisdiction.

The question of the jurisdiction of magistrates is a very vexed question. We have no Statute law in the country on the point. That is a subject that ought to be taken up by itself. But with regard to the present matter I think Grand Falls, Botwood and Lewisporte are certainly places that should come under one magistrate.

MR. COAKER—I think Mr. Chairman that here the Government might have combined the positions of Sub-Collector and Magistrate and thus by allowing the present Magistrate a couple of hundred dollars extra for the additional labors might have saved about \$600 and at the same time given to the Magistrate enough to live decently upon. \$600 might have been saved in this way. This matter ought now be considered by the Government. I am in no way interested personally in this matter, but think that it would have been very desirable in the interest of the government to have these positions combined.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, Just a word or two to reply to the hon. member. There has been no desire in this case to overlook Magistrate Cook. But it has been the settled policy of all recent Governments, not to combine the offices of sub-collector and magistrate, as this would make it impossible for the Magistrate to hear any case arising from violation of the Customs act.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: In connection with the vote for the Police Department, I think after the expression of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that we are entitled to a little information, we would like to know what the Minister was referring

to when he made the statement. I was wondering if there was a change contemplated or a coming vacancy in the office of Inspector-General; and if that vacancy were to be supplied in the person of the present Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think that the House is entitled to know what the Government intends to do, because this is the time to discuss the appointment and to vote any pensions, and not immediately the House closes. I am not making any special accusation, but the objection has been raised so often that if such is intended it is only fair that this House should know something about it now. I would call the attention of the Prime Minister especially to the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his official capacity when he stated that some change was pending in his department. We are naturally curious to know what the Minister evidently thought we did, and I think we are entitled to have our curiosity satisfied.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the hon. member, no such appointment has been contemplated. This matter has never come before the Government in any shape or form.

DR. LLOYD—So that is the information the Prime Minister has to give this House. Well, I gather that this matter has been under consideration for a very long time by all persons concerned.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—By whom?

DR. LLOYD—For instance, I remember when I sat on the other side of the House the matter was frequently hinted at in some quarters, and I would expect that it has been kept up ever since the Prime Minister obtained the position he now holds. This being so, it is hardly safe for the Prime Minister to tell us that absolutely nothing is going on.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The hon. member must have misunderstood me. What I said was that the matter had not come before the Government in any shape or form.

DR. LLOYD.—The Prime Minister cannot say that he knows nothing about what I have asked him, because he heard his Minister of Marine tell him about it yesterday. He has assured us, however, that nothing is contemplated in the direction of my remarks, and therefore I presume that no vacancy will be made in that department during the coming year. I am right in my statement, am I not?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Perfectly.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: While the question of the Constabulary is up, I would like to make a remark or two concerning a fox case up before the Court recently. The case of Russell and Pilley of Lewisporte. These men were summoned here, and the cases against them were dismissed because it was argued that the foxes were killed in open season. Now, I have good and sound reasons for thinking that that case was not examined into as it should have been; and if the Crown wants evidence to show that these foxes were killed as was contradicted, I can produce it. The witnesses were asked no questions. Now, our courts ought not be made a farce of in that way; the result will be that the people will have no regard for it if these things continue.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman: I would again refer to the vote for the police, which I have brought up year after year before this House. Mr. Morison promised when he was Attorney-General to have the matter considered. Last year also changes were promised in connection with the pay of these men. Now, at the present time conditions have altered, and I think that the police as a body deserve that their pay

should be sufficient to support them, and that therefore we should give them a living wage. This I am sure at the present time they do not receive. We do not appreciate these men as we ought. We accept the security their presence affords, but do not pay them a wage which their actions deserve. I would ask the Government if they have given this matter any consideration since the last session of this House. Now, it will be admitted that this is a time when curtailment, rather than increase, is in order, but I do not think that this course should be followed in the case of our police and firemen. In these cases, in my opinion, a living wage ought to be given. I think before this vote is passed we ought to reconsider the question as to whether we should not provide a living wage for these men under the present conditions. This desire for increased wages is not as much an outport question as it is a city one, and I think it would be only fair for the Government to have it attended to at once.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman: In reply to my hon. friend I may say that since this House last met, this and other matters pointed out have been under the consideration of the Government, and that this vote and also the vote for outport post offices and post masters would have been recommended for increases but for the short revenue and deficit which has made it necessary not to do anything this year. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is in the public interest to have our police vote sufficient to give them a living wage and to keep a good class of men in the Force. It is only a few years ago that the desire was expressed to improve the wages of these men over what it was 10 years ago. At that time they got an increase of from 30 to 40 per cent. on their salary, a not

half had increase, but even this is not sufficient. This department is now paid according to length of service, and this is found a much better system than the old. This matter, however, will receive the full consideration of the Government, and I hope that as a result our police and firemen will get enough increase to show them that their services are appreciated by the people and Government of this Colony.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman: The Prime Minister has given us this same reply now for the last two or three years, but that was all that resulted from my complaint. I think that something might have been done in this direction. We are now going through the Estimates and we find a lot of needless expenditure; surely the police ought to have the benefit of this and not those who receive it now for what is not as necessary. We saw by the Auditor General's report a list of new salaries and increases; yet I do not think that any of these were as essential or necessary as an increased vote to our police force. And then I notice here a full page of advertising expenses, \$100 for this paper and \$100 for that, an absolute waste of money. It would be much better for the country if this advertising were done away with and the police given a decent salary, that is a substantial increase on their present one. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this vote wait till the Government have considered this matter, and then the amount might be augmented as thought advisable.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: With regard to this matter now raised by Mr. Kent, I would like to say a word or two. I quite agree with him in what he said, and in my opinion something ought to be done. I do not agree with or advocate increases at this time, but in this special case something ought to be done. There is

no body of men in the civil service who deserve more compensation for their work than these people. \$400 is not enough for such men as these. They ought to get \$500 or \$600. How can a man bring up a family of children on \$400 a year? If the desire of the Government is to save money, then I think the best direction for them to follow is to cut out advertising so extensively as they have in the past. I think that they would find that they would save \$25,000 or \$30,000 per year by stopping this. You notice here that every Christmas number gets \$400 or \$500 for Christmas advertising. If I had to do with the distribution of this money, I would tell every publisher that came to me asking for advertisements to go and try to earn an honest dollar.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman: I would just like to say to the hon. member that the matter of curtailing as regards advertising, both at home and abroad, has been taken up by the Colonial Secretary's Department, and I have no doubt that a considerable reduction will be made in that connection. Of course, what the hon. gentleman complains of has become really a national custom. For the last ten or fifteen or twenty years the Government has been helping out these little Christmas periodicals, college magazines, and productions of that kind. It is a very difficult thing to refuse a small ad. to the organ of a particular college or a particular body—some church institution or some temperance institution. Then you have got papers devoted entirely to advertising the resources of the country. Take that little magazine over on Prescott Street, edited by Mr. Evans. Hundreds of these go away every year, to the United States and Canada, and one tourist that might come here as a result and leave some hundreds of dollars here would more than pay

for the cost of the advertisement. You will find, if you go back for a number of years, that all Governments have helped that class of work along. For years we have had arrangements with 'The Standard of Empire,' and other leading papers in England, to advertise the Colony's resources, and it would be a misfortune if we had to make a reduction in that particular. Not alone do we get an advertisement, but a good many of the articles that appear from time to time in these papers find a place there entirely because of our giving the advertisement. There is an Empire Number published every year by the London 'Times,' thousands of copies of it, in which we have an advertisement, and we have also had for a number of years a small advertisement in an illustrated paper published in London called 'Canada.' There is not an issue of that paper in which you will not find illustrations of Newfoundland and of the resources of Newfoundland, and all for a small advertisement, that, I think, probably costs three or four hundred dollars a year. Since the war broke out, our volunteers and naval reservists have had a very prominent place in these papers, and have done a good deal to advertise the Colony abroad.

Now, in reference to the pay of the Police, I would like to draw the attention of my friend who has just sat down to the fact that there are very few of the police who are only getting \$400 a year. There are 15 who are getting \$450 a year; 5 who are getting \$475; 6 at \$419; and 15 at \$401. In addition to their salaries, all these police have perquisites. Where they live in the outports, they very often have free homes, some of them free light and free fuel; then they get conduct money for serving summonses; and in other ways they add to their salaries; so that it may be safely said that all these men are getting to-day about \$500 a year. I don't

say that is enough. I should like to see the minimum wage for the police \$500, and the higher class men getting \$700; but there are only sixteen men, who are juniors and who joined this year, who are receiving less than \$400—they are getting \$365. A policeman goes in at the present time at \$365, and his salary increases year after year until it reaches something like \$600. Now, if you will go back to the year 1902, you will find that in the Estimates for that year a vote was taken for 29 constables at \$205.

MR. COAKER.—They got a rise since then?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—They got a rise, and have been getting a rise ever since.

MR. MORINE.—Give them one now.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—As I say, they have been getting one ever since. Of course, it is always good policy for the Opposition to advocate an increase for the police, and keep on good terms with them. Be that as it may, however, I shall have very much pleasure in taking the matter suggested by my hon. friend up in a very short time, and hope that it may be possible to do something.

RE PENITENTIARY.

MR. COAKER.—I would suggest that that vote remain over until we hear what the Select Committee has to say with regard to that Department.

RE LEGISLATION.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman. In connection with Legislation, I would like to call the attention of the Premier to the manner in which the publication of the debates of this House is handled. In the first place, I think that the debates should be published day by day. If they are to be of any value at all, they ought to be published when they can be of some service during the time when the House is in session. The debates of last year were not completely published

until some time in the month of August, or September. Published in that way, they are of absolutely no value to the members of the House, and I don't think that the general public takes much interest in them after the House has adjourned. When the people have got down to the summer's work, they do not take the slightest interest in the debates as published in the daily papers. The "Hansard" is all right; and the publication of the debates in the daily press is also all right, but it must be done in such a way as to be of value to the members of the House and to the public, because as it is done at the present time, and as it always has been done (what I am saying now does not refer particularly to what has been happening during the administration of the present Government any more than what has been happening during the administration of any government in the past) it is a waste of money, and I think it is time to change the system. If the debates are to be of any value, they must be published promptly.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman. I think the debates as published are not very accurate. At least, some of the reports of the debates have been very accurate, almost word for word; others have not. For instance, take the opening day of the session. What I said on that day was reported in a way that I would not recognize. I certainly did not say what was reported, and what I did say and was reported was not reported in the way in which I said it. The reporters have I know, to work very hard during the session, and there are some of them who are very good. For instance, you have got Mr. Mulcahy, Mr. McGrath and Mr. Emerson. These are experienced reporters, who have been here for a number of years. But a reporter

ought to be always an experienced man and able to take verbatim reports before he is appointed to the position of a reporter in this House.

I think, Sir, that the matter of the publication of the debates ought to receive the serious consideration of the Internal Economy Committee. If the debates are to be published in the daily press, it ought to be done promptly so that it will be of some value to the House and to the public. The cost of publishing them at the present time is practically money thrown away.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman. Just a word on this subject. It particularly interests me, having done service in the box for a number of years. I think the real cause of the trouble is that the reporters are not sufficiently paid. In this, as in every other line, if you want expert work you have got to pay for it. The amount that is paid a reporter here is not sufficiently attractive to warrant a man getting down to work and making himself proficient. The result is, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, that while the present reportorial staff includes some excellent men, yet the work is not as good as it might be. I think, as one who has been there, that if the position were made more attractive you might have here, what you have not had so far in this colony, and that is a large number of verbatim reporters. In this country so far, the exception is to find a verbatim reporter. There are not many of them here. Shorthand is taught in our schools, and the pupils are turned out with the idea that because they are able to take dictation at the rate of fifty or sixty or a hundred words a minute, they are therefore sufficiently qualified to be reporters; they appear to have no idea of how expert a man has to be in or

der to be a verbatim man or even a good man for his work, because men who have not done it have no idea of what an amount of labor reporting involves. Some of the men on the present staff are very expert reporters, probably none better in Newfoundland, but a half hour's 'take' from some of the gentleman on the opposite side gives them at least three hours copying; and when the session is busy, and the reporters have to get in the box two or three times in the course of the day, it is perfectly impossible for them to keep their work up to date. However, as I have said I think the remedy in this case is a better-paid staff.

MR. MORINE—*Mr. Chairman.* It appears to me that there are two things to which objection is taken. First, in connection with the work of the reportorial staff, and second, in connection with the publication of the debates. With regard to the work of the reporters, I would suggest that if you had a couple of typewriters—by that I mean operators as well as machines—who would occupy a room here, the reporters could, immediately upon leaving the box go down and dictate their notes to the typewriters, and so be resting, because engaged in another form of labor, while their notes are being typed; and in that way each reporter would have a very large portion, if not the whole, of his notes transcribed before being called upon again. That would immediately put the manuscript in the hands of the printers, and prevent them from having any excuse. Now I think that might be done; and while we may not have expert typists still I think the reporters would not find much fault with a couple of nice, intelligent pretty girls down stairs. I think it would be very restful, and at the same time it would give the la-

ties of the city a chance to share in the patronage of the House. No doubt, some of the members would be quite willing to go downstairs and help matters along—we might name a representative from each side.

With regard to the question of publication, that is much more difficult to deal with. First there is the question of getting the manuscript in. For last the members themselves are sometimes responsible. Some of them like to look over the reports of their speeches and to make changes; some, like myself, occasionally forget to supply some quotation; and all these things help to hang matters up, so that the newspapers get the manuscript very slowly. If, however, you rush the matter along to the papers, then you will have a ground upon which to insist that the papers shall publish a large portion daily, even if they have to put out an extra page or two in order to keep up to date; because I think we will all agree that the value of publishing the debates depends to a large extent upon the promptness with which they are published. Within a week after this House closes, the last word of the debates ought to be in the newspapers. From the newspapers standpoint I believe they suffer a good deal from having to delay week after week waiting for manuscript; so that if we can furnish them with the manuscript, it is to their own interest to publish it immediately.

MR. CURRIE—*Mr. Chairman.* I would just like to say a word or two though the last speaker pretty well covered the ground. I had four years' experience as Supervisor of Debates in this House and know something of the difficulties one has to get up against in connection with this matter. We have not, unfortunately,

a sufficient number of experienced reporters to do the work. We have on the staff at the present time several gentlemen who are experienced reporters, but these men have other work to perform. They come up here and take the work, and they have to try to transcribe it late at night or early in the morning, and as a consequence they are anything but prompt in handing it in. This year, I understand, the Internal Economy Commission has made a change in the rules, whereby no reporter gets paid until his work is all in. Prior to this year the rule was to pay half the salary, \$75.00, when the House opened, and the balance upon the Supervisor certifying that the work was completed. Under the present rule, therefore, the reporters, if they want to get their money quickly, will have to do the work quickly. From the newspapers standpoint, what Mr. Morine has said is perfectly correct. No newspaper wants to handle this work in the way in which it has to be handled now. The manuscript is too slow, and the papers are not able to get it fast enough. So far as the "News" is concerned, every line that has been sent to the office up to today has been printed. I think the Supervisor sent in some today, which will appear tomorrow or the next day. The newspapers today are able to handle within forty-eight hours all the manuscript that is sent them. The delay is not caused by the newspapers, but by the fact that it is impossible to get the manuscript in. As Mr. Morine has also stated, some of the members get copy and hold it for three or four days, or longer, and the Supervisor cannot get it back. Then there is another matter, from the reporters' point of view. Some of the gentlemen in this House who are remarkably good speakers, have the habit of talk-

ing at the rate of several hundred words a minute, or at all events they talk very fast; the result is that the reporter gets down about one word in ten, and then when he starts to transcribe he has not the slightest idea of what the man has said, and that makes his work extremely difficult.

MR. MORINE—I don't agree with you at all.

MR. CURRIE—It is a fact. Sometimes some of these members, when they get excited, go off like a steam-engine, and no reporter is able to take down what they say. That very frequently occurs. I have had twenty years' experience in newspaper work and can report a man of any ordinary rate of speed, but there have been times when I have not been able to follow some of our speakers at all, so far as reporting them is concerned.

MR. MORINE—I presume I am one of those to whom the hon. gentleman refers, because as a matter of fact I suppose I am one of the most rapid talkers on this side of the House. I do not agree with his view. On the other hand I think that a reporter has more trouble in following a casual halting speaker than one who talks fluently and straight to the point. I remember that the best reporter of my speeches that I ever had in this House was a long-hand reporter, Mr. Herbert Knight. He turned out splendid work all the time, because he used his intelligence. He did not attempt to take down speeches absolutely verbatim, but took a word here and there, following the drift of what was said, and always sent in good reports. However, I know our reporters do the best they can, and under all the circumstances they are doing very well. What we want to do is to help them.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on this subject. Last year I made a few remarks

while the Estimates were being discussed. They were published and reached the district of Twillingate some months afterwards. I had forgotten all about what was said, and was pretty busy with my own work at the time; and was surprised when certain parties came to me, showed me the published reports of my remarks, and asked me: If I had said this? If I were responsible for that? and so on; and I had to sit down, try and remember what happened, and tell them what I really had said. Now, if there were any way of improving the system so as to make the reporting accurate, I think it would be well to do it, because I would rather not be reported at all, than have remarks credited to me which I did not make.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I was waiting to see whether the Premier would make any reply to the observations of the various speakers. I certainly think we ought to make some effort to improve things in this respect. If a vote of \$1,000 or \$2,000 is necessary to make this thing right, why, so far as we on this side are concerned, we give it our warmest approval. The suggestion regarding typewriters is alright, and if the House thinks that the work would be facilitated in that way, why not have it done. I certainly object to the way in which I have been reported here. It may have been my fault in many cases—I have been speaking too fast—but I do strongly object to the way in which my remarks were reported last session.

Some of what was said here last year did not come out in print until August. It ought to be all published within ten days after the House closes. The debates are useless to the outports after so long a time. I think that it should be arranged that one paper take up one day's work, and an-

other, another day's work and so on. I do believe that you can facilitate matters greatly by doing that. I hope that the Government will take this matter up before we begin another day's debate.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We will take the matter up immediately and endeavour to do something in this direction.

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.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of saying something in connection with the contract now before us; to give some reasons why the contract as it now stands must not receive the approval of this House before going into that aspect of the matter, I would like to look at certain principles which justify my taking that attitude. I would like also to make it clear that I am not treating this matter as a party question, or raising any objection to something being done to further development of Newfoundland.

I would like to draw attention to

the fact that for the past quarter of a century, both parties in this House have been making concessions, giving away water, timber, fee simple rights inland, in the hope of promoting developments in Newfoundland, affording work to all classes of labour seeking to foster an increase of population, and revenue. We do not object to large expenditures in the proper direction such as education. I should like to see a large increase there if we could afford it, but we cannot afford it. We find that we have been going ahead faster than our revenues enabled us to do. But that is all the more reason why every man in this House should do what in him lies to see that we get an adequate return for what we give. Further I say that though I have been one of those who have drawn attention to the promoters of this company, it is not because they are the Reid Nfld. Co., or any other. I do not say that because the Reid Brothers are the promoters of this that it should be condemned. They already control large interests in this Colony, notably the railway system. They hold millions of acres of land in fee simple. Both parties in this House have contributed towards giving them these interests. But there are facts relating to the bill itself that must be taken into consideration. The experience of the past 25 years is such as should make us halt to consider carefully, before going further.

The Reid Nfld. Co. have extraordinary interests in this Colony. I passed the earlier part of my life in South Lancashire where a very large amount of cotton is manufactured. The climate is such that it contributes largely to the success of the cotton manufacture. It rests on a coal field; indeed the cotton industry is based on the fact that there is coal there. It is the same elsewhere. The success of any

large manufacture is based on the fact that something is easy to get there. In this case our great resource is our water power. And therefore we ought to take care what we are doing, and be reasonable in looking after ourselves, and at the same time we ought to give this proposition fair consideration.

That is the spirit in which I approach this question. What are we asked to do? I am going to deal with this matter from the standpoint laid down by the member for Bonavista.

In Bay of Islands they ask for rights over the drainage area of the Humber. That is very large. If you look at the map, you will see that it includes a very large drainage area, running in the direction of White Bay and South beyond Grand Lake. Much that is outside of that area they also want. This matter needs great consideration. If we give those grants we must see that we get fair returns. Outside of that area there is a request for water power that would include practically the whole centre of the island. If we turn to the first section of the agreement we find that the company is asking not only for water powers, but the power to control the whole of the western drainage area, including Grand Lake, and to do what is necessary for their purposes in connection with every stream therein. There is a complete absence of information in connection with these water powers. We have no report dealing with the point. We ought to have the whole of the information before us. It will be noticed that the whole thing amounts to the asking for the power to handle the whole drainage area of the Humber. On turning to the map which the Premier has laid before us, it will be observed that a large section is blocked off.

I would like to draw the attention

of the Committee to this,—to the southern boundary of that area. An examination of the Southern boundary of that area and the local topography will reveal this fact that there is a number of very valuable locations for water powers situated just within the area. For instance it takes in the North part of Red Indian Lake—and the very fact of the establishment of a water power under the concessions made and the promise of similar concessions in regard to this area gives them the power to control the whole of Red Indian Lake and the waters which drain into it. Then going a little further we come to Victoria River. They control that area; by the acquisition of water powers there they get the right of controlling the whole drainage area which runs into Victoria River. That runs pretty well down to Burgess and La Poudre. Going further you come to Noah Paul's Brook. They have the control of the entrance of that tributary, and with the concessions made to them they get control of practically the whole centre of the country outside of the limits marked here. Then again, if you turn to the Gander we find the mouth of the Gander within the limit; so that if a water power is acquired at the mouth of the Gander under the concessions spoken of they obtain the control of the whole drainage area of the Gander.

Now, Sir, if any member will take the trouble to look at the map he will find that this acquisition gives the Products Company absolute control over a whole host of private individuals, and a whole host of corporations who have timber limits not only in the described area, but all the extensive limits to the South till you get to the watershed running into Burgess and draining into Fortune Bay and Placentia Bay. Now it would be reas-

onable to consider water powers that would contribute to the industries which will be established at Bay of Islands; but here you have an immense area covering half the country, divested altogether from Bay of Islands, and having no connection with it, and, from the speech which I heard Mr. Willson deliver, which has nothing to do with the Bay of Islands enterprise, and which is only thrown in as part of the bargain, I think the whole thing highly improper, and it ought to be rejected and not considered by this House. I do not want to go at this stage to the Labrador. I shall hardly have time, and I shall reserve my remarks for another time. I will get now to what I consider the crux of the whole position.

Anyone who reads the contract and the resolutions covering the contract will be compelled to come to the view that everything possible has been done to conserve and make sure and perpetuate any suggested concession to this Company. But if you look at the Resolutions there is not one single word from the beginning of the Resolutions to the end which attempts to restrict or limit or assure or perpetuate any interest of the Colony—not one single word.

Now Sir, that naturally leads to the question how are the interests of the country conserved in this contract? Now I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the second clause. I would like to direct the attention of the Committee to clause No. 2 of the Agreement which is contained on page 21 of this Green Book, and well down in that section these words can be found. They have reference to development work on the Labrador:—"The Company shall within five years from the date hereof expend in the development of said water powers and the construction and operation of its plant in Labrador

the further sum of ten million dollars." Now the words to which I wish to direct attention are the specific undertaking that a large sum of money shall be expended in the development of the said water powers, and the construction and operation of the plant. That is that there is to be a plant and the actual development of water power, and the actual expenditure on the plant and undertaking, and that that money shall be spent in reference to Labrador, or if not spent then the fee simple grant shall be void. Now that is specifically laid down, and it naturally turns our attention to the clause which deals with the undertakings of the Company in regard to the whole contract, and particularly with regard to its holdings in Newfoundland. Bearing in mind the undertaking to spend money in the development of water powers, and the construction of a plant on Labrador, I will now ask you to look at clause 18. That is practically the undertaking clause of the Company. I shall read it. "The Company undertakes to begin actual construction work upon its undertakings within two years from the date of these presents." First I would like to draw your attention to this fact, there is no definition of what the Company's undertaking is. It may mean anything. If the Company's undertaking is to be the actual development of the water powers and the plant at Bay of Islands, if it is to be the actual construction of the electric furnace or coke furnaces, if it means the processes by which the nitrogen is extracted from the air to make the nitrogen compounds which is the particular feature of the proposition before us, and then afterwards develop the ammonia salts—if by the undertaking is meant these manufactures and processes, then it should be specified clearly. At present there is

absolutely no definition of what it means. There has already been some comment on the point of beginning actual construction. There is no undertaking to go on with the construction even if it has only spent five dollars. The next point is more important . . . "to spend a sum of five million dollars within the Island of Newfoundland in and about the business operations of the Company within five years from the date of these presents, and if the Company fails to begin such work or expend such money within the times mentioned this agreement shall be void." Now I wish to dwell upon this feature, that in clause 2 to which I have directed your attention, there is an undertaking to spend ten million dollars on the Labrador on the Company's water powers plant and works. There is no such undertaking in this clause. It can be spent in connection with the business of the Company, in connection with the operations of the Company. Now there is nothing in the clause that lays down that the business of the Company shall be carbide works or ammonia plants. It has already been pointed out that it may be anything within the limits of the Memorandum and Articles of Association, and may not contain one single factory connected with the fertilizer scheme. That is the dangerous clause. I am not attributing to the Reid Brothers or any of the promoters that it is their intention to collar the resources without spending money on the construction of a plant; but the promoters of this Company may fail absolutely to raise the eighteen million dollars talked of by the Premier, or even the five million mentioned in this contract, and they may fail absolutely within the next year. They may fail to get the money and may fail to put up any fertilizer

plant at Bay of Islands, and if they do fail to do development work at Bay of Islands in connection with the fertilizer plant or the development of the water powers the agreement will necessarily be void and all the concessions fail. Now I wish to point out that here there is a means by which the promoters can conserve all those interests and retain all the benefits of the Contract without spending one cent upon construction work should they fail to obtain this money through no fault of their own, or through fault of their own. Should they fail to obtain this money and do any development work there is a means of retaining all the concessions under the Contract so far as Newfoundland is concerned without spending one cent at Bay of Islands on the water powers or on the fertilizer plant. I would like to point out how it can be done, and how it is likely to be done if it is necessary to do it. All that is necessary is for the Products Company to pay five million dollars in bonds for the holdings of the Reid Newfoundland Company for their lands or water powers or anything else they have, and if they spend five million dollars in acquiring these properties and rights from the Reid Newfoundland Company they satisfy this section, and retain all the rights given in regard to Newfoundland. What does that mean? It probably means that so far as they are concerned all they have to do is to take five million dollars out of one pocket and put it into another. Take five million dollars worth of bonds from the Products Company and put it into the Reid Nfld. Company and they have satisfied the contract without the expenditure of one cent. Now, Sir, this is not good enough. I am not accusing them of an intention to do this; but I am pointing out that it can be done, and if it is done it

satisfies the contract, and they retain all the concessions given. That is why I say if there is a specific undertaking by the Company to spend five million dollars in Newfoundland on the development of water powers, and on the construction of these factories, and electric furnaces, carbide plants, chemical plants, and all such undertakings; if there is a sound undertaking, and it is the intention that the Agreement shall fall if these undertakings are not carried out, then we ought to be careful as to this proposal. If there is no undertaking then the consideration given for the Contract is illusory and useless, and we are grasping at a shadow; giving up substantial interests and getting nothing in return. Now Sir, may I point out another reason why we put temptation in the way of the Reid Newfoundland Company to transfer its landed interests to the Products Company. Under the Railway Contract the land of the Reid Newfoundland Company becomes taxable, a subject to taxation immediately it is improved and worked upon; whereas if the Reid Nfld. Co transferred its landed interests to the new company they escape all taxation in regard to improved land; and not only do they escape all taxation in regard to improved land, but they get the benefit of getting all the concessions given in this Contract in regard to Newfoundland without spending one cent in construction work. Now, Sir, as I have already pointed out you ought to treat this proposition as a business proposition—that a suitable return should be given to us, and that that suitable return should take the form of an undertaking that the whole contract shall fail, unless this money is actually expended in regard to these factories and water powers at Bay of Islands.

With regard to the other concess-

ion, the concession throughout the rest of the interior of Newfoundland, as they are unconnected with any clear business proposition for the carrying on of any work then they ought to be rejected, and rejected absolutely, because it has nothing to do with any definite proposition of development. I have already illustrated that the great industries of England rest on the coal fields, and should any one corporation control the coal fields they would control every manufacturing industry in England. The water powers in Newfoundland in regard to our development stand in the same relation and unless in connection with some specific undertaking no water power should be given; and this throwing in of water powers over the whole interior of Newfoundland for no purpose whatever except to enable the Reid Newfoundland Company to control the interior to a greater extent in order to make better bargains in any future promoting scheme is totally without justification.

I have already drawn attention to the fact that there is a great temptation for the Reid Newfoundland Company to place all its lands under the new Company in order to escape taxation when these lands are developed. Now I regard the proposals in regard to taxation as altogether unreasonable. Reasonable concessions might be asked for and given. There might be an exemption from municipal taxation for a period of years. For my part I would be quite content to give a twenty year exemption. I would be prepared to give them exemption in regard to construction material and some limited exemption in regard to raw material; and also to give an undertaking that these raw materials should only be taxable to a very limited extent; but I am not prepared to

assent to the proposition that shares and particularly their dividends—no matter what dividends may be declared, shall be forever free from taxation. In fact I cannot conceive for what purpose—except to see how much it was possible to get out of the legislature—any body of reasonable men should approach a legislature and ask that no matter what profits they may make forever they should never be subject to any taxation, except it might be on coal. It is an absolutely unreasonable and improper concession to ask for. I hope the Government will take into consideration the various objections and criticisms made from this side of the House. I would commend to their serious attention the remarks which have come from this side. They have not been made from any party standpoint. I am prepared to vote for reasonable concessions in connection with a business proposition where there is an undertaking that the money shall be spent in actual development of water powers and actual construction work; provided the concessions in regard to taxation be more reasonable and be limited in time; and that, with regard to dividends, within five or six years after they have been paying dividends some reasonable contribution should be made towards the upkeep of the country; but I am not prepared to support this proposal. I am not prepared to support the giving away of all our valuable water powers all over the Island, not only for nothing, but for no object—absolutely no object, except it may be to put them in the control of a body of men who already are in control of very much. We do not object to the Reid Brothers getting concessions because they are the Reid Brothers; and we do not object to them getting water powers if it is for reasonable development purposes; but

we ask, and fairly ask, that a proper bargain be made with them, and if we give up water powers to the Reid Newfoundland Company and the Reid Brothers, they should give something in return. I do not think if we give them a very valuable water power on the Labrador and ask them in return to hand back some of the fee simple lands of the country, or that they undertake to develop these lands which they have so far been able to develop that we would be asking too much. If we give them these valuable concessions they should give us something in return. If they are prepared to come to us with any kind of a fair deal I am prepared to support it; but if this is the proposition I am not prepared to support it, and I shall endeavour to prevent it going through, even if I have to remain here all the summer.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

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

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, May 3rd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 3rd, 1915.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the Central Forests Co., Ltd., relating to certain resolutions before the House in connection with the Newfoundland

Products Corporation. This Company is identified with the A. E. Reed Co., and begs to lay certain matters before the House when it goes into Committee on this subject.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Channel on the subject of prohibition. I can assure the petitioners on behalf of the Government that this case will receive their careful attention, and do when the time comes what will be necessary. I beg leave to ask that this petition be referred to that Department to which it relates.

QUESTIONS.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the returns for all monies sent to Captain John Collins, Sr., of Catalina, for the years 1912-1913; (2) also, copy of the returns for all monies sent Captain Albert Haynes, of Catalina, for same years.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I hope to be able to table the answer of this question to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement of all expenditures of the main line grant from Renewals to Trepassey for the years 1912, 1913 and 1914, and all returns connected with the same.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The answer is being prepared.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House a statement of the names of holders of timber and water power rights, with the areas of such rights, within forty miles of Humbermouth.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg leave to table the answer.

MR. MORINE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement, showing how much money has been paid

out in special and local grants for roads and bridges, during the past two years, to each of the Road Boards at Highlands, Crabbe's and Robinson's Head.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The answer is being prepared.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House a copy of the grant of water power on Junction Brook to the Penn Newfoundland Company.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—This will be furnished.

SUPPLY RESOLUTION.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported a Resolution, which was read a first time, as follows:

Legislation \$33,750.00

The said Resolution being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolution was agreed to.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: You will remember that I endeavoured to lay down the proposition that we ought to promote as far as lay in our power any industry we conveniently could, granting what concessions might be necessary for its promotion, provided we were confident that the project was a clear and definite undertaking that would ensure the spending of money in the development of our waterpowers and the constructing of works in connection therewith. I

also pointed out that the fact that the Reid Brothers were the promoters of this scheme should in no way affect our criticism. I consider that the granting of privileges connected with the eastern area is absolutely outside of any works contemplated at Bay of Islands. Now, Sir, in reference to that matter, as the Contract now stands, whatever the intention of the Government may be, and I have no doubt after having heard the Premier's speech what that intention is, I have no doubt that the Premier and the Government had in mind that this expenditure in Newfoundland should be an expenditure at Bay of Islands on water powers and such like construction works; although that is perfectly clear from the tone of the Premier's speech, it should be remembered that if a question arises subsequently and the issue had to be decided by the Court the intention of the Government so far as set forth in the Premier's speech would not be in evidence. A Court would be governed not by what the Premier had said, but by the actual words of the Contract, and therefore in considering this matter we have to follow exactly what the contract says. And I pointed out that so far as the words are concerned there is no undertaking at all that this \$5,000,000 should be spent at Bay of Islands or should be spent in Newfoundland on the development of water powers or other works. It would be quite sufficient for the Company to spend \$5,000,000 in the course of the business of acquiring property and rights from the Reid-Neil Co. I have learned that the Government has decided that there shall be no doubt about this matter. They have decided to make it clear before this contract passes the House that the \$5,000,000 shall be spent at Bay of Islands, and spent in the development of water powers and in construction works. But, Sir, even if that is done,

there is still another point to be considered in connection with the same clause, 18. This is the clause upon which the material consideration of the Contract rests. I would like, Sir, to draw your attention to that clause: "The Company undertakes to begin actual construction work upon its undertaking within two years from the date of these presents and to expend a sum of five million dollars within the Island of Newfoundland in and about the business and operations of the Company within five years from the date of these presents, and if the Company fails to begin such work, or expend such money within the times mentioned, this agreement shall be void."

Suppose, Sir, that this is altered to meet the points already raised, suppose it is made to read that this money shall be spent at Bay of Islands, and in and about the development of water powers and construction work, suppose that all this is put in so that there will be no mistake on that point, still there is a very serious matter to be considered, and that matter depends upon the construction of the latter part of the clause, "And if the Company fail to begin such work and to expend such money on these works at Bay of Islands, within the time mentioned, this agreement shall be void." I would ask you to look at the last four words, and I am assuming that the contract has been altered so that there is no doubt about the expenditure of the money at Bay of Islands. I wish to point out that the agreement provides that it shall be void on a violation of the agreement, on a failure to do something in the future, but not before. Up to that time the agreement is valid, and I would point out that when it does become void it does not say in express terms that the agreement shall be void ab initio. It does not say that it will be void as from the date of the

Contract. The only meaning that can be put upon that is that the agreement shall be void as from that date, as from five years hence. Now, Sir, what is the effect of that? It means that on the failure of the agreement what the Government undertakes to do during the currency of the agreement shall not be binding on them, and what the Contractor undertakes to do so long as the agreement is in force shall no longer be binding on him. That is clear. There is no doubt about that. But what of the past? What about all that has happened during the five years? Unless avoidance of the Contract is made to date back to the date of its making, everything that is done under the contract is valid. The most important point of that is that as soon as the Contract is confirmed it leases certain water powers on the Humber. That act is complete in itself. It is finished with. It is valid and binding. And they can avoid all the Contract five years hence and yet not avoid that lease.

If it is the intention of the Government and I presume that they do intend that the lease of the water powers shall be void, the proper place to make it revert back to the Government is in the clause creating the demise. And I ask the Government that when they take up this matter to reconstruct, as I understand they intend to reconstruct that clause, that they will insert something to the effect that if this \$5,000,000 is not spent at Bay of Islands in connection with the development of water powers and in connection with the construction of their works that the lease referred to shall revert to the Crown. That I take it is the real intention of the Government. My point at present is that it is not as yet stated in the Contract. It is not a fair inference from the words of the Contract to assume that that is the intention

of the parties; but if it is the intention of the parties it should be specifically stated in the clause, just as in section 2 when you have a grant of the water powers on Labrador, you refer to the expenditure of \$10,000,000 within a certain time and if they fail to do this the grant of the water powers is to be void. Those words are clear, they express the clear meaning in connection with the Labrador water powers. If that is stated in clause 2 why not have it stated clearly in clause 1 in connection with the demise of the water powers of the Humber. I would point out in connection with that lease that there is no condition attached to it. It is an absolute lease. The only thing that is said to be voidable is, not the lease, but anything that the government would be called upon to do after five years.

Now I pass on to another point. I have already expressed the opinion that in regard to the leasing or granting of private water powers, the government should obtain a fair quid pro quo in consideration for what they give. Now, sir, these grants or leases are made without any consideration in the form of rental in money. When you consider the figures laid before us by the incorporators there appears no reason whatever why the Company should not pay a fair rental for what it gets. I was struck with the elaborate detail with which certain parts of the undertaking have been mapped out and the very considerable amount of information that was given in some respects as to the Company's plans. We have had laid before us, from, I understand, the engineers report to the promoters, the cost of each of the ten dams and everything connected with the development of water powers. It is estimat-

ed that an expenditure of \$6,440,300 will be required on capital account for the development of 119,500 horse power. That works out at \$53.85 per horse power. These are the figures from the Engineer's report. They come roughly to \$54 per horse power. Now that capital expenditure is comparatively low when we consider the value of these powers when developed. I have here, not in connection with this matter, but in connection with other matters, a paper giving some idea of the value of horse powers in various parts of Canada. In the case of the little town of Prince Albert, for an expenditure of \$53 to \$54 per horse power, they get an income of from \$30 to \$35. That is a pretty big return on \$54. Well over 60%, 60% income on capital expenditure. Now, Sir, to show that that is by no means extraordinary I would like to point out another statement as to the value of electrical power at Regina. And this power is obtained not from a water power but from coal. "Although coal brought from some distance has to be used in producing the electricity the corporation is able to supply current at \$59.40 per horse power, so that if it were at Regina it would bring in every year in return far more than the capital expenditure, more than one hundred per cent"

Now, Sir, I am not putting up these figures as necessary figures for this Company. I am willing to concede for the sake of argument that they may be calculating getting only \$5 or \$6 per horse power per annum, that would be ten per cent profit on their expenditure per horse power. The point arrived at is this that even if you only place \$5 or \$6 per annum as the value per horse power of this water power this Company could well afford to pay a rental on the horse power developed.

This proposition is by no means out of the way for I find that that is precisely what is done in Ontario. I have before me some information obtained from a publication issued by the Conservation Commission of Canada. I find that some Companies are supplying to large concerns power at very much less rates than those already quoted, but I do not find anything lower than \$10 per horse power. At that rate the horse power developed at Bay of Islands is worth \$1,200,000, per annum, even at the low rate of ten dollars per horse power. I have already pointed out that as far as we are concerned the water powers of this country stand to us in the same relation as the coal fields of England stand to the industries of England. We ought therefore to conserve them, and let them out so as to get some return for them, and not throw them away with prodigality.

I find in this publication certain regulations that have been adopted in Ontario in regard to the dealing with and letting out of water powers. Some of them are interesting, as they afford considerable illumination in reading the Contract now before us. I would like to read a few. Upon complying with the regulations a lease of water privileges may be issued to the applicant upon such terms as may be approved by the Minister. There is a rental reserved in each lease. "No lease shall be granted for a longer term than twenty years, but the lessee shall have the right of renewal of such lease for two further successive terms of ten years upon such terms and conditions as shall be agreed upon by the Minister." There you see that the furthest term for the granting of a lease in Ontario is forty years. That ought to be sufficient in any case, and it is the example of a Province that has had extensive ex-

perience in these matters, and we ought then to have a Commission to investigate the value and extent of the water powers at the end of the forty year limit. But even under all the circumstances of the case the very farthest extent of this lease ought not to be more than 99 years. And this House ought not to grant a perpetual renewal of that lease; because if we grant them a lease for 99 years we are granting them a period two and a half times as long as is granted in Ontario. Now, Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the next section. "The right of timber owners to drive logs of timber down any stream or over any body of water as now by law established shall not be interfered with, lessened or restricted by any grant of any such lease and no dam or other structure shall be built in connection with the development of these privileges with the object or effect of damming the water or interfering with its flow, unless proper provision shall be made for the driving of logs over the same." My object in referring to that is to draw attention to the first part of the clause where it says that the lease shall not interfere with the rights of others. I would draw your attention to the extraordinary clause in the Contract before you, which has already been commented on by the hon. member for Bonaville. Section 26 reads: "Notwithstanding the grant of the water powers herein all persons shall have the right to the temporary use of the said waters for the purpose of passing to and fro in small boats, and for the purpose of floating logs and lumber belonging to such persons to their mills provided that such use shall not interfere with or prejudice the business or operations of the Co." The whole matter is topsy turvy. In Ontario the onus is upon the Lessee

not to interfere with private rights. Here you place the Company's rights above those of individuals. Now, Sir, I think the best thing that can be done is to adopt the Ontario precedent, and say that the Lessee shall not have all the right or interfere with the rights of others.

There is another matter about which I would like to say a word or two and that is the scarcity of information, and I think that this committee should have this before it is called upon to discuss this clause. I refer, sir, to clause 4 of this agreement which exempts from taxation all the stock, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages and other securities of this company.

I notice in the preamble the following:

"AND WHEREAS the Company has acquired by assignment the rights of the patentees in the Colony and its Dependencies in and to the following patents, namely: No. 184, dated April 21st, 1914, for manufacturing Phosphoric Acid and Phosphates, and No. 189 dated May 16th, 1914, for a method of making nitrogen compounds, and No. 190 dated May 18th, 1914, for Phosphoric Acid Products, and No. 193 dated July 25th, 1914, for method of producing Nitrogen and Compounds and No. 196 dated Aug. 22nd, 1914, for method of manufacturing ammoniated double super-phosphate, and which patents have been granted to Jesse Critz King and by him assigned; AND WHEREAS the Company has also acquired by assignment all the rights of the said Jesse Critz King in and to an invention of improvements in the method of manufacturing nitric acid and for which a patent has been applied."

That in itself throws no light upon the enacting clause. It is merely a statement to the effect that a certain

man has applied for a patent and that the rights of this patent have been assigned to this company. It is extraordinary because it does not give any information as to what is meant by its insertion in this Bill. No information is given and we are just left to grope and find out why this clause is put here without any information to start on. I presume the object of this clause is to give the company confirmation of these patents, otherwise there is no necessity for it.

We are asked to do something extraordinary in the way of changing the Patent Law, for the Products Company. Now this needs some explanation and it will need some adequate cause before the patent law shall be over ridden. Now, Sir, it is clear that there was something in view when this cause was included in the bill. With the patent law as it is now, the government has the power to grant patents for a period of 21 years. They may grant it for fourteen years at the date of application and at the end of that time it is renewable for seven more, or in all 21 years; notice in looking at the dates of these patents that they are all except one, 1914 ones; and that one is a 1915 one. Now sir, why is it necessary to have this clause included here. There must be some reason or we would not be asked to pass it. If this is a safe venture and I presume it is, why is it necessary to have this clause inserted. The company has 21 years to use their patents and at the end of that time if the company is as safe as it has been suggested here it is, why should they need an enactment to safeguard their patents? By that time they should be so situated as to make opposition an impossibility. There must be some reason which is not known to this House.

Now I would ask that we be told what this reason is.

The absence of explanation leaves us to conjecture what that reason may be; but this is a thing that this House should not have to do. If these patents were patents registered in some other country there might be some possible reason for the necessity of this clause but we are given no information. We are not told but perhaps these patents had already expired and were registered again, and we may be passing something illegal; I do not say this is the case but no information given this House makes this an impossibility. We ought to be told whether the patent we are asked to confirm is valid or invalid. This is the time for any invalidity to be pointed out and not after the measure has been passed. In these days of adventurers it is of the utmost importance that great care be practiced. I do not say that the promoter of this company is one of these adventurers, but being left to conjecture we must include this in our conjecture. I repeat Mr. Chairman, that there should be an extraordinary reason for this House to overrule the Patent Law in this manner. There may be some cause, some just necessity for having this clause inserted, but if this is the case why not let the House know of it. We should not be asked to give a 'carté blanche' for anything they may desire without first assuring ourselves of its necessity. As I have said we may be granting something which is not ours to grant, and may be granting patents in cases where patents are illegal. I have expressed myself several times here to-day in the form of conjecture. I did this because this was the only way left us.

One other thing, sir, should be attended to before this bill is passed and that is, the water powers ceded

this company should be more limited. There are water powers over which this Government has no control and the bill should be so arranged that these are exempted from the provision of this bill. I would suggest that the Government study more carefully the water powers granted and so know what they are granting.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman: When I brought this matter before the House some days ago, I went into it very fully, with the view that the Contract in all its details might be before the House. I think at that time I gave hon. members as much information as it was possible to give. Since then I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches that have been made on the other side of the House by the hon. member for St. John's East, the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, and the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, who has just closed. With very few exceptions, I have nothing whatever to find fault with as regards the tone of these speeches; but as regards the deductions that have been drawn from the agreement and the interpretations that have been put upon it, I shall have a good deal to say; but, as I have said, with the exception of a few points, which I shall deal with as I go along, I have to find no fault with the spirit which has run through the debate.

Mr. Kent, the Leader of the Opposition, opened by making a strong appeal to us from a patriotic standpoint, and he was followed by Mr. Morine and Dr. Lloyd to some extent in the same strain. All things considered, the speeches, viewed from the standpoint of an opposition, were fair; though I cannot at all admit that any of the constructions, or very, very few of them, from an interpretation standpoint, can fairly be sustained.

First, I would like to draw the attention of Mr. Morine to the fact that it is not correct, as stated by him in his opening remarks, that the agreement and the resolutions were drawn and prepared by the counsel for the Company, the Solicitor of this House, Mr. Furlong. Several days before he made that statement I told the House, in his presence, that that was not so. They were not drawn by the Solicitor of the Company. I think it was in reply to a question from Dr. Lloyd that I made the statement. If he will look at the Telegram for April 24th he will find that the statement I made was this: "The Premier, Sir Edward Morris replied that the Attorney General and himself had acted for the Government, and that the matter had also been looked after by the other legal members of the Executive Council." That was the statement which I made. Now, as regards the Resolutions confirming the agreement: "In reply to Dr. Lloyd, the Premier said that the resolutions confirming the Contract were drafted at his request by the Solicitor of the House and submitted to the Attorney General and himself."

Now, that is the statement that I made. In other words, the agreement was not drawn by Mr. Furlong, but by the Attorney General, and the other legal members of the Council. It is quite true that the original proposal came from Mr. Furlong, as the Solicitor of the Company, but there is nothing of that original in the agreement which we have before us to-day. It has been drafted and redrafted again and again and again, and not a section or a line as originally proposed now remains. As regards the resolutions, when they came to be drafted I drew the Attorney General's attention to the fact that it was proper that we should have them before us with a view of seeing that they contained

nothing except what was absolutely necessary to confirm the agreement. When they were drafted, and before the final printing, I had a meeting with the Attorney General; the Colonial Secretary and Mr. Furlong were present; and we went over the Resolutions word for word.

Now, the next point I should like to call attention to is the statement made by Mr. Morine. He says: "We were told here in the House by the Premier in words to the effect that persons having interests in lands upon the Humber and in the watershed of the Humber, had assigned their rights although there is nothing they can show, no agreement, no assignment in support of such statement."

I made no such statement. What I did say was that we conferred no rights, merely by a recital in the agreement, as regards assignments. There is a recital there in relation to assignments, but if the assignments have not been made, the recital does not make them.

MR. MORINE.—I am misreported there. I did not say you said it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, I am glad of that. The same is true as regards patents. We knew as a matter of fact that patents had been granted by the Governor in Council. We were not interested in seeing the assignments, because that would have been of no interest to us. They had been assigned, and as to the consideration for which they were assigned was a matter in which the Government had no interest. The question discussed here by my friend, Dr. Lloyd this evening, on this point, is one that we will be better able to deal with when we come to it later on.

My learned friend, the hon. member for Bonavista, then dwelt to some extent on the interests in the water shed of the Humber. The only rights that we know of here are a number of mining claims, a list of which I have

here, and which I shall be glad to table for the information of the House. I also have a memo. as regards the grants of land in the Humber watershed for agricultural and timber purposes, the land claimed at Humbermouth and not granted, the applications for land at Humber River, and a list of timber licenses and leases of water powers on the Humber River, Junction Brook, and the Humber River drainage area. Now, all the holders of water powers are adequately protected, because the demise in the first section specially states that nothing passes where there are any rights under grants, leases or licenses. Every right, whether it be conveyed by grant, license or lease, is specially exempted from the demise. If there are any imaginary rights, or speculative rights, or any other rights that may be called into existence in order to block the development of this country, then we cannot deal with these. We are only concerned here in protecting in this demise bona fide rights of those who have grants, licenses or leases; and everyone that has a grant or a license or a lease of a water power in that country is protected.

Now, the next point that I wish to deal with is a statement by my learned friend from Bonavista, again in relation to myself. He says: "Then, again, I have this fault to find with the Premier's speech, that you may search it from end to end and find no warning, no adequate warning, to the people of this country as to what they are called upon to surrender. The Premier never told us that we are called upon to surrender the right of taxing the capital, dividends and mortgages of this Company as the capital, dividends and mortgages of every other Company doing business in the Colony are taxed. I think you will look in vain to find any statement whatever in his speech that they are

free from municipal taxation." Now, I would be glad to know if that is a correct report? Because if it is, he could not have read my speech.

MR. MORINE.—No, I did not read it. I heard you.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—But you had a copy of my speech before you made yours.

MR. MORINE.—Yes.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Now, nothing could be plainer or clearer than the official report of my speech, which contains a summary of the Contract. Section 6 of page 2 says: "The Company's property shall be free from municipal taxation. The stocks of the Company are also free from taxation. Construction material and machinery will be admitted duty free." It is barely possible that I may not have used those exact words when speaking here, because there were interruptions on that occasion which to some extent disarranged my notes. And then Mr. Morine went on to say: "But there is no attempt whatever to point out that this was a freedom from municipal taxation, and not only with regard to the main objects of the resolutions and the agreement, or the main objects covered by the resolution. . . ." As a matter of fact, this Company is only on all fours with other Companies. My learned friend in his speech drew attention to the exemption of the Harmsworth Company; but he forgot to say that all their lands and all their mills and buildings are exempt from municipal taxation for ever. The twenty-year clause which he unfairly quoted merely applies to the importation of construction material. It was never claimed by me, in introducing these resolutions, that we would support and uphold some of the clauses which are in this contract and to which objection has been taken, if we were dealing with these matters in the State of New

York, or in London, or even in Ontario, which has been referred to; but we have to give special consideration and special advantages to companies to bring them here in order to develop our resources. I remember in 1905, when the hon. member on the other side was in Opposition, and when Sir Robert Bond brought down the Harmsworth contract, he proposed 22 amendments to that Contract, and my friend Mr. Kent, and Dr. Lloyd and Mr. Clift and Mr. Clapp and others who are now on the other side had to vote against them.

DR. LLOYD.—I beg your pardon I obtained some amendments myself.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Where?

DR. LLOYD.—In connection with the Harmsworth Bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In the Upper House.

DR. LLOYD.—No, in this House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There were no amendments made in this House.

MR. KENT.—I beg your pardon. Amendments were made after the Bill was introduced.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—However, anyone who will look at the Journal of the House for that year will find that my hon. friend, Mr. Morine, introduced twenty-two amendments, which were voted against by our party to a man. Now, I don't want to say that these amendments were not alright, if we could have had them, but the parties with whom we were contracting at the time would not accept them. Their answer was: It will be impossible for us to get a dollar out for the proposition in London if these amendments are accepted. I say here now that there was hardly one of the amendments which were proposed on that occasion that would not have been an improvement to the Harmsworth Contract (they

were mostly in relation to public rights); but the Harmsworths took the position that unless we were prepared to grant them an extraordinary and unusual measure of control over their lands they would not come here; and we had to grant them what they asked. No one would think for a moment that Sir Robert Bond and the thirty men who were behind him on that occasion—because there were only four, or at most five, who voted for Mr. Morine's amendments—would have voted as a solid body against these amendments if they could have been placed in the Contract. As a matter of fact, when the Bill went to the Upper House a great many of them were put in, and they were an improvement, and after a great deal of difficulty Sir Robert Bond got the contractor's representative, Mr. Beeton, who was here at the time, to agree to them. As far as the Contract now before the House is concerned, some people may think it was merely a matter of the promoters coming and asking for the proposed concessions; but it has taken nearly a year to negotiate this Contract. The Executive Government have had not one meeting, but twenty in relation to it, and have gone over every paragraph and every line of it.

MR. COAKER.—It may take twenty more.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It may, and it might be time very well spent.

My learned friend, the hon. member for Bonavista, designated this as "the most infamous contract that was ever brought before the House; and while he was speaking I was wondering where I had last heard that phrase, and then I remembered that it was the phrase used by the present Chief Justice in relation to the contract that he fathered himself and

that I supported namely—the '98 Contract. If you will look at the debates of that session and read Mr. Morine's very interesting speech in its defence, you will find that he said that it was not an "infamous contract." In my opinion it was a good contract; to-day, after eighteen or twenty years experience, I think it was the best contract that ever passed this House; but it contains all the objectionable features that my friend is arguing against so strongly to-day. It provided freedom for ever from taxation for the dock, right here in the city of St. John's. The dock was not an industry which had to be developed. It was something which was there. It might have been fair then to say to Mr. Reid: Well, pay the Municipality something; you are going to have fire protection for your dock; you are going to have water and sewerage for your dock. Give them a few dollars like every other firm in St. John's. This is not like an industry out in the woods, something that has got to be developed; here you have got an actual business that has cost the colony \$650,000. But no, that dock is exempt from Municipal taxation for ever. Why? Because Mr. Reid to whom we sold it would not take it under any other conditions. If you don't put that in there, he said, some day we may be taxed out of existence; we will be in the hands of any Municipality who may like to put on any special rate they like. That is the reason. It is not the five or ten or the hundred dollars a year that they would have to pay, but under the law to-day, or under a law which might be passed, they could be taxed out of existence. For that reason my friend on the other side said: The dock will be free from taxation for ever. And I agree with him. Under the circumstances no man would buy the dock

if he knew that he would be in the hands of the Municipality. But that was not the only thing in the '98 Contract which was free from taxation. We sold Reid the railway—not only leased it to him for fifty years but sold the reversion to him. And that railway, and everything on it and in connection with it, is free from taxation for ever. All his rolling stock and his buildings, and his stations, and everything in connection with the railway is free from taxation for ever. And this is the very thing that my learned friend pleaded so strongly against the other day in relation to these people who are going out into the wild woods to try and establish an industry. Then we sold Reid the telegraphs.

MR. MORINE—We only leased him those.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Are you quite sure?

MR. MORINE—Yes, for thirty years.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, look and see. I think we sold them.

MR. MORINE—Without looking at it let me tell you. We gave them permission to buy afterwards if they wished, and they never exercised it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is putting it another way. They might have exercised it, and would have exercised it but they were taken back from them during the period the option existed. That is one of those subtle distinctions that won't go down. My point is this: That we sold the Reid Company our telegraph lines and the buildings and everything in connection with the telegraphs, free for ever from municipal taxation.

And then we exempted their lands until they were improved. They are exempt for ever until improved.

Once they are improved then they are taxable. So that under the Reid Contract of 1898, of which I may say my friend was a great part, although he did not draw it up we gave freedom from taxation, and I say that there never was a better contract passed in Newfoundland, not on account of the small side-issues, but for the mere fact that we got clear of the operation of the railroad, and we got clear of \$500,000 a year, that would have been our loss as a Government on that operation. It was because of that that I say it was a good contract, as well as for the other matters therein contained. But it was a contract that very few agreed with, and there are people today who do not agree with it. And I think my friend will be glad to know that during his temporary absence from the Colony, I stood here almost alone in defence of it. But that was not all that was done in relation to the Contract of 1898, for when Sir Robert Bond in 1901 undertook to amend it, he never made any attempt to remove the provision granting freedom from taxation, but went one step further and incorporated the Reid-Nfid. Company and gave them the right to assign their contract, and passed a section freeing from taxation forever all the stocks, bonds and debentures of the Company. And to hear my friend the other evening one would fancy that this had never been done before, and that there never was a contract in the world or in any British Colony in which there was such a clause. Let me be understood on this matter. I do not mean to say that any one of these concessions in the contract of 1898 could have been left out. I know enough of negotiations to know that most of them must have been very objectionable to the men who, on behalf of the Colony, negotiated the contract, but it was the best they could do. It was the same with the A.N.D.

Company contract. If the House is interested in the amendments proposed by my learned friend, Mr. Morine, on that occasion, they will find on reading them that every one of the 22 proposed by him were in the interests of the Colony and they were voted down, because the men on the Government side led by Sir Robert Bond knew that no better contract could be made. It was no endorsement of these principles which in themselves were objectionable, but they had to be measured not by their objectionable character, but by their surroundings. What would be wrong in New York would be alright in Greenland, a little better in Labrador, and still better in Newfoundland. The great trouble has been this, that we have been assessing our natural resources too high and driving everyone away, and unfortunately up to the present, with the exception of the Harmsworth enterprise and the Bell Island Mines, we have very little industrial operation in the country. It was claimed by my learned friend, the leader of the Opposition, and by Mr. Morine, that that freedom from taxation applied not alone to the mills and dams and property of this Company at Bay of Islands and on Labrador in relation to the particular work of the Corporation, but that wherever they carried on any business, no matter of what description, in any part of the country, they would be exempted from taxation. Well, now, all I can say is this, that any reasonable construction and perusal of the act will convince any lawyer that that exemption is limited to the industry mentioned in the act. My hon. friend, Mr. Kent, will agree with me that there never was an act yet that could not be criticised. A great legislator has said that he could drive a coach and four through any Act of Parliament that was passed. It is only a question of opinion. You could get

the highest lawyers in the Empire to take up that contract and give you opinions diametrically opposite to each other. My learned friend, Mr. Morine, will tell you here to-night that the '93 contract was the very best contract that was ever made for Newfoundland. Now, what does Mr. Chamberlain say about it. It may be interesting to the House to draw attention to what was said about that contract by the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, probably one of the greatest Colonial Statesmen that we ever had, when he was Secretary of State for the Colonies. This is what he said, "By this Contract and the earlier one of 1893 for the construction of the railway, practically all the Crown lands of any value become with full rights to all the minerals the freehold property of a single individual; the whole of the railways are transferred to him, the telegraphs, the postal service and the local sea communication, as well as the property in the dock at St. John's. Such an abdication by a government of some of its most important functions is without parallel." That is the opinion of Joseph Chamberlain, and on the other side of this House we have a gentleman equally eminent in his own sphere. I refer to the gentleman on the back row, the Leader of the Independent Party in this House, who has said.

MR. MORINE.—And you agreed with me.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes. But my natural modesty prevented my associating myself with such distinguished company. But my hon. friend has said, "When I die I want no epitaph on my tomb other than that I worked for and voted for the '93 contract."

MR. COAKER.—And you will say the same about this one.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No. I leave the inscription on my tomb

to my friend, the Member for Twillingate, and I have no doubt that in that charity that has always characterized his utterances in this House he will inscribe on my tomb something of a charitable nature. So that there was a difference of opinion about the '93 contract. Mr. Chamberlain on the one side and Mr. Morine on the other. You pay your money and take your choice. But I was going on to point out that my friends on the other side of the House, the legal members of the Opposition, claim that the exemption from Municipal taxation applies to the business of the Company no matter what it may be and no matter where it is situate. Whether it is a biscuit factory, or a laundry, no matter what they undertake, this exemption goes with it. My answer to that is this, that if you go through it for a correct and legal interpretation you will have no doubt as to its meaning. The contract has to be read with the Act confirming it. The Contract will have to be read as a whole. It will have to be read from the viewpoint as to whether it be a public or private act. If you read the whole contract and act, and have no prejudice one way or another, and do not approach it as a member of the opposition, but simply with a dispassionate, open, and free mind, you will come to the conclusion that every section points to the fact that the exemption is only intended to apply to that particular kind of work contemplated by the promoters and written all over the contract. This is not a laundry or a biscuit factory or an ordinary commercial business. It is not a business of supplying for the fishery, but they simply want exemption from municipal taxation on that business, the nature of which is to be gathered from the contract and that, the manufacture of a fertilizer. However, so that there may be no doubt whatever on that point, before we go

out of committee I shall propose to the Committee an amendment which will limit the freedom of taxation to the particular industry that the contract deals with and to Bay of Islands and Labrador. In other words, we will take no risks whatever. I do not admit that any such construction can be placed upon it. There is always a difference of opinion on a matter of this kind when it is before the House, but it is a dangerous and serious matter to be placing extreme constructions and interpretations on contracts. It will be remembered that Sir Robert Head and Sir William Horwood, both prominent in the political party of the day, sent home to the Colonial Office a memorandum in which they said that this Colony had given in the '85 Contract a monopoly for the next thirty years of its coastal carrying trade. That was a statement for which there was no justification. My learned friends will agree that it was absolutely without foundation.

MR. MORINE.—There was not sufficient in it to base an argument.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—But Reid afterwards used that as a basis upon which to make a claim, which we were compelled to refuse. This goes to show the danger of making such statements.

DR. LLOYD.—And contracts.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes and contracts. Without wishing to weary the Committee I wish to point out the distinction between the permitting of construction material in duty free and the clause in relation to taxation. My friend Mr. Morine referred in his remarks to the fact that the Harnsworths were limited to twenty years as regards the admission of material for construction duty free. That is not important at all because to-day if anyone asked us to place on the Statute Book a permanent law saying that

every barrel of cement and every bit of machinery for construction purposes should come in duty free is there any member of this House who is going to vote against it? Does not every barrel of cement mean labour? Does not every bit of new machinery mean labour. What law could you have better than a general law saying that every man who spends a dollar in concrete should be allowed to have his material in duty free. There was no wonderful concession to Harnsworth to allow his material for construction duty free. What are we doing here? We are merely allowing construction material to come in duty free. It is not to renew any old buildings or machinery, but merely for new buildings. Does the House mean to object to that? We are not admitting construction material for the purpose of replacing old or worn out machinery or buildings, but merely for the new buildings for original instalment. Is there any objection to that? If you regard that as an unimportant concession why not grant it? It is important to them in getting their money. It is unimportant to us. I would allow in all machinery for such a purpose duty free for ever and for ever. It may be objected that in a hundred years we may be making machinery here. My answer to that is that when these days come, if they are able to get the machinery in the country they will not be importing it. There is no risk whatever. No man is going to import machinery or cement if he could get it in the country. And every bit of cement and every bit of machinery that comes into the Colony means so much labour.

The freedom from municipal taxation we gave to Reid and we gave to Harnsworth. We gave it to Harnsworth within the whole area and we can never tax them one dollar. And

my learned friend in his remarks made it appear that we had only granted this to the Harmsworths for twenty years. I do not say that he did it intentionally, but none the less he said it. And yet these contracts can be summed up in one or two words. They were the best contracts that could have been made. The Contract of 1898 was the very best that could have been made and so was the Harmsworth contract.

The contract made by Sir Robert Bond was the best that could have been got, and what has been the result? I think that those who have any knowledge of the operations of the Harmsworths and the Albert Reed Co., know what they have got to contend with, the expenses they are under in trying to get paper out of that country between December and June, know the losses they have sustained, and what they are up against in connection with other mills all over the world; and I don't think that any fair mind, under the circumstances, will say that the concessions which we gave them were excessive. Now, here you have an industry about to be started at Bay of Islands. Well, we who live in this country know that that port is practically closed between January and May, and it will mean a very large expenditure to get their produce taken out by rail; and then we know the conditions which apply down on the Labrador.

Then my friend Mr. Morine went on to say: "By way of showing that the Premier does not understand this agreement (and if he does not, it follows that his government does not understand it), I mean to read some extracts from his speech"; and then he went on in reference to the money to be spent "I assume that this misleading statement was not deliberately misleading. I do the Premier

the justice to suppose that he would not in this House attempt to mislead." And then he referred to the five million dollars to be spent at Bay of Islands—the additional five millions which it is optional with the Company to spend either in Labrador or Bay of Islands. Now, as a matter of fact the words giving the Company the option to spend that five millions on the Labrador were put into the contract at our request in order to make it absolutely certain that before a grant would issue there would be an expenditure of five million dollars down there; and to show the bona fides of it, the company are prepared to strike out the words "Or its Dependencies," and let the whole ten millions be spent at Bay of Islands, in addition to the ten millions on Labrador. When they first came to us they proposed to spend ten millions over at Bay of Islands, but we suggested that five millions be spent at Bay of Islands and five millions at Labrador, and then afterwards ten millions at Labrador. My friend referred to my statement as a "most glaring inaccuracy." Now, what I stated was this: "That that additional five million would be spent in Newfoundland. It was optional with them to spend it either at Bay of Islands or Labrador, and it was in that sense in which I used it. It was not my intention to mislead, nor was it a glaring error.

Then my friend went on to say: "We are granting a large number of franchises that will be tremendously troublesome to the Colony by and by.

There is nothing to prevent the shareholders of the Corporation selling out at any time, nor the corporation itself selling out." That is true of every company; it is true of the Harmsworths and the Reids and every company in this country or in any

other country. You are not going to here, because with the exception of get any corporation to agree to any—the limestone and the water power thing different.

Then my friend went on to say, speaking of the water powers: "We have probably on the Northwest and Hamilton Rivers one of the greatest water powers in British North America, and perhaps the only free water power at present on the continent, and you propose to hand that over without a dollar compensation." Now, is that a correct report? "You propose to hand that over," he says, "without a dollar compensation, without a single attempt to assess its value, without advertising it through the world and asking for bids upon it, without attempting to turn this great asset into money for the discharge of the public debt of the Colony."

I say we are not handing it over without a dollar compensation. Before they will have any interest in it they have got to spend \$10,000,000 in Labrador and an additional \$5,000,000 in Newfoundland. When they have spent that they can hand it to anyone they like. It is ridiculous, and absurd and nonsensical to ask any intelligent body of men to believe that a company is going down on Hamilton River to spend ten million dollars, and then scuttle out of the country and never do anything else. If they go down there and spend that ten million dollars, I think we can be perfectly safe in believing that they will continue the industry. We have been talking about the Hamilton River and the Northwest River and the Humber River and all the other rivers, and with the exception of the Exploits, which has been harnessed and utilized by a great captain of industry in the person of Lord Northcliffe, nothing has ever come from these great water powers. It may be said, if you will only wait; if you will only advertise. But the industry under consideration is one which has practically been brought

there is nothing else here. The phosphate rock has to be brought from Florida, the pyrites from Spain, the coal from Sydney; and all those articles might be assembled somewhere else with equal advantage to those who have money to put into such an industry. Here we have got a chance. We are not giving away the whole of the water powers down on the Hamilton Inlet or the Hamilton River or on the Northwest River, but only one power. That is all we are doing. Up to the present time not a stick of wood is being cut down there. Now, here is an opportunity, if you like, to advertise the country as it has never been advertised before. If this is a success, well, then, be as conservative as you like with what remains—with the millions of horse power that may be developed in connection with the Grand Falls of the Hamilton. This is not an attempt to give away the Grand Falls or the waters—either above it or below it—it merely is the water power of the Muskrat Falls; and even that is not given, because the Company has an option on another river there. I have heard people say what a wonderful thing it would have been for Newfoundland if we had never given the mines on Bell Island away; we would have been able to go to the London Market and sell them for twenty or thirty millions and pay off the public debt. Well, Bell Island is practically closed down to-day, but that is on account of exceptional circumstances. But even before the war commenced the men were practically paid off and the mines practically shut down. The same was said about Tilt Cove and Bet's Cove and LaManet, and every other mine, and where are they to-day? You have got to encourage and assist people who are going into a venture surrounding which there is a great deal of uncertainty. It is

not the mere passing of this Act; it is not the mere granting of these concessions! It is when those people go to New York and London or wherever they are going to look for the money that the real difficulty will be encountered. Before those who have the money will put a dollar into this they will want to make certain that the industry is a permanent one, and cannot be affected by anything that may happen in the world. This contract means the development of a water power at Bay of Islands costing seven million dollars, and then in addition to that seven or eight millions more will have to be spent in concrete and buildings and machinery and wharves and piers. For what? To manufacture a fertilizer. The men with that patent can go to these people and say: Now here is a good thing; we have the water power; here is what the product from this industry will cost to produce; and here is the market. And that looks very attractive. But the man who is being asked to put his money into it may say: Well, but it may not be well established before some other fertilizer discovery will be made which will knock that whole industry silly. Have we not seen it over and over again. Why, one of the fears to-day of those who put their money into the manufacture of paper from pulpwood is that some day the millions of tons of straw that now have to be burnt on the prairies may be converted into paper. Those people will go over this thing, over every word of it. They will examine it section for section, they will examine the possibilities of the enterprise, and the fluctuations and accidents which may affect it; and it is for this reason that we have got to give them concessions which are exceptional and extraordinary and unusual to make it attractive. We have done it in every case, and we will have to continue to do it. Ev-

ery country has to do it. I mentioned here some time ago what was done in relation to the Anglo American Telegraph Co. Some person may say: Oh, that was fifty years ago; conditions have altered since the days of the Anglo. Well, we gave them a monopoly for fifty years and a franchise for ever, with freedom of taxation on dutiable goods coming in for their works for ever. Right up through the years we have had to give similar concessions to people coming in here. What did Sir Ambrose Shea, the late A. W. Harvey, Mr. Peter Teasler, the late Sir Joseph Little, Mr. R. G. Kent and others give the promoters of the Blackman Company in 1882. Look at their charter and see what was given them, and you will find, Mr. Chairman, that they were given concessions as regards freedom from taxation. If ever there was a man who abhorred monopolies it was Sir Robert Bond, and he found it necessary to give the same concessions to the Reid Newfoundland Co. when he incorporated them in 1901. And we have got to keep that before us. You can go on talking about our great natural resources, but nothing will ever come of them, except to form the subject of an article for a Christmas Number. You have got to utilize them if they are to be of any value to the country, and in order to get them started you have got to give some concessions.

—Now a great deal was said in relation to the East Coast, and one of the objections made by all the speakers was that as regards the East Coast we were giving too much, and were likely to interfere with the established industries there. Well, it will probably be news to the Committee when I say that the promoters did not ask for that originally. It found a place in the bill because it was considered that it would be a great advantage to every

person who had a land interest in that country, developed or undeveloped. Under the contract nothing whatever is given away—not a drop of water nor a stick of wood, and the whole noise that has been made about it is merely a storm in a teapot, nothing more. It is a very good argument, of course, from an Opposition standpoint; but I say here, now, that that section was put into the contract in order that those who may be interested in that country might some day be able to avail of the advantages of this contract. In other words, when this industry had got started at Bay of Islands, and the people there were receiving the blessings and advantages of the contract, that others might be able to participate in it in other parts of the country. Nothing is taken from anyone. There is no application here for a grant of a water power or a lease or a license of a water power in that area. The Contract merely says that if the Company at any time within twenty-one years validly acquires a water power, then the provisions of the contract as regards exemption from duty, free importation of material for mills, etc., and the other advantages, will apply. We have had petitions and letters read here, in relation to people who may or may not be affected by such an agreement. I find no fault with anyone who may have property situated in that neighbourhood coming here to this House or taking any other legitimate means to protect their interests; but before ever there was a petition presented here, or before ever there was a word said in this House in relation to this agreement, I conveyed to those who were interested the assurance that there was no desire whatever to interfere with anyone who had interests in that country; and to show our bona fides in that respect, I will propose to the Committee to withdraw that whole

area from the contract. It was, I repeat, not in the original proposal, and was forced on these contractors. They never asked for it until it was suggested to them that that part of the country might some day be able to avail of the advantages of the contract.

Now, the unfortunate thing about Newfoundland to-day is this: That our industries—some of them—are not paying, and instead of being an advertisement to the country they serve as a black eye, and keep capital out. What we want to do, if we can, is to put our great pulp and paper industries on a paying basis, help them in every way so that they will serve as an advertisement to the country and not keep capital out. It would serve no purpose here to-day for me to deal with the results of these great operations for the last five years; anyone that wants to can find the results for himself, from the published reports; but I say here to-day with all sadness and regret that a great deal has to happen yet in Newfoundland in relation to these industries before you will find other people coming in and establishing on the same basis. It was stated, when Sir Robert Bond brought down the Harmsworth agreement, that we were giving away the whole country and that nobody would afterwards be able to live in it.

We have been hugging our natural resources to our breast too long, and have never utilized them. We have always placed too high a value upon them. That was the trouble with Joseph Chamberlain, and that was why he was led into the mistake in his opinion of the '98 contract. He was thinking of London. He was thinking of Hyde Park and St. James' Park, where he walked every day on his way to the office, when he placed an estimate on our lands. But if he had journeyed from Port aux Basques to St. John's he would have formed a different opinion as to the value of the

lands along that road. This sophistry and nonsense is all very well for Chambers where people are not affected by reason, but what we want here are facts and solid argument, and if we cannot bring in any capital, then do not let us drive it out. We have lands and water powers, but not any better than other countries. I repeat that under the provisions of that agreement to-day there is not a solitary interest as far as Lord Northcliffe and his brothers are concerned, that will be affected. I have sent a copy of the agreement to them, and asked them to submit it to their Solicitor in London, and I have no doubt whatever as to what that opinion will be. My learned friend was trying with that cleverness for which he is remarkable, especially when he is trying to convince the men on the other side of the House and keep strong the faith of those that are with him, he was trying to lay stress on an argument made by the Leader of the Opposition that there ought to be three contracts instead of one. And we were told that it was so mixed up that neither gods, angels nor men could understand it. What about the '95 contract? How many contracts ought there to have been there? If this contract calls for three, then I think the '98 contract should have called for 22. But the whole difference is this: Anything proposed on this side of the House is treated on the principle that nothing good can come out of Nazareth. In the '98 contract there was the contract for the operation of the railway for fifty years and all sections incidental to that. Then we had a contract in connection with the sale of the reversion. Then there was the contract in relation to the handing over of the coal areas and the working of these areas, and all the minutiae necessary to such a contract. Then we had a contract in connection with the electric tramway. Then there was

a contract in relation to the dock. Then there was a contract in relation to the public lands, a contract in relation to the telegraph lines and a contract in relation to Angel's. Then there is a grant of water powers at Petty Harbour that were not given under the original contract. Then there was the paving of Water St. and a Loan Act. All these were rolled into one. But now we have a contract before us in which there are two principal sections, the first two. The important points of the contract are confined to these two sections. The other sections are merely details, important, if you like, some of them. But this argument is made merely for the purpose of making a point against this side of the House and is not seriously put forward. Take the contract as it stands. The first section is a grant of a water power and the right to acquire further water powers. That is all. There is nothing else in that section. There is a grant of a water power at Bay of Islands and in the Hamilton Inlet, and a right for twenty-one years to acquire other water powers in the area laid down. It would be impossible to have a contract simpler. Then we go on to the second section. That is simply connected with the expenditure of money in relation to the development of these powers. That is the whole contract in relation to Bay of Islands, Hamilton Inlet and the East Coast. Two sections. The third section refers to the supply of electrical power to other property owners on Labrador. The fourth to the assignments of patents.

MR. LLOYD.—Can you give us any information on that section?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No. I am not in a position as yet to give any information on that point. Section 5 grants a certain mining area to the Company at Bay of Islands. I am sure that every member of this House

would be glad if we had a hundred applications for the right to cut that limestone. It extends for miles and miles over there. Section 7 refers to the stock and debentures. Section 8 is the freedom from duty of the construction material. Section 9 deals with certain lands to be granted to the Company for its mills etc. at the usual price of 20 cents an acre. Section 10 deals with the acquisition of public lands from private individuals. Section 11 to the building of telegraphs and telephones to and from their own buildings. Section 12 gives free entry for phosphate rock and pyrites. Sec. 13 the same for coal on Labrador. Section 14 deals with the delivery of the fertilizer free all over the country. Section 15 deals with the compensation for damage to be fixed by arbitration, one arbitrator to be appointed by each party and a third by the Government. What fairer tribunal could you have than that?

MR. KENT.—Why not have the ordinary Courts?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—We have followed the usual precedent in this regard.

MR. KENT.—There are plenty of claims that would never have been allowed at all if they had come before the usual Courts.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This is the most usual practice and the one in which the fairest trial can be obtained by the injured party. The Company will only have one arbitrator, and the injured party will practically have two.

There was another point made by my learned friend in regard to the expenditure of money. I think that I have already answered that point. The money has to be expended in relation to the particular industry at Bay of Islands and Labrador.

MR. LLOYD.—Do you intend to make that clear?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes.

I have already said so, but my contention is that the contract is already absolutely clear on that point. I want to read to the Committee the words of the contract:—

"The Company undertakes to begin actual construction upon its undertaking within two years from the date of these presents, and to expend a sum of five million dollars within the Island of Newfoundland in and about the business and operations of the Company within five years from the date of these presents, and if the Company fail to begin such work and expend such money within the time mentioned, this agreement shall be void."

You have to read the contract to find what the business and operations of the Company are.

MR. LLOYD.—That is the trouble. You can't find it in the contract.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is where we differ. It is absolutely clear and absolutely without doubt what the business of the Company is, and they are prepared to expend the sum of \$5,000,000 in actual construction.

MR. LLOYD.—It does not say that.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—They undertake to develop these water powers and manufacture fertilizer. I have as much right to say that as my learned friend to contradict it. That is my duty, and the other is his. However, that will be placed without any doubt. That expenditure will be earmarked. It will have to be spent on the dams and buildings and works of the Company and in their construction, and limited to Bay of Islands.

MR. LLOYD.—Have you anything about the demise?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I did not mention that matter as yet, as I had not come to it in my notes, but as the hon. member has brought it forward I will mention it now. The point

made by my learned friends is that under section 15, although the agreement would be void on failure to carry out the provisions of the agreement, yet the lands granted under the demise would not revert. My reading of the Act is that no such construction can be placed upon it. In other words the agreement includes the demise. If you read the whole contract you will find that it is capable of no other meaning. My learned friend was contending a moment ago that under Section 15 of the contract, it did not become void for five years, and that in the meanwhile that part which had been demised might have been transferred, and that in that event even if the agreement was void that part of it would continue. I say that that construction is far-fetched and is not capable of being read into the contract. I will submit to the Committee, however, a resolution dealing with the matter, which will make it so that in the event of the agreement becoming void, the whole of it shall be void, and the demise as well. It is not the intention, and never was the intention, that such a construction should be placed upon it, and I am not admitting here now that such a construction can be placed on it. But there was never any intention to have any hair-splitting about the contract. It is intended to put it beyond any possible doubt, and we propose doing that.

The hon. member for Bonaville referred to the water powers in his remarks. I have already pointed out that his argument is most unfair and most misleading. It is quite true that we are getting no consideration in the way my learned friend has made it appear, but the consideration in this matter is the expenditure of \$10,000,000 on the Labrador and of \$5,000,000 in Newfoundland, or the Company gets no water power. That is the position. My friend Dr. Lloyd gave

some very interesting information in relation to the water powers of Canada, principally Ontario. But the value of a water power and the cost of development, and the price at which it can be leased or sold is a purely relative matter. It depends upon its situation. It depends upon its possibility of being utilized. And in considering this question, in considering the contract, we must bear in mind that these water powers are far away from centres of population. I am prepared to admit that electricity is not like other natural resources, in that it may be utilized as a revenue earning power and a labour producing medium, even when far removed from civilization and population, but as a rule, I think, the principle can be laid down that the value of developed electricity, its selling value, depends upon its nearness to large centres of population. I qualify that by saying that in Norway or on Labrador and in portions of the world where there are not large centres of population, you may be able to establish an industry and induce labourers to go down there and live. You may be able to tempt the labourer to go into these untrod countries, but you have not the same advantages as you have when near large centres of population, like in the State of New York or in the Provinces of Canada. You take the development of Hamilton Inlet. The first problem that you are up against is the problem of labour. You are not going to spend \$5,000,000 on Hamilton Inlet without your first seeing that you can develop an industry that will employ 4,000 or 5,000 men. You do not need any report from an engineer on that point. I think we can assume that if they expend the sum of \$10,000,000 in the development of that water power on the Labrador and in the construction

works, they will need a very large business to make it pay and it will necessitate the employment of thousands of men. You know very well that you cannot get thousands of people to go and live at Hamilton Inlet as easily as you can get them to go to work on works in the Province of Ontario. My friend, Dr. Lloyd, read from the Report of the Commission on Conservation of the natural resources of Canada, and gave us considerable data in relation to Ontario, but it is easy to get men to go into these works because the conditions of life are easy. The labourer of to-day wants to be cared well for and looked after. But when he goes down to Labrador and sees that he will be cut off practically from November to May, you have to hold out to him great inducements. That is the labour element. Then there is the element of shipping from there. I would not go so far as to say that you could not ship from there if you had the proper ships. Perhaps if you take one year with another you will be able to ship all the year round, with perhaps an occasional hold up for a month or so. But to all practical purposes the Labrador is closed.

MR. LLOYD—Are they going to make it a shipping port?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Well I could not say definitely. It may be that the electrical power is going to be brought down from there. I am only pointing out the difficulties. I am not laying it down as a fact, but if they do ship from there, it will be particularly expensive. Even if they transmit the electricity there will be considerable expense. Everyone knows the great loss there is in transmission of electricity. I am only pointing out the difficulties. I want to show the drawbacks in doing anything in the way of development at a place like Hamilton Inlet. I do not

care whether it is fertilizer or pulp or minerals. It is all the same. There are great difficulties and you have to hold out great inducements. And if this industry materialises it will give a great impetus to the development of Labrador, even if it does not come in our time.

My learned friend, the other day, made a glowing peroration in relation to the dangers of taking away our people from the fisheries, and as I listened to his burning words I was thinking of the very opposite argument that he put up in 1898, when he told us that the only hope for the fishermen of this country was the labour foreshadowed by the '98 contract, but he was not on the opposition side then. And now we are committing a crime because we are creating an industry that is going to take away the people from the fisheries. Well, I have several answers to that. In the first place, if the fisheries are more lucrative, if the people can earn more money at them, then they will not work for this concern, they will stay where they are. But do you know that the average family in Newfoundland to-day is not earning \$400 a year, and the average earnings of a family in the very next Province to us—Nova Scotia is about \$1000, and do you not think that it is time we did something to create some industries in addition to the fisheries, in order to give our people an opportunity to live, and provide themselves and their families with some of the comforts and docencies of life. \$400 a year is only a starvation wage, particularly when we remember that one-third of that goes into the revenue to keep up the public services of the country. Our people won't leave the fishery, unless they are better paid. In the days of the Harmsworth contract

It was pointed out that the mills would be run by Chinese labor, as my friend Mr. Kent quoted the other day in relation to this contract. But he forgot the head-tax—he forgot that every Chinaman that comes in has to pay \$300, which in itself would be a very considerable revenue, if they did come here. But he need have no fear. If these industries do go on there are thousands of our own people that are at present working under ground in the mines of Nova Scotia that are longing and pining to come back to their own country. Why, there are more Newfoundlanders to-day in the State of Massachusetts than there are in St. John's. Go to Ferryland, go to Fortune Bay, go to Placentia and St. Mary's, and ask them why the population of these and other districts are at a stand still and have not increased. The people have been driven from the country so that they might earn enough to support their families. Take the losses out of Gloucester. Is there ever a vessel comes in with her flag half-mast that does not tell the story of the death of some Newfoundlander. These, the people that have been driven out of the country, are those whom we want back to work in the mines of Bay of Islands and in the mills there and down on the Labrador. There are four thousand people to-day living down on Labrador, British subjects, under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, that have to leave their homes every winter and trek into the woods in order to get fuel to burn; they live in a hut or a tilt that no one in this House or within sound of my voice would live in; they have got to live in the woods for eight months of the year, without any of the civilising influences of the easy and pleasant conditions of life. Does anyone know what that means? Every man on the

Labrador has to take his wife and children and make an annual trek into where he can get a bit of fuel free for the winter, and return, like the swallows, in the spring to the home he has abandoned on the coast. You can get a thousand men to-day living down there for these works. I have been on the Labrador. I am not as well acquainted with it as some of the members of this House who have been there, but I know the conditions down there. They have winter from December to May; they have none of the comforts of life; there is nowhere for them to go either in the night or in the day. Now, these are some of the people that we hope to give employment to in the Hamilton industries; we hope to take them out of the huts in which they now exist, and put them in good homes, clean homes, and happy homes. There are a thousand men, members of one thousand families, who are only waiting for the call—men who don't average \$200 a year. I know what I am speaking about. There is not a year that we have not to send down thousands of dollars worth of poor relief to the Labrador in order to keep the people from starving, because of the failure of the fisheries down there in spots, no matter how industrious the people are. So that we can get all the labor we want from the men living down on the Labrador, from our own people in Newfoundland who are idle half the year round and from Newfoundlanders abroad who will return. Instead of earning three hundred dollars a year they will be earning seven or eight hundred or a thousand; and then you will begin to appreciate the value of a great developing industrial enterprise like we are contemplating. We want to keep our people home that are now being driven out of the country; we want to do something for those who live in remote parts of the

country and who cannot get labor. My friend, Mr Kent, pointed out that there was nothing in this bill as regards the wages to be paid. My answer to that is that there is no need, because the price of labor to-day both at Bell Island, Grand Falls and here in St. John's has made it impossible for any company or any concern to go back to the days when men were paid starvation wages. If these works go on, they will have to pay a good daily wage for their labor. Another argument that was made was that we were doing wrong in giving this company an option for five years to examine the water powers in the Labrador. Well, you can get no industrial concern to do business with you unless you give them an option—unless you say: We will withhold grants while you are making your survey. It may be that hundreds of thousands of dollars may have to be spent to survey the Hamilton River before deciding on the water power to be selected. It is not like the Waterford Bridge River or Renie's River. I am informed by the promoters of the present company that up to date they have spent \$100,000 in relation to surveys, in relation to working out this industrial concern in order to put it before capitalists. We have got to try and realize that when they go to New York with this undertaking they will have to pass the gauntlet of a dozen experts, mining experts, engineering experts, fertilizer experts, financial experts, and all the other kinds of experts. You don't get fifteen or twenty million by merely going and asking for it. You have got to convince these people beyond the possibility of a doubt, and if the contract did not give them an option for five years, as soon as they went to New York this would be pointed out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one or two words in relation to the people with

timber areas in the Humber area. Mr. Morine pointed out: "If the owners of these lands were here to say that they assented to that, that it had been agreed upon, then there would be some justification; but while a man who holds a single acre of land over these objects, what right have you to take away from him all the great natural common powers which he has over the streams and lakes—what right have you to hand them all over to the Company and say: Squeeze the life out of him." Well, if that doctrine were once admitted, you could never develop a water power in Newfoundland. If you have got to wait until every man with an acre of land agrees, you would never in this world or the next develop a water power or an industry.

We cannot go beyond what is stated in the contract, and which I submit includes and embraces and protects every possible right, every lease, license and grant. There may be people in that area who have land; they have been trying year after year, some of them, to do something, but they have never been able to do anything, and individually they never will be able to do anything. It is very questionable if any one of them to-morrow, even if there were a water power developed there, would be able to use it.

And then my learned friend went on to point out that a further reason for not passing the contract was that the company was going to make millions. In other words, that the expenditure in the country was going to be so large that the return would be millions. "We were told some time ago," he said, "that a similar corporation in the United States had watered its stock over and over again and on that watered stock were paying a 10 per cent. dividend, and this concern is expected to be more valuable than anything either in Canada or the United States."

I don't know whether my friend has

any inside information, but if what he states is correct then I say that that is the very strongest argument that has been used up to to-day why this company should be encouraged to come into the country. They cannot make millions and they cannot spend millions without sharing them with us and with the country. Every bit of machinery they bring in, every bit of cement they bring in, means permanent labor to the country. I hope they may make millions, because if they do the country will be benefitted. They won't be able to get labor, they won't be able to get the people to produce the materials which they will be manufacturing, without paying them well. Why, what is the policy to-day in the United States and in England. Look at the Ford Motor Car Co., the Sunlight Soap and all the other great industrial concerns, that pay their men as high as five dollars a day, treat them as partners in the concern in order to give them an interest in it. That is the policy to-day. The old days of grinding down the laboring man have passed away. Every intelligent Captain of Industry now recognizes that in the production of wealth labor is as necessary as capital—more valuable, because you may be able to get the capital but not the labor. We need lose no time discussing the question as to how our people will fare if this company makes millions. I hope they will Mr. Chairman because I know that they cannot make money without sharing it with our people. But what inconsistency this argument reveals, one moment we are warned against a paper company and in the same breath we are told they are going to make millions. But, as I say, we need lose no time over that. What we are concerned in now is to try and get them in. My learned friend, Mr. Morine, the other day, in this very debate, referred to the fact that unless we do something for this country

we will have to go to Canada. I say this evening here that it is measures like this which will make it unnecessary for this country to go to Canada; and that even if we had to go, with a development like this an accomplished fact we would be more independent. He pointed out that if we give away these natural utilities—natural raw material, if you like—instead of waiting for the time when the people of the country will be formed into small municipalities and avail of those privileges, that in that way we bring confederation with Canada nearer. I join issue with him there. I say that it is industrial enterprises, enterprises like this that will postpone the day when it will be necessary to discuss confederation; and that if the day ever comes that the people want to discuss confederation then with improved conditions, with a great development such as this, we will be in a better position to discuss and demand proper terms.*

At 6:30 p.m. the Chairman left the chair until 8 o'clock.

The Chairman resumed the chair at 8 p.m.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—Mr. Chairman, before recess I dealt with several objections raised by the members on the other side in regard to this contract, and I hope made clear to the Committee that they were all shadows arising out of an over anxiety on their part to protect the public rights. That is a most commendable spirit on the part of a legislator, whether the speaker be in the Opposition or on the Government side. I look at it as my learned friend, the leader of the Opposition looked at it in his opening remarks, when he said that we were making a large contract, granting large concessions, and we should look at such a matter as trustees for the public. That is a very proper spirit and that is the spirit in which I hope and feel that every one

will approach the discussion of this contract. We are here to guard the interests of the whole public, to guard the interests of the people of the whole country. These interests are very wide and very extensive but we must not forget also that we are not here to guard the interests of a few land grabbers, that we are here to guard the interests of the whole public. We must separate these two. We must guard the interests of the public in such a way as to secure every member of the community whether he be the poor man who never had a grant, who never had an application for a timber lease or license for water powers or for anything else, or whether he be the individual that lives on speculation, whose hands are never off the public lands and water powers, preventing everyone from developing them. In this community to-day, and not alone here but everywhere, that individual is prominent and you never attempt to develop any public work but the land grabber and speculator bobs up serenely and you always find him in the way when you are going to do anything. He has nothing. He never had anything and he lives by following in the train of those who are doing something. Protect the public by all means and you will be quite certain that men on both sides of this House will vie with each other in making that protection as effective as possible and surround these concessions with every possible safeguard. I said before recess that in regard to the several points raised by my friends on the other side I was prepared to place every one of them beyond all possible doubt and although I do not admit that the Contract was capable of the constructions placed upon it by them, I was prepared before the Committee reported to propose such amendments as we considered necessary. There are three clauses in the bill in relation to the exemption from taxation. First in

relation to the stocks and debentures. I pointed out that that concession, although they considered it important, we had given to other companies, and it was a concession which was very important to them in raising their money. The next exemption was in relation to the importation of their construction material. There is no one in Newfoundland to-night who wishes to see rapid development in Newfoundland, who would object to putting a law on the Statute Book for all new machinery to come in duty free, and all construction material, especially such as we have not in the country, and except for wood I do not know of anything else in that way that we have. In the case of the Harmsworths there was a limitation of twenty years. Now the limit was put in that contract because it was assumed that the buildings put up by them or which they intended to put up would be put up before that twenty years was passed. Their limits can only supply a certain amount of timber, and can only supply the material for a certain number of mills, and having put up these mills and installed the machinery it is fair to assume that for the next century they will hardly require to make any additions to the mills. This is entirely a different industry. This is an industry that if it is successful will manufacture year after year more and more and will necessitate additions to the machinery and buildings. And they merely ask that when they wish to put up additional buildings and additional machinery, you will allow the construction material and machines in duty free. That is a reasonable request and is the interests of the Colony.

The other concession is freedom from Municipal taxation. That is an important matter with them in raising their money. They want to have their issue of stocks absolutely as free as possible and as I pointed out this even-

ing that while some of these concessions may not appear very attractive to us, still in order to get these people to come here you have to hold out some inducements, but we propose to limit that freedom to the particular fertiliser industry and particular works on the Labrador and at Bay of Islands. My learned friend, Mr. Morine, pointed out in this connection that we were giving away the principle water power in the country. I would like to remind the House that with the exception of Exploits there is no other river in Newfoundland developed. There is not a river in Newfoundland or Labrador upon which any attempt has been made to develop. In all the rivers all round the country there is not a particle of development and on the Hamilton Inlet there has not been a solitary attempt to utilise the waters in any way. Complaints were made on the other side that we were not fully informed and that we had no surveys or other detailed information. My answer to that is that it would take thousands and thousands of dollars, you would have to import special men from abroad to examine and survey the lands and rivers and report on the possibility of their development. We have given this Committee all the information obtainable from all departments. I think that under the amendments that will be proposed we can report a good bill and although we are giving concessions to this Company we will find that we are safeguarding all the public rights and that if this Company does not establish itself here and spend the sum of money specified all the rights will come back to the Colony.

I hope the day will never come when we will see the contract that we are considering here to-night fall like nearly all the others that have been placed on the Statute Book. If they go on and establish in the Labrador and in this country and spend the

\$20,000,000 in the country it will mean at the least \$1,000,000 a year to the Revenue. Calculate it how you may, if they spend \$20,000,000 in Newfoundland that will mean an industry that will be worth to Newfoundland in revenue alone \$1,000,000, not to speak of the benefits that will accrue by the stimulus it will give all over the country.

They propose at Bay of Islands alone an industry that will represent something like ten million dollars worth in exports. Now, that will give you some idea of the size of this enterprise. It is only a few years ago since our total exports amounted to \$10,000,000; and last year, our total exports, including paper and all our fishery products, only amounted to \$16,000,000. This Company proposes to go into a business at Bay of Islands alone that will represent an export of somewhere in the neighborhood of ten or twelve millions. The amount of labor that that will represent is a very easy calculation to work out. We have got to take some risks to get that here, we have got to take a good deal of risk, we have got to give some concessions. We were told by gentlemen on the other side of the House that in this contract we were giving everything and getting nothing back. Well, what we are getting back is a permanent industry, if they come here—if the money can be raised. On the other hand, if they don't come here, if the money is not raised and it never becomes an accomplished fact, well, then all the rights come back to the Colony.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary at this stage that I should further delay the Committee. Nearly every point that has been raised by the other side has, I think, been covered. As we go on in committee, discussing the Bill section by section and resolution by resolution, I shall be glad to propose these various amend-

ments that I have already suggested, and I think in that way we will be able to get a measure that, whilst it will be an inducement to those from whom we hope to get the money, will at the same time properly and effectively safeguard the public interest.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, from the remarks of the Premier I take it that it is his intention on behalf of the Government to introduce some amendments which will make some of the clauses of the proposed contract more moderate. I think that we ought to have these amendments as soon as possible on paper as it is impossible to discuss any portion of this contract without having the whole in its present state before the committee. Broadly speaking I think the proposed amendments were: firstly to secure the spending of the \$5,000,000 referred to in section 18 for actual construction work; that is the first as I understood it. The adoption of this would have a very material effect on the bill from one end to the other. Then another amendment as I understand it, is to cut out from Section 1 that part dealing with areas in the East Coast. I understood that this clause is to come out entirely. I do not know if you intend to propose any changes in the clause referring to the "Labrador areas." I would propose that Section 2 be amended with the object of limiting the period during which this Company shall be exempt from taxation to 20 years. As regards Clause 6 of the contract I understand the intention is to limit the provisions somewhat? Then another amendment, I understand, is in case of failure to keep the conditions of this contract. Failure to do this means that not only do the agreement and privileges cease but all the grants herein contained become void.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes. Every section will become void. What

I was suggesting was this, that after Section 18, add this: "And in such event it is agreed that all the provisions of this indenture shall be void if any section is not carried into effect."

MR. KENT.—I would also recommend to the Government that it draw more distinction, as regards this agreement between leases and grants, in case of failure to perform the conditions of this agreement.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Every section would be void in this case. This is as an ordinary indenture. If the indenture is void then the provisions under every section become void.

MR. KENT.—The distinction is important as there is a difference between the altering of a lease and a grant; you get both here in this agreement. I think words ought to be used to express the interpretation the Premier has put upon it. We will discuss this question later.

Now Sir, I do not intend to discuss this matter this evening except one or two phases which I will consider on their own merits. I think there were more merits in the '98 contract than in this. On that contract I have often expressed my opinion which is that it was not in the best interests of the Colony; that it was a poor business proposition. If we are to get our industries only under agreements such as this it is no good having them. We want industries started here but we want them to make some return to the revenue of the country.

I think, sir, we ought to get some direct return to our revenue from this Company. Some rental, bonus, or share; something to justify the concessions granted it since we are to get nothing. Then, sir, if it is the intention of the Government to have these assets of the country developed I do not think it right and proper that one company should be given complete control of such an important drainage area as

the watershed of the Humber. To do this gives a sort of monopoly to this Company. This area should be independent of this or any other company. As it is by this contract if any company starts to operate within the area of the Humber it will practically have to pay a fine to this Company. Why have this monopoly? As a precedent has been quoted the "Deer Lake Co. Contract." But in that agreement the interests of all parties in any way connected with the area in question were conserved. I presume the owners of timber areas inside the drainage area of the Humber will have to get capital to develop them or go to the market to get money to develop them. In this case a decided advantage is allowed the Company. These companies will not be able to get money as usual, now, but this Company's contract is worded differently. Here we have a contract confirmed by this Legislature for this Company to do certain things. In consideration of this certain things are granted to them, not subject to renewal but for ever. Is this a necessary thing to do without obtaining any return whatsoever? The Harnsworth Company had to pay taxes under the Crown Lands Act. In this case there are no direct returns to the Colony.

Then I think sir, the lease for 99 years renewable for ever is too long. I do not think it is necessary to make such concessions to a company for the purpose of developing the water-power of the Humber, as the concession here granted means the passing of that area out of the control of the Government. I do not see how this can be regarded as anything but a monopoly, for under the contract the Company has in practice the power to exclude competitors from that area.

Then sir, I do not think that the stocks and shares of the Company ought to be free from the taxes of the

country for ever. They might be freed for a number of years, say 10 or 15 or even 20 but certainly not forever.

For 99 years we can tax none of the shares, none of the profits, none of the dividends of this Company; while at the same time we will tax and will have to tax every other company and every other person; because remember that this clause is not limited to the capital invested for work on the Humber but covers every work engaged in by the Company and frees from taxation its business profits. The courts will substantiate any claim made by the Company in this connection. As this contract is now worded all capital invested in this Company will be free from any taxation forever. The limiting of the period of freedom from taxation on the properties within the area of the Humbermouth is an improvement on the clause as it was before, and if it is limited to a certain number of years, I think it would be fair to grant this to the Company. I think this alteration should be made to be prepared for the business changes which will be taking place in the coming years throughout this country.

Then again, I think that private property ought not to be interfered with by this contract, and I certainly object to any concessions being made in connection with such. A certain amount of concession is alright. A company like this ought to get certain concessions, and I think that certain ones should be made, but I think at the same time that any individual who loses the value of any of his property by the passage of this contract should be fully compensated for it.

I think also that compensation should be granted to any individuals who may lose the value of their property through this Company's diverting or damming the stream and thus either submerging or removing the water power from their land.

There is another matter which in my opinion ought to be considered more fully and that is the question of patents which has been referred to this House by the learned member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, this afternoon. This is an important matter and ought to be more fully investigated. We are asked to make a law and place it on the Statutes of this country; but are given no information regarding the merits or otherwise of the application. Nothing but that this man named Jesse Critz King has a patent. Suppose some man were to say that he and not the said King invented this patent. By this law one would be justifying its appropriation under this or any other circumstance. This is a matter which should be set at rest before we pass this section.

I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to discuss this contract any further until I see and examine the proposed amendments made this afternoon. Some affect the contract as a whole and others certain sections, and so I think this debate ought to be deferred until these have been printed and placed in the hands of the members, when we might consider the contract itself.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Chairman: I want to say, Sir, that in approaching the consideration of this matter I do so with a perfectly open mind. I had the privilege of listening to Mr. Willson, the promoter of this Company, and of hearing from him some details of the proposed undertaking. He went into the matter very fully, and left no doubt whatever upon my mind as to the desirability of this contract being undertaken by the Government. From all that Mr. Willson proposed to do in return for the few concessions asked for, I made up my mind that so far as I could, I would be prepared to support any reasonable concessions for the purpose of bringing about this industry in Newfoundland, and I am still

prepared to hold to that decision. I am glad to hear from the Prime Minister, that he has considerably modified this contract, and I think these changes have made it very much easier for me to give my support to most of the sections of the resolutions now before the chair. I desire, however, to obtain some further information in reference to the relations between the parties. Now, in the first place, mention was made of an agreement being made. I would like to know where is that agreement. I want it because I am not quite clear in my mind as to what water powers are granted to this Company. I am aware that the Reid-Nfld. Co. are holders of certain blocks of land throughout this country, and that some of these blocks of land were under rivers, or in other words they have been the grantees of land covered by water. I am not quite clear about this, particularly in view of the provisions of the Transportation of Timber Act, 1904. I will read the provision I refer to:—

“There shall be reserved for public use a right of way twenty-five feet wide around and adjoining lakes and ponds, and on both banks of all rivers on the lands of the Company.”

It seems to me that under that provision a right of way for public use is reserved along the banks of these rivers, and I would like to see the conveyances from the Reid-Nfld. Co. to this Company, The Nfld. Products Co., for the purpose of ascertaining exactly the intention of the agreement. I would like to have this before being asked to vote upon this contract. Another thing I would like to know, and it is one of some importance. It is, what is the extent of the drainage area of the Humber? We speak of the drainage area of the Humber without really considering what it may mean. If I understand aright, the drainage area of the Humber extends away up

to the end of the Grand Lake on the South Side of the Humber, and for a considerable distance up the Northern Peninsula to the north. I would like to be informed authoritatively as to the extent of this drainage area. Because we are granting within that drainage area very large concessions, and I think it would be well if we could be informed as to the extent of that area. I do not wish to labour the points that have been raised by the speakers, and will not weary the committee by any reference to those points; but I may say that I concur with some of the points that have been taken. I think that the concessions in the matter of freedom from taxation, are too long. Making them exempt from taxation for all time, is too long. I would like to see some limitation—15 or even 20 years. I do not think that this legislature should go as far as to exempt them from taxation for all time. I cannot consent to that part of the Act, and also the freedom from duty on construction materials. That should be limited to a period of 20 years.

There is another point that I am not very clear about, and which I do not like at all. It says in section 26: "Notwithstanding the grant of the water powers herein, all persons shall have the right to the temporary use of the said water powers for the purpose of passing to and fro in small boats, and for the purpose of floating logs and lumber belonging to such persons to their mills, provided that such use shall not interfere with or prejudice the business or operations of the Company."

That is practically vesting the Company a monopoly. That section is put in there in direct conflict with the first section of the Act passed in 1964, in relation to the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes and for other purposes in connection with

Crown Lands, which says: Section 1— "It shall be lawful for all persons whomsoever to float sawn logs and other timber, rafts and draws over all streams and lakes within the Colony, when necessary for the descent of such logs or other timber." Section 2— "There shall be reserved for public use a right of way twenty-five feet wide around and adjoining all lakes and ponds, and on both banks of all rivers on the lands of the Company. Where the land adjoining any lake, pond or river is required to be used or occupied for a building or other purposes by the said Company or its assigns, the Governor-in-Council shall permit such use or occupation upon condition of such other or substituted reservation out of the lands of the Company as may be necessary for the public right of way around such lake, pond or river."

If it is intended by these resolutions in this contract, to repeal that act of 1964 so far as these rights are concerned, with regard to floating logs down the rivers, if it is the intention to repeal the Act of 1964 so far as these rights are concerned, then it should be stated in the resolutions. At the present moment, one is in conflict with the other. I would like the Premier to clear that matter up. When we go into committee, we shall be able to discuss the matter further. There is no provision in the Act with regard to preventing the company from polluting the waters in any way. I know that that is provided for in the Crown Lands Act. But it would be wise to provide that there should be no matter to injure the fish life. There is such a provision in the Paper and Pulp Act. So far as I can say, I am prepared to go to any reasonable extent to assist the promotion of this industry.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. This bill that is now before us seems to be

taking a sumpersault. From what was a most monstrous measure, we have now got down to something far more reasonable. I think that the Government has acted wisely in coming to this decision; but it should have been considered before the bill was brought into the House. The country has formed its opinion from what was first introduced, and I know that its confidence in them is not going to be what it was. The Premier talked how the waters have been running uselessly away and will be going on for ever. But suppose some one found a coal mine, would you be so eager to give that away without some returns for it? That mine was there forever, useless. You do not consider that what you are giving is of very great value. First when you introduced the bill for electric power in St. John's, the engineers thought that it was impossible to bring electricity so far, but it is a success. It will not be very long before you will be able to take the power at Grand Falls and send it up to Montreal. Therefore we should go slowly. We should not sacrifice all those tremendous powers which may some day become of great value. Up in the region of the Gander, there is \$50,000,000 worth of timber. How is that timber going to be utilized without water power? The power is there. Palpwood will be so scarce in the future that that district will be needed. The Company must think you very liberal indeed, and say that you are a good Government to deal with.

It was a mistake to exempt them from taxation for ever, even no duty on the raw material coming in. I am not going to give a vote in this House for any company to be exempt from taxation for ever and ever. I am satisfied to see these people bring in raw material without taxation, for a limit

ed time. Why not tax their profits. What are you getting in return? If they make a dividend of 10 per cent, why not tax that profit? Do not give everything away. You are going to give them those great concessions on the Hamilton lake. All I can say is, they would not get it from me. There is another very important point. I ask you to take care that you put on that agreement a clause to the effect that these men shall erect their works on the Newfoundland Labrador. How easy it will be for them to bring their works on the Canadian Labrador and bring the power to them. Then why not prevent them from establishing their works on the Canadian front of Labrador. Take that precaution. I say let the people also have a say in this great matter. They will have their say in two or three years time. The Government will find that they have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. I sincerely hope that the Government will alter that agreement. The Premier said that what would be right in London would not be right in Greenland and less so in Newfoundland. What is wrong in London is wrong in St. John's; and that is what we want recognized. I know the Premier will not say it any more now. It was said that some of the industries of the country do not pay now. That is a fact. Take the Grand Falls industry for instance, that does not pay. But I do not think that you can blame the country because these industries will not pay. They do not pay a great deal for their timber. These only serve as black eyes for the country. Again, the Premier, said that Chamberlain made a mistake about the Reid deal. That may be so, but that is no reason why another one should be made now. I know

there are men in this country who know what is in this country; they were allowed to take charge of the whole railway system, and take land in payment for operating the system for fifty years. They knew that there was something in these lands. The timber in the Gander region is worth \$50,000,000. There is tremendous value in the timber there. "Nothing good can come out of Nazareth," said the Premier. If this bill as it read formerly, had gone through the fishermen would have a say in the matter. But we have not been so very bad the last two years. We have got along very well together. The Government, however, has done better the last two years than during the previous years in which they were in power. You ought to forbear a little. I think that our conduct during the past two sessions on this side of the House has been very good indeed. There is another point that I hope you will safeguard; that is the right to drive logs in the rivers and pass boats over streams. You ought to protect the people who have rights within that area. You should look out for these people. The Premier painted a very rosy picture when he said that four thousand men would be working there. I would like to see the day. I hope it will not turn out like the promise that the South Side Hills would be white with sheep. A bird in the hand is worth—how many did you say? I should say all in the bush. But our fishermen are not going to get such tremendous benefits, even if it does work. A fisherman is able to do more for the country as a fisherman than as a labourer. As soon as they go up there to work for a while, they are useless as fishermen. Many a man has gone up to work at Grand Falls and is very sorry that he ever left the fishery to go there. The

ordinary fisherman if he remains at home to work hard, catching fish, would earn a far better living. I agree with the Premier, that men are unwilling to submit as they have done in the past. I do not think that you will be able to get men to work on Labrador, unless you can give them two dollars a day. That will satisfy us for a year or so. The day is gone when men will work for a dollar or \$1.50 a day. The labourer of the future is going to have enough wages to clothe himself on. If he works hard ten hours he is entitled to a comfortable living. I do not mean lazy men, but men who work hard all day long. Men go into a job on the first day of January and work every month for a whole year and find at the end of the year that they are no further ahead than when they started. Do you think that men are going to put up with that sort of thing? They are going to have their share. Take Mr. Reid, he can drive around in his car, his wife can wear pretty hats costing an enormous pile of money. But the men who work ten hours a day it is different, altogether different. Not only in Newfoundland but all over the world, the labouring men are going to have comforts. God never intended to put men in the world for that. He intended that men should get enough. Men who come to work in Bay of Islands will be not only Newfoundlanders but others who want work. I have no intention of delaying the House with any lengthy remarks. I want to see what sort of an agreement you are going to bring down. I hope that you will have something in it that will give us the right to tax profits. Do not give them any more area than is necessary and give them the freedom from taxation just for a number of years, not forever.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about this contract;

and a great deal more would have been said had it not been altered; but having been altered and the great objections being removed and if safeguards are provided with regard to the Hamilton Inlet business so as to protect the right of Newfoundland so that these water powers may not be utilized to build up an industry in Canadian limits instead of Newfoundland limits you might depend the country will appreciate your action in providing those safeguards. The country was alarmed, I might say, sir, over this business and I have not the slightest doubt that the greatest agitation you ever had in this country would have resulted if this measure had passed in its original form after Mr. Morine and Mr. Kent and others pointed out the mistakes and if the Premier had not been so anxious to respond. I made up my mind there and then that he had not been caught napping and that he was ready to do something in connection with making concessions. I do not believe that the members on that side of the House had a great deal to do with that. I believe they were unaware of the objectionable features and I congratulate them on the corrections which they have made; but if they want to secure the support of this side of the House and especially the back row, they will have to put in the safeguards we have suggested.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply to the hon. gentleman. First I would like to say I think he has been very reasonable and fair in his criticism of the case. I should like to correct an error which he made and which I also saw in the press the other night—that this debate was adjourned because I was not ready to go on at the time. I did not ask for any postponement. The request came from the other side of the House. Mr. Morine asked in open House for a postponement of the further debate because Dr. Lloyd was not

ready. He said Dr. Lloyd desired to speak and it was not convenient for him to do so then and I consented to the postponement. The postponement was not for me. I shall be very glad to consider the many points which my hon. friend has suggested and if there is anything that can be done it will be done.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, I hesitated to rise but for the remarks made by the Premier that it was owing to my request the debate was postponed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No.

MR. LLOYD.—I shall make the statement to suit him—owing to my request through the mouth of Mr. Morine that the debate was postponed. I do not know how Mr. Morine came to make such a request because it was utterly unauthorized. I had no intention of going on because we had from this side of the House two important speeches dealing with the matter—one by the Leader of the Opposition Mr. Kent, the other by Mr. Morine—and it was about time we heard from the Government what they intended to do in the premises and therefore it was hardly reasonable to expect anything further from this side of the House, till we had heard some pronouncement from the Premier. That pronouncement was delayed and was delayed until to-day. We heard some inkling on Friday as to another reason for delay; we heard something of the kicking that my friend the member for Twillingate tells us of and we know that there was a postponement of the debate on Friday at the request of the Leader of the Government in order that there should be a party meeting on this very point. Now, then, if it was in order for the Leader of the Government to bring up this matter of the postponement of the debate for some purpose alleged from this side it is equally in order to explain how the postponement took place on Friday.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have no objection whatever.

MR. LLOYD.—I have no objection to stating it and I am glad the Leader of the Government consents, because after all there is some point in referring to that; because the result of that party meeting was that the Premier came into the House this afternoon in a chastened state of mind, and in a chastened state of mind he has made a proposition which was exceedingly objectionable and undesirable into a reasonable business proposition. I congratulate the Government on the way this matter has been dealt with. On this side of the House, I think it will be conceded, we tried to meet the Government in a reasonable spirit. We did not treat this measure, although opposing it very strongly, in any party spirit. We made objections that should be made. We asked for consideration of those objections. There were men who felt equally strong on several of these points on the other side of the House, who while not making these objections in open House nevertheless made them in the privacy of the "caucus;" and we see the result.

Now, sir, I wish to emphasize exactly what has been conceded; and the concessions are very important with regard to the lease of powers on the Humber. He has acceded to our request that the lease shall revert to the Crown and it shall be so stated in the agreement, if \$5,000,000 is not spent on the plant there in five years. That is a very important concession and it is exactly what we needed. The Premier of course, can say that that was what he meant all the time, but the point is that the contract did not say so but he is going to make it say so and when he does I am prepared to support the lease to the Company of the water powers of Bay of Islands.

He has also cut out that most objectionable feature of the contract, the attaching of certain privileges to water powers that might be acquired in a very large area to the south of Notre Dame Bay which would have the result, as it stood then, (because within that area it was possible for that Company to acquire practically all the sites where important water powers could have been developed), to take in practically the whole drainage area of the interior of the water shed into Burgeo and LaFolle, Fortune Bay and Placentia Bay and practically control the whole water power system of the interior. That is cut out completely and it was a very wise thing for the Prime Minister to cut it out because in my opinion it would have killed the whole scheme even if it passed this House because I do not believe that one cent would have ever been raised for this scheme if it was left in because you would find such a mighty opposition in the London money market and the New York money market, if they had the Northcliffe interest up against them that it would be more than the Reid Newfoundland people could do to raise money in either London or New York; and therefore it is very wise on the part of the Government to cut it out and give this scheme a chance.

I am also glad to see that the Government have made some changes in regard to exemption from taxation by making that exemption apply only to such products as fertiliser carbides and the output of the factory which have been spoken about. The Premier contended of course that these exemptions only applied to these industries. I do not think he can have very carefully considered some of the clauses or he could not possibly have come to that conclusion. I would draw his attention to one clause: "All the land waters, water-powers, buildings, erec-

tions and all property whatsoever of the Company." Surely that is as absolute as it is possible to make it. There is no limitation there as to property used in the production of fertilizer. The property the Company may hold may have nothing whatever to do with fertilizer or a part of it may have nothing to do with fertilizer. At all events it is eminently satisfactory to know that the Premier has so modified these exemptions as to apply only to such property of the Company as is used in its principal industries.

Then again I wish to point to another clause. "The stock, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages and other securities of the Company, shall also be exempt from taxation." Will not that stock cover all the Company's concessions whether the property is used for the manufacture of fertilizer or not. All the stock of the Company is exempt from taxation whether it represents factories that turn out fertilizer or properties that have no such purpose. There is no distinction at all drawn. All it has to be is property of the Company and if it belongs to the Company it is exempt from taxation. It is satisfactory to know that the Government intends to make some limitation in this respect.

Now, sir, on this question of taxation I may say that my position as outlined the other day is generally that I think the Company ought to be given a reasonable concession in the way of exemption—for 20 years for instance as regards municipal taxation. I would be quite prepared to see for 20 or 30 or 40 years exemption of their stock. I would be quite prepared to see for all time exemption in regard to raw material; but I am not prepared to see, except for a very limited time after they get to work and as some compensation for moneys invested before they can make an output, exemp-

tion on the dividends. Now the Premier this afternoon speaking of the fishermen on Labrador said that these men earn some \$300 a year, one-third of which goes back to the Government. And yet there is a proposal here that no matter how big the dividends of this Company may be or what their net earnings are they have to pay nothing. Now it could not be contended that it would be in any way crippling the industry by taxing dividends at a reasonable rate. It is only taxing profits. I am not contending for anything big in the way of taxation of dividends but I think that after they have got the business established and are making dividends, there should be a tax of five per cent. or ten per cent. on these dividends. I am quite prepared to see fair play given to the Company and some limit put upon the Government and this House as to the future so that they should not be in a position to tax the Company out of existence. Now it must be remembered that these water rights are given free, that is without rental, to this Company. I drew attention to some of the water powers in Ontario in reference to rental. I would like to point out what is done in connection with Niagara. The Niagara Company pays to the Government under its license the following rentals for the first ten thousand or less electrical horse power, a yearly rental payable half yearly of \$15,000. For each additional electrical horse power "generated and used, and sold or disposed of" the annual rental for each horse power shall be:—From 10,000 horse power to 20,000 \$1.00 per H.P.; from 20,000 H.P. to 30,000 H.P., Seventy-five cents per H.P.; from 30,000 H.P. and over, Fifty cents per H.P." Thus for example forty thousand horse power could bring in an annual rental of \$17,500. At that rate the water power that is conceded on the Humber

would be worth about \$75,000 a year at the Niagara rate. If you follow the Ontario rate the Government would charge \$60,000 a year for that concession.

Now, sir, with regard to this new industry; I have every faith in it. The man who has come here as a scientific promoter of that industry and as the scientist and manufacturer behind it is a well known man. Immediately I heard of the proposition I wanted to know who Mr. Willson was. It may be of some interest to tell you how I found out. I had not heard of him previous to this proposition but I happened to have in the office of the Telegram a book published in 1898—seventeen years ago—called "Canadian Men" and I turned up the name "Willson" to see if I could find him and I did find him. I found a column of the book devoted to a biography of this man and it spoke of him then in 1898 as a man of eminence in the chemical manufacturing world. That was seventeen years ago. It spoke of him and of his connection with the Arc Light and of his invention and of what he had done in connection with the development of carbide and it referred to him as being president of some carbide company. That showed sufficiently that he was a practical man who was a success in connection with this light some seventeen years ago. Now I understand that the scheme at Bay of Islands is the following out of his development of the carbide industry. He proposes that this Company would make calcium carbide at Bay of Islands by importing coal and cooking it in electric ovens and with the coal burning the coke with limestone in another electrical oven and making calcium carbide and this carbide with the nitrogen and pyrites produce cyanamid of ammonium. Now in connection with cyanamid, that is a compound of calcium carbide and

nitrogen. That industry although a comparatively new industry is a successful industry at present at Niagara Falls and has works in connection with the power I was talking of which pays the rental I spoke of. Now that cyanamid is manufactured with a horse power of some thirty thousand. The output is about one-half the proposed output of Bay of Islands. That factory turning out one-half the output expected of Bay of Islands, employs 750 men. Now at Bay of Islands with a double output and the very latest means of labour saving there will not be more than 1500 men employed so far as this cyanamid is concerned. Having made cyanamid, Mr. Willson, I understand, goes further, and by passing steam at a very great temperature through the cyanamid turns out ammonia gas; which goes through another process in connection with phosphoric acid, and is converted into phosphate of ammonia, which is the fertilizer.

I think it can be assumed that as far as this industry in connection with ammonium phosphate is concerned it will employ about two thousand men. I have not gone into the question of subsidiary industries. I have not gone into the matter of the sulphite industry; but at all events these figures make clear to my mind that the industry will be a very large one, and therefore should meet with every encouragement from this Legislature; but at the same time we should try to get what is possible—I am putting it up to the Government—I should like them to try, if they have not already tried, and see if they cannot get a rental, as is done in Ontario, for this water power, even say fifty cents per horse power. Supposing they only got half, it would be something and would be a precedent for the future.

Now, sir, with regard to the Labrador proposition, I am not convinced

that the promoters have acted wisely in connection with this matter. I think it is very doubtful, even from their own standpoint, because they are introducing very doubtful features into a very attractive proposition. It is clear enough, knowing what we know as to the position of affairs on Labrador in connection with the Labrador boundary that no one is going to put up money on any title given by this House and Government until the matter of the Labrador Boundary is settled; and this makes it clear that the grant or the confirmation of the grant from this House has no investing value, and to get an investing value it will have to be put through the Quebec Legislature, so that there may be no doubt about the title. To-day it would be no good going to any market, because you are only asking people to invest in a law suit—nothing else.

Therefore there is a good deal of doubt in my mind as to the wisdom of including this Labrador proposition. Now in speaking about the industry at Hamilton Inlet the Premier said this afternoon that about four thousand men would be employed at wages of about seven hundred dollars a year.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I never made any such statement.

MR. LLOYD.—You were excited then.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—What I said was this: I said the population of that place was about four thousand. Out of which about one thousand, roughly speaking could be counted upon to avail themselves of this opportunity. These men would receive from seven hundred dollars to one thousand dollars a year.

MR. LLOYD.—I must have misunderstood the statement of the Premier but I do not think that ordinary workmen there would receive such a large sum as that. I regret that the

Premier makes this in all seriousness, because it casts a doubt upon what would otherwise appear genuine. No one I fear, would believe that this Company or any other will pay from seven hundred to one thousand a year to workmen. I do not believe that Hamilton Inlet can produce the number of men stated by the Premier. Again, this may give rise to serious trouble as to the question of the Labrador boundary. We must be able to give a title that will admit of no doubt.

I will close what I have to say in congratulating the Government on its reasonableness in this matter and also the promoters for the obliging manner in which they assented to the modifications of the contract. I think in its present state you ought to be able to make the contract satisfactory all round. You have a practical man in Mr. Wilson, who has already made a big success in a number of projects of a somewhat smaller nature. We have the assurance that first the money will be raised, and secondly the Water Power being here, the limestone at Bay of Islands, the proximity of the coal areas, and all facilities requisite thereto easily procurable, you have the certain knowledge that ere many years an industry shall arise at Bay of Islands as great as that which we now have at Grand Falls.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—
Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention at this late hour to occupy the time of the Committee very long but I would like to say that in my opinion the discussion we have heard on this Bill will go down in the history of this country as one of the most interesting and instructive debates that has ever arisen in this Chamber. No question ever came before the Committee or before this House since the days of the Harmsworth deal that has created such

a widespread interest and been productive of such a large amount of discussion and debate as this we have before us to-night. I consider that the observations made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent, were in every respect worthy of that gentleman. His criticism of the Bill was most reasonable, and was indeed up to the highest standard that should be expected from a gentleman occupying his august position. The hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, in brilliant and scathing language practically tore the Resolutions to pieces from a legal standpoint and forcibly and clearly delineated the numerous difficulties that his penetrating intellect discovered therein. It has never been my pleasure to hear a more reasonable expression of opinion on any matter before this House than that which the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, began on Friday evening last and continued here to-night. The hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Cliff, expressed himself with regard to these resolutions in a manner remarkable for the sincerity which always distinguishes his bearing on matters that arise for discussion in this House. The hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, has also evinced the greatest reasonableness throughout the discussion, and I congratulate him that at last he has seen that good can come out of Nazareth. There is an ancient adage that says, "where Doctors differ, the patient dies." I consider the operation that we have been performing the last week has been a most successful one, and we may congratulate ourselves that our patient is lusty and alive. It is true that the amendments to this Bill promised by the Premier have met with the approbation of hon. gentlemen opposite but those who have heard the Premier's remarks this evening could not but be struck with the

sincerity of the Government who so anxiously strove to eliminate anything from this Bill that might prove undesirable to the future interests of the Colony. The Premier has adopted an attitude throughout that showed he desired to make the different clauses more clear and I may say to this House and to the country that this contract lay between Government and promoters alone and had absolutely nothing to do with the counsel for the promoters. These amendments looked at from the point of view of the layman seem to alleviate the possibility of any ambiguity in the framing of the Bill. I personally had the pleasure of participating in the consideration of the Bill by the Executive Government, but I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the Bill was in no way the creation of Mr. Furlong, or any person interested in the promoters, and I think the Government is only too desirous of having everything objectionable expunged from the Bill. I remember the time when the Harnsworth proposition was before the House, how the Government received censure for dealing away such a large area of the Colony. I well remember the amendments proposed by Mr. Morine to the measure then before the Government and how Sir Robert Bond said that that Agreement would go through in its original form or not go through at all, that it was the best project he could make. We were delayed two days waiting the necessary alterations. Mr. Lloyd's statement this afternoon that this Bill was amended in this House was incorrect if I remember rightly. I think no Government would contemplate bringing down a measure of such a far-reaching and important effect as this, without really being prepared for some alterations during the discussion in this House. I congratulate the Premier because it was owing to his special efforts that

the promoters agreed to the alterations. These alterations were unnecessary in certain cases, in my opinion, but necessary in others. The carrying out of this Agreement will ensure the development of the Humber and the water powers in that section of the country. I anticipate that the development of the East Coast will revolutionize the future of this Colony. We are passing through, as the other parts of the British Empire, a critical period. Our fishermen are unable to obtain supplies to prosecute the Labrador fishery. Many industries are closing down but I believe that Newfoundland will resume her former prosperity and our people will forget their despair and dependency. When this Contract is thoroughly understood, and put in operation, and the thousand men required by this contract operate the manufacturing concerns, I believe that this time of despair and dependency will pass over and a new era of prosperity will begin for this Colony. Our interior provides water-power capable of providing an immense source of wealth. I may say that I consider that to-day you have re-discovered Newfoundland. We stand on the threshold of great developments. Men who have left this country to earn their living in foreign parts will return to their native land when they can earn money here as elsewhere. It is only by the introduction of industries such as this that you are able to accomplish such benefits for our people, but we must grant concessions that will make the auspices of this Company favourable in the foreign money markets. The Company must have attractive possibilities. This will necessitate the granting of large concessions. We are enabled to offer large natural possibilities and facilities. We must do our share to help else it will be a fail-

ure. We should not be exacting, nor begrudge concessions which mean ultimately our own repayment. We are doing something for Newfoundland that is greater than anything ever attempted before. We must not handicap it by taxation. Indeed I think that a Company of this kind should by all means be exempt from the caprices of municipal taxation in the future. Indeed if this were not so no Company could afford to take the risk. A venture of this kind when it attains success which I think it eventually must will foster the growth of a large population around its centres.

Now, sir, if you put in a limitation of 20 years or fifty years or ninety-nine years, capitalists might say, no we know not what might occur at the end of that time, and we might be taxed by some Government or municipality in such a way as to handicap us in a great measure.

As to the tax on stocks, bonds and debentures, I think we have a precedent for that. I do not know whether the Company would be prepared to consider a slight tax on their debentures. It appears to me that it is a reasonable suggestion to make that if in years to come they declared dividends of ten or fifteen per cent, that we should get a small share of that in consideration of the privileges we have given them. I do not know if they would accept that suggestion, but I do not think the matter is of sufficient importance to endanger the passing of this measure, because of the great benefits that are likely to accrue from the establishment of this industry. The amount of money that is going to be invested in this industry is the largest and most staggering sum that we have ever had anything to do with in this Assembly. When the Harmsworth deal was going through we were only dealing with a matter

of a million dollars, now we are dealing with ten millions—ten million at Bay of Islands and ten at Labrador, or twenty millions in all. We can hardly appreciate the enormous development that that will bring about and I have no doubt that it will be brought about. I have no doubt of the sincerity or the capability of the people behind this enterprise and I have no doubt that they will bring it to a successful issue, and that we will see this industry established not alone within the next five or ten years but I believe before the next six months we will see a large development, and that will be the justification of this House and the justification and proof of the sincerity of the people behind this enterprise. I do not intend to delay the Committee further, but I wish to express the satisfaction I feel, and which I am sure the whole country will feel, in the manner in which this matter has been debated on both sides of the House. The members of the Opposition, as I stated before have criticised it fairly by pointing out what they think are its weak points, and have praised what they think are its good points, and I think when this Bill finally passes this House we will have on the Statute Book of this country a measure that will spell hope and inspiration for the people of the country for many years to come.

MR. KENT.—I suppose the amendments which the Premier has hinted at will be printed and circulated before we go into Committee again.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—They will be printed to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that

the Committee have leave to sit again.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Motins gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 4th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 4th, 1915.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from Mr. P. Costigan. This man was a Government official, and while at Rose Blanche met with an accident, and has been incapacitated ever since. He asks some support from the Government. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the prayer of this petition is very reasonable, and that it ought to have the full consideration of the Government, and I feel sure that when the facts of the case are considered, Costigan will be given a pension. He received a salary of \$240 as tidewaiter, and asks the usual pension. He has been laid up now for twelve or thirteen months, and though he has several times been operated on, he has never fully recovered. I would ask the Government's consideration of this matter, and that it be referred to the Customs Department.

MR. DWYER.—I support this petition.

MR. HIGGINS.—I would commend this case to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when it comes before the Government.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a number of petitions on the subject of temperance, among them one from the Rev. Mr. Harris and others of Moreton's Hr. I would ask the consideration of the Government to these.

MR. CLAPP.—I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from Mr. Andrews and others of Duggan's Cove, asking that that place be made a port of call for the northern steamer. This would be very much appreciated by the people of that place, and I hope the Government will be able to accede to the request. I ask that this be referred to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker: There was a Committee appointed some time ago to enquire into the complaints about the Penitentiary. I have been appointed on that Committee, and the Committee desires to report that it cannot complete its work in the 10 days allotted to it. I would ask that the time be extended a further period of ten days.

On motion, it was ordered accordingly.

QUESTIONS.

MR. STONE called attention to the fact that his question on order paper of April 13th was unanswered.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—This answer was tabled, but seems to have been mislaid. I will have a copy furnished to-morrow.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Public Works if he had received returns from Bell Island Local Council.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS.—These returns would be sent to the Auditor-General.

MR. ABBOTT.—I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to three questions, one asked by me on the 26th, one on the 27th, and one on the 25th April, not yet answered.

MR. TARGETT.—I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a question which I asked on April 13th, which has not been answered.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I gave instructions to have these statements prepared. I will table them as soon as I possibly can.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement, in detail, of all moneys spent on the wharves at Kitchuses East and Bacon Cove, Harbour Main District, from January 1st, 1909, to date.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—That statement is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement of all special moneys sent to St. Jacques, in the District of Fortune, for the year 1914; also, a copy of the returns of same, if the money has been spent, and the returns sent to the Department.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS.—That is in course of preparation.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs whether tenders were put out for a steamer to do the work usually done in the summer by the "Fiona" on Bait Protection Service and Customs Preventive Service; and, if so, who tendered, and on what terms; and to whom the contract was awarded, and what steamer has been engaged, and on what terms.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—That information is not in my Department. It is in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table copies of the assignments by Jesse Critz King of certain patent rights to the Newfoundland Products Company, Ltd.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I will make enquiries in relation to that matter, and if I can find anything I

will table it.

MR. GRIMES—In regard to the question which I asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, and which should have been asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I would be glad if I could get the information.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—The hon. member shall have it.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the hon. Minister why he has not included in the Estimates a vote for the travelling expenses of the Salvation Army School Inspector. From where does he get the money to pay his expenses?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think there is now a petition before the Government in connection with that matter. It will be attended to.

MR. COAKER—Is there a salary provided for him?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Dr. Pilot examined the Salvation Army Schools for a great number of years. They now have a School Inspector of their own. He gets a small salary. There are only a few schools.

FUBLIC CHARITIES

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, before this vote passes I would like to know the basis upon which salaries are paid the Relief Officers in the outports. There seems to be quite a difference in the salaries. The votes here range from \$300 down to as low as \$20 or \$25. I have taken the trouble to go through the Estimates and find out what Fogo district gets in comparison with other districts of about the same population. I notice that the total salaries of relieving of-

ficers in the whole district amounts to \$60. The man at Fogo gets \$48, and the man at Musgrave Harbor \$59. In Carbonear district, because, I suppose, the district is so compact that one man can do the work, there is only one Relieving Officer, and he gets \$200. I don't know what governs the appointments or the rate of wages, but it seems to me that there is need of a readjustment of salaries in this particular as well as in others. Now, Fogo is quite an extensive district and much time must elapse before the wants of those in need can be made known to the relieving officers, and then there has to be quite a lot of correspondence before the relieving officers can secure reliable information as to the condition of the applicants; so that it is quite evident that the men in Fogo district are not as well paid as in some of the other districts in comparison with the work done. The total salaries for relieving officers in the outports is \$3897.00. Fogo should get about 1/22 of that, according to population; so that instead of \$60 the vote should be at least \$150. I think, therefore, as I said before, that there should be some readjustment in this particular.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—In reply, I may say that I agree to some extent with the contention of the hon. member that there is need of a readjustment in this connection. With respect to Carbonear, all I can say is that that salary of \$200 has been voted for the past twenty years. There is only one relieving officer in the whole district. In the other districts, such as Harbor Main, Ferryland, Placentia, there are ten or twelve, and in some cases fourteen or fifteen relieving officers; but in Carbonear one man has to do the whole work. There has been no change in the vote for the past twenty years.

At the same time I agree with the Hon. member that there should be a readjustment.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman. That is no answer to my statement. It is not because one man has been getting \$300 in Carbonear for the last twenty years that the whole district of Fogo should be compelled to accept \$60. Surely, it doesn't mean that there are so many poor in the district of Carbonear that it takes one man's whole time to attend to their wants. I don't think it is fair to the district to suggest that you must pay a man \$300 to attend to the poor, whereas in the district of Fogo you have only got to pay two men a total of \$60.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. I think that Carbonear ought to feel very happy over the way it has been treated in the past. They can certainly congratulate themselves on having received a fair share of the perquisites and emoluments of public offices. I don't think that there is a town in the whole island, outside St. John's, that is getting a bigger share of the various public grants. I don't know whether they have to thank their worthy representative, His Honor the Speaker, for this, though I don't suppose he has made such a tremendous lot of changes over there. I have here a list of officials in Carbonear. I got it because I heard some talk that there were quite a number of officials over there, and I wanted to see how it compared in that respect with other districts. I find that they have a Judge, two Head Constables and two Constables. They are in the Justice Department. In the Customs Department they have a sub-collector and five tide-waiters, which I think it will be admitted is a fair share. In the Marine and Fisheries Department there is a light-house keeper. In the

Fiscal Telegraph Department there is a postmaster, an assistant and another assistant, a letter-courier, a man courier, a telegraph operator and assistants; then there is a janitor and caretaker of the public building; there is also a relieving officer. Now, I think that it is a fair share of positions so far as public departments go, and I feel rather like supporting the position set up by the hon. member for Fogo, when he protests against Carbonear receiving \$300 while Fogo has to put up with \$50 from the same vote, when Carbonear has only about half the population of Fogo. I don't suppose there is going to be any readjustment of salaries at this session, and probably not very much at the next, but it won't be very long when we will have to get down to business in this connection, because once the people of the outports become awake to what is going on, they will insist on a fairer distribution, and we will have to sit down here and think the matter over a great deal more seriously than we have been doing in the past. Some of the districts are not getting their due and others are getting far more; but the day is coming when each district will have to get its fair proportion of the grants which are voted here. I am not going to find fault with His Honor the Speaker for looking after his district so well. In all probability most of the appointments were in existence before he took charge; but if he has been successful in getting all these appointments, I certainly think he must be an influential man with the Government. About the best thing the Government can do with a man like that is to take him from the position he holds now and give him something that will enable him to exercise his ability.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman: While we are discussing this question of public charities, I would like to

draw attention to the matter of expenditure at Bell Island. I notice the returns are very small. I would like to ask whether there are amounts that have been sent and that have not been spent as poor relief; and if they have not been spent on that account, to what account have they been transferred? Of course, moneys sent out from the Charity Department should be accounted for to that Department; either a statement should be sent in showing how it was expended or it should be returned and transferred to some other Department. I judge from the returns that there is one allocation of \$1,969 that is not included.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I think the statement that I gave includes all the grants that were sent, and, I understood, returns of these grants.

MR. KENT.—There are returns for all expenditures that have been made out of grants. What probably happened was this: That that grant from the Charity Department was put into the general fund of the Council and expended generally in connection with the public needs that come under the jurisdiction of the Council on the Island. I would like to get a return showing all expenditures that have been made through the Council on public works.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—You want to know the amount sent from the Charity Department?

MR. KENT.—Yes, and how disposed of?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I think it is in the way you suggest.

MR. KENT.—I think probably it is.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman: I should like to ask the Government for all correspondence between the Government and Mr. Weir, of the Halifax School for the Blind.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I would like to say that Mr. Weir and

the Government have had some correspondence, which I will furnish.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: Suppose there was a Hospital established at Twillingate, would there be a grant of \$1,000 towards it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The Government would look at this matter most favorably.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: I read the report of the Commissioners in connection with the Lunatic Asylum. I draw from their evidence that some one at that institution has not been doing their duty. Some of the patients in that institution were dirty for 18 months, and this was allowed to go on, and no effort was made to remedy the wrong until at last some of the officials had to report to the Government. It is a very serious matter when officials have to come to town and report the state of affairs to the Government. Such conditions should not be permitted to exist. The Government is not to blame for it, but they ought to see that the Asylum is inspected. It is a very wrong thing that such conditions should be allowed to exist in such a large and important institution. The blame is on the Superintendent of the Asylum. It was his duty to know what was going on. He ought to have enquired about these things. I hope that something will be done in this respect. The Superintendent ought to be superseded if he cannot do his work properly.

LIGHTHOUSES, ETC.

MR. COAKER.—In Bonavista, \$700 is being wasted on an extra light keeper, for whom there is no need. One man can attend to the two jobs. These are the things that make the fishermen look about them. \$700 is being wasted for nothing. The keeper at Seldom Come By gets a salary of \$400, and there is not a more competent man in the Island. I think you

will agree with me that the \$700 spent at Bonavista is not needed.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman: I just wish to try to put my friend, Mr. Coaker, right. He says there are two men at Bonavista; one man getting \$700 for the fog alarm. When it was proposed to put that fog alarm there—and a fog alarm cannot be put anywhere at all; it must be in a proper place—the engineer went down to Bonavista with the object of trying to get the fog alarm as near as possible to the light-house. But it was found that it could not be done. The land intervened, thus preventing the sound from going where it was required to. And then there was another obstacle in the way, which prevented it from being put somewhere else. It is very often no easy matter to select a site for a fog alarm. As they are consequently such a distance apart, it is impossible for the man who runs the light-house to run the fog alarm also. The man in charge of the fog alarm is put under a great responsibility. We got him there for the very purpose that when an accident occurs at sea—which is rare—the man will be in his place, and will be able to render assistance if necessary. I understand that he pays the assistant \$300, and so is responsible for the assistant.

MR. GRIMES.—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries why no provision is made for the lighthouse at Cupids this year.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—It will be in the Additional Estimates.

M. COAKER.—Why does the keeper at Green Island get \$800.00?

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—It is a place shut off from every means of communication. It is hard to get a man to go to such a place. That salary was the same before I had anything to do with the Department. He is a first-class man, and instead of

\$800, he should be getting \$1,200.

MR. COAKER.—There is another matter to which I wish to draw attention. The keeper of the light at Certain Cove Head gets \$535, while five other light keepers in Exploits Bay get from \$200 to \$250. Why is this?

MR. PICCOTT.—He has to provide his own assistant, and has to look after one of the most important lights on the coast.

MR. COAKER.—Now, I hope that the Minister when bringing in these estimates again will try and improve matters and even up the salaries. Some men are getting very poor pay and others very fair pay; and in some places you have a man getting \$200 and another getting \$300 for the same class of work.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—I agree with you.

MR. COAKER.—When are we going to have the second reading of the Hospital Bill?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Do you intend to discuss it? The usual practice would be for the second reading to take place and then have the discussion in Committee.

MR. KENT.—The practice we have been following is to table the Bill before the second reading.

MR. COAKER.—What is this \$7,000 for construction of and repairs to roads?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is a special grant.

FERRIES.

MR. HALFYARD.—I would like to know who is in charge of the Ferry at Change Islands; whether it is a boy or a girl or a man or a woman.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—The hon. member had better give a notice of question.

MR. COAKER.—You might say if there is an appointment. It is generally run by a girl or a boy or a woman. The man goes fishing.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—If there is a man and he is not doing his duty, it ought to be reported to the Department.

MR. HALFYARD—That is what I am doing at the present time. It was quite recently brought to my notice that a woman has charge of the ferry. She has two children, and sometimes this ferryboat is given in charge of the children. The channel is not very wide, but still there is a lot of traffic; and motor boats come up frequently and also the coastal boat, and it is very dangerous not to have some responsible person in charge of that ferry. They say that the \$110 granted is so small that a man cannot be got for the work, but it is very dangerous to have things in their present condition with children in charge of the ferry. If an accident happens and two or three persons are drowned, the newspapers will speak strongly of the neglect, and somebody will have to assume the responsibility, but that will not bring back those who may lose their lives. It is in all seriousness that I bring this before the Committee, so that the Minister may take the matter up and put some responsible person in charge of this ferry. You will not get a proper service in these places unless you pay the men properly. This ferry is doing service between a number of islands and tickles. It is very important that some person should get the job and do his duty without any excuse for leaving the work half done. It is not like a great many places where you have ferries, and it does not matter whether the ferry-man is there or not. It is a very important service, and therefore the salary should commensurate with the work.

MR. COAKER—In regard to the ferry at Change Islands, it is a matter of very great importance. The water is very shallow in places and in oth-

ers it is very deep. The ferry does all the traffic from Fogo to Herring Neck and places in between. All the people from the various places around go through that Tickle. There are nothing but motor boats continuously passing through and it is getting dangerous to leave the ferry in charge of a man who is not always there. The sum of \$120.00 is not enough to pay him. Give him \$250 a year. You have a Sub-Collector at Change Island earning \$350 to \$360 a year. A ferryman working from 5 o'clock in the morning and running continuously all day is worth more than \$120. It is not a ferry which runs for ten or fifteen minutes and then stops for a long while; it is running continuously. This matter is getting serious and I would ask the Government to give it their consideration. I must take this opportunity to congratulate my friend Mr. F. J. Morris upon the very important position which he has assumed in connection with the Court. Last year I was telling him that he ought to be appointed and I was sorry to find that he did not wish it. I was very pleased to find that he was sitting on the Bench this morning and carrying out the duties of that office. I am sure that he will carry them out very well.

POST OFFICE.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I notice in the Auditor General's report in connection with the Post Office that there are a number of salaries put down as new salaries. These are not provided for in the Estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—They will be provided for. We have already arranged for some of them. What he refers to there are salaries paid under a re-arrangement in the Post Office. It was referred to by the Colonial Secretary; he can explain it better.

MR. KENT—I am referring to the St. John's Post Office. The Auditor General in his report shows that a number of changes have taken place in salaries, but I see no corresponding changes in the Estimates. Is it intended to arrange for them in the additional Estimates? Take the case of John Mercer.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—His is a temporary appointment.

MR. KENT—Has he any special work?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—He is reporting on the outport work and salaries. That is the work undertaken by him. That report will be tabled within a few days.

MR. KENT—Then there is the Assistant Secretary, he has got an increase in salary. That is not in the Estimates. It was referred to in the Auditor General's report last year. It is reported again this year. If this is a permanent increase it ought to be put in the Estimates. It should be put in the additional estimates when they come down.

MR. COAKER—Some time ago we were talking about some trouble in the Registration Office. Is it intended to make any investigation?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I have received no report as yet. I will enquire again to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—I would like again to refer to this question of construction of Telegraph lines. Last year I laid before the House the pay list and asked the Colonial Secretary a number of questions that I wished answered, and he said then that he would make some investigation into the different matters. I have heard nothing since but I understood that some trouble has taken place. Now I can tell the Colonial Secretary that something very serious is happening in regard to that. A lot more serious than

he has any idea of. There is a great deal of trouble in regard to the purchase of poles. If he only had the facts in connection with it he would know that some thousands of dollars are paid for which no value is given at all. Last year I notice that Patrick Brennan got \$2983.; John Davis \$369; H. Burt \$120; J. McDonald \$1110 and so on to a large number of items. If I were to ask for particulars of all those items there would be no such thing as getting them at all. There is quite a lot of work in connection with this that needs enquiring into. Take the question of supplies; not one-third of the supplies which are obtained are used. You really ought to find out what is going on in this direction. I made a statement last year that these men on some of the jobs were spending a great deal of time consuming intoxicating liquors and having quarrels. I do not want to give the Government too much trouble over these matters but something more ought to be done. Here we have an account for 1914 charged against the Fiona for seventy-one meals for Mr. Stott; sixty-nine meals for John Dyers. Was that amount credited back to the Fiona's account again.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Yes.

MR. COAKER—In laying the cables in 1913-1914 both Mr. Stott and Mr. Veitch were engaged and had their expenses paid as well as extra salaries. Mr. Stott got \$100 for laying one cable and the amount of his expense was \$141, that is \$2.35 a day. Mr. Veitch got \$150 for expenses besides an extra amount for salary. We have an account here of Mr. Joseph Manuel for food supplied, and yet we find the men on this business were paid a daily wage, and they ought to find themselves; and the men in charge were getting \$2 a day for their

wages in addition to having all these goods supplied. Now there were no less than five or six coils of rope used in connection with the cables. These things ought to be in these accounts. Also five coils of rope and two coils of rope; what became of all that rope?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—That rope was used.

MR. COAKER.—I am just pointing out how some of the Departments are run. These things ought to be brought back and sold, going in to the credit of the Department. Then there is the use of motor boats. Every man who had a motor boat had a chance to hire it. Here there is a bill for \$26 for motor boat hire.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—In regard to that question of the rope, you will find that that has all been brought back and is now in the basement of the Post Office.

MR. COAKER.—Another thing is the Telegraph Service as a telegraph service. It is not giving any general satisfaction. I notice there were many breaks in the lines that took two to three days to repair. You are spending a tremendous amount of money in repairs. You ought to find out where the line was interrupted and for what reason. I know something about the line in Green Bay that could have been repaired right away and yet took two or three days to repair. When there is only twenty or thirty miles of line it ought to be repaired in twenty-four hours. I have a statement here which if the country knew of it and knew of the amount of delays and interruptions and the length of time over which they extend I do not know what they would think of it. It costs a fine sum of money and ought, I think to be tabled. I do not say that a service such as this can be run without some complaints, but this thing

has gone too far. We will have to get a man to run the Telegraph Department if we want to get satisfaction. The man who is there at present is incompetent to run the service. This won't do. We want a man, a good active man, with a thorough knowledge of the business to see that the officials do their work, and if we have interruptions to see that the repairs get it repaired within a reasonable time. There are ten or fifteen items here for interruptions on the line going to Green Bay that I took notice of last year, and which ought to be changed when you have the facts before you as you have. I do not expect the Minister to know about it but I have drawn this matter to his attention and I know that he will never get down to the bottom of the trouble because he does not know where to look for the leakage; but I hope that my remarks upon this subject will make them more careful in the future. We will never have satisfaction in this service until we get another man in charge of the Department.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, the Honourable member has referred to some discrepancies in the Department of Telegraphs. If there is anything that can be done I can assure the member that every effort will be made to have it remedied. I cannot claim to be in a position to give an opinion as to how the Telegraphs Department should be run, but I have a knowledge of the work of that Department and I certainly agree with him that the Department has grown to such an extent at the present time that it requires the undivided attention of some man who is thoroughly competent. As far as I know Mr. Stott is a very competent and reliable official. He visits me nearly every day in connection with the matters in his department. I am continually

in touch with him and find that any instructions that I give are carried out in a satisfactory manner. Of course, like in every other public service there may be some people who are not giving that attention to their duties that they should but that unfortunately is a matter very difficult to remedy. I quite agree with his remarks that the Postal Telegraph Service and the Post Office are important services. As to any changes, that is a comprehensive question that would require the advice of some person qualified in the work, but I can assure the Honourable member and the Committee that if there are any discrepancies and I can lay my hand on them and have them proven I will

take the proper steps to have the remedy applied. I am very glad that the matter has been brought up because it is a public service that is of very great importance. In regard to interruptions that is a very difficult matter. In many cases there is a large stretch of country where travelling is often very difficult and repairing is impossible in boisterous weather. It very often happens that it is through snow storms that the repairers have to go to repair the line. I would be very glad to see any improvement that can be made and shall be happy to receive any information from the hon. member or any reliable member.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words about this point which has just arisen. I think the time has come when we should take this matter up thoroughly and have the whole Department put on a business-like basis and run properly. It seems to me that things are not quite as they ought to be, for judging from what I have seen and heard this department seems to lack

proper control and appears to have been neglected by those responsible for it in this House. The Postal Telegraph vote for this year amounts to nearly three quarters of a million, which is spent in its maintenance. There are besides large expenditures which have been paid out of loans, and I think the time has arrived for the proper establishment of this Department on a thoroughly business-like basis. If the descriptions of the Colonial Secretary and that of Mr. Coaker are correct then it is perfectly clear that this Department requires immediate attention. I may mention here that rumour has it that the Government intend to retire the present Postmaster General and I would like to know whether this is correct or under consideration or not. If it is so some provision will have to be made in the Pension Bill, and discussion will have to take place as to his successor. Mr. Woods has been a valuable servant during his tenure of office, and the selection of his successor will require particular consideration. If possible we want a man who has experience in that ever increasing Department. The position will have to be filled by a man of experience, for it would take a new man several years thoroughly to acquaint himself with the intricacies of this immense service. I merely wish to make public that I have heard the Government intended retiring Mr. Woods, whose health is not what it used to be, and were now considering the question of his successor.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is no intention whatever on the part of the Government to retire Mr. Woods. I understood that his illness was of a temporary character. I hope that his health will soon be quite restored, and that he will be able to resume his duties for which he is so well fitted.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to hear this. I regret that the matter has not arisen before the consideration of the Government for Mr. Woods is a man who is over seventy years of age, and I do not consider that he is now fit to shoulder the immense responsibilities of his Department. I hope the Government will consider that, and consider who the next man to take charge of that Department will be. It is a position involving immense labour, to perform which a man would have to work from nine in the morning until nine at night, for twelve months. Mr. Woods is now in very poor health. He has not made a success of his business by any means, that may not altogether be his fault. We want a strong man also and competent well experienced in that particular department, to supplant him. I would suggest the Hon. J. A. Robinson. I am sure that a stronger or more efficient man cannot be found. The state of things existing at present cannot continue. I believe the Government will consider this and act with reasonable promptitude. While I do not wish to dictate to the Government I would like to suggest Mr. Robinson as next man for that Department.

MR. LLOYD—I presume from the Premier's last statement that the matter has not been brought officially before the Executive.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—What I meant to say was this, that the matter has not come under my notice in any way at all, nor has it come before the Executive at any time. Of course, I cannot answer for the future. I was merely replying to Mr. Kent's question as to whether the Government were contemplating it.

MR. LLOYD—I do not want to contradict the Premier in any way, but I

would like to remark that the matter is being generally discussed around town as an understood thing, as a settled policy of the Government. This apparently is news to the Premier. I would add however that it is currently believed in town that the success-

or to Mr. Woods will be the Hon. P. T. McGrath.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring one matter for the consideration of the Government in relation to Fogo District. In the Fall of 1913 Government wires were sent down there, and everybody expected that within a few months telegraph offices would be erected, but nothing has been done. The service could be extended to Gander Bay and Muskrat Harbour, and I do not think it would prove very expensive as the necessary poles are available at that place. It was rumored that the Government sought to elicit votes by a tacit promise of communication with the outside world. The people are most desirous of ascertaining the precise intention of the Government in sending these wires there. These wires are an inconvenience to the people, and the man who has had the custody of the wires since that time, intends, I believe, claiming rent. These are the sort of things that persuade people that only Government members can help them, and a Government behaving like this acts contrary to the dictates of justice, and tends to foster the growth of a partisan spirit which will react most unpleasantly on the Country. In the matter of salaries Fogo District got only \$457, when according to population it should get \$1,350, according to salaries paid to Postmasters in the outports. I hope the Government will take these matters into its immediate consideration.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I

wish to draw the attention of the Government to the matter just referred to by the member for Fogo. The extension of telegraph wires referred to by the hon. member would only be necessary for a distance of ten or twelve miles. The wires were taken there in 1913, and the entire establishment of this convenience would not cost more than five or six hundred dollars, and would not cost more than forty or fifty dollars when once constructed. I hope the Colonial Secretary will take notice of these things as the necessity for this slight extension has been a long felt want in Fogo.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, you have down here for the Port de Grave mail courier the sum of \$200. Now I want to say, Sir, that this is a very small salary for a man who finds it necessary to keep a horse and carriage, and whose whole time is taken up with this matter. It needs considerable attention to keep this route open all the winter, and only one cognizant with all the circumstances knows the great difficulty in making this the worst of our courier's journeys. Work at that time is constant, and takes every hour of the day, and to expect a man to live with a large family on that wage is impossible. Other couriers get \$180 to \$200 for places which do not require half the time necessary here, and I think that something ought to be done to allow this man sufficient to live upon. I take it that the Minister will make inquiries into this matter if any other information is needed, and make allowance for this expenditure when supplementary amounts are voted. I just want to draw the Government's attention to this and ask for their consideration.

MR. JENNINGS—I hold in my hands, Mr. Chairman, a letter from a man of S.W. Arm, Green Bay. He says

he had the summer mail but that since that time it has been taken from him and given to a man Thistle, which man gets \$7 per week, or \$1 more than he ever got. This man now offers to do it again for \$6 and so give the Government a chance to save \$1 and get work done just the same.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will have this matter looked into.

MR. COAKER—That was just before the last election.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, while these votes are still being passed I would like to call the attention of the Government to the Labrador steam service. I have in my hand a letter from a fisherman of Twillingate district. This was written not on his own initiative but on behalf of the men with him. They complain against this service and say it is unsatisfactory. They were a long time cut off from all communication with their homes, I cannot I think do better than read it to the House. (Read Letter.)

Now that will give you some idea of the circumstances to be faced not only by men of Twillingate, but by men of everywhere. I would like the Government to see that everything possible is done to insure good service to these men. The last captain sent down there was the very worst they have had there. Captains G. Barbour and Hann gave good satisfaction and I think the Government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will look after the interests of these our fishermen.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I would endorse Mr. Chairman, the remarks made by Mr. Jennings. Last year through some misunderstanding, my recommendations were not carried out. Whether it was my fault or the Government's I do not know, but I assure you I was en-

endeavoring to do the best possible to make this a good service.

The first year I was honored with the position I hold now, I went down to Labrador on the Fiona, and went up and down the shore. Years before I had been down that shore and seen the necessity of main ports of call, and I brought the attention of Sir Edward to it. He acceded and the "Fiona" was dispatched to Cape Mugford.

At this place the men bring up. This seems to be their central station. Since this time the Government has been endeavoring to get a boat to go down there. This year I propose to recommend that a boat leave here not later than June 1st to inform the people on the Treaty coast of alterations made in view of petitions.

About the last of July or the first of August men from Green Bay go down there and I believe that 3 out of 19 of them get good loads of fish.

I may say that my intention is to give the fishermen down there the best possible service, and if they do not get it, it will not be my fault, but the fault of the Government. There are two boats going down this year, an early spring and one mail boat. Personally I think what is needed is a small boat which would be able to keep in touch with all places down there. Last year, it will be remembered, the "Daleine" was sent down in charge of a Green Bay man. He was ordered to do whatever he could to help the men down there. That was all that we could do, we could not follow him down. I think that this year and in future whenever possible the master of this boat should take all this into consideration and get as much news as possible from the Marconi stations down there, and spread it among the people. If the Premier will promise that and will get the telegraph people to toe the line, the

people would get good service. I will give Mr. Chairman my word of honor that nothing will be left undone if the Postal people will back me up in this matter. I appreciate the necessity of it. I think that the boat should call, be there mail or no mail there, I have heard no complaint against Capt. Wm. Winsor. He gave information as fast as he could. The reason was that he, being a fisherman, knew the necessity this is, and I believe the Government will do all in their power to facilitate this work.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, what is the answer to Mr. Jennings? What is the Government going to do? What programme are they putting down? I understand they are going to get a tug. They don't intend to hire the "Daleine" do they? There is no accommodation aboard her. Let the boat first have accommodation, and don't let it be a joke. You want a smart, good, seaworthy boat which will be well looked after.

I agree with Mr. Jennings. A boat is no good if she misses certain ports. This is what the people complain of. Get the most suitable steamer in the country, and if you do your best to have her properly looked after no one will complain.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—It is impossible to direct a captain from St. John's. What is wanted is a man who will use his common sense, and follow around using discretion as to where to go. These were the instructions given to Capt. Parsons last year. Captain Winsor is the only man that ever carried out that service to good satisfaction, but he incurred the jealousy of the Bonavista Bay people because he towed a Conception Bay schooner in once.

MR. JENNINGS—I would like to call attention to the Reid boats. If the 'Clyde' would go once a week it

would suit the people very well. I hope the Government will arrange for a good service this year, and include places like Point Leamington in the schedule.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I have heard of no application from these places. I do not think I am far astray when I say that I do not know of any Government getting a boat to call there. This place has become a lot more important since Mr. Crowe took charge there, and I think application was made to my friend Mr. Coaker. I think it is only just and right however that these should have the services of the boat.

The Chairman left the Chair at 6.30 until 8 o'clock.

The Chairman resumed the Chair at 8 p.m.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman: Before the vote passes, I would like to say a word in support of the statement that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made here before the House adjourned. Point Leamington not only has a large population of itself, but there are many other settlements near by which would benefit almost as well. It is, I think, about ten or twelve miles from the nearest port of call of the Clyde, and about twelve miles by road from Botwood. There was a man down there last Fall that wanted to get some fresh meat over to Botwood. He simply had to drag it across, because there was no other way by which he could get it there. There are a number of others, too, in that part of New Bay, to whom it would be a great advantage if a steamer were to call and give them a chance to send their goods in that way.

MR. COAKER.—I was hoping that the Colonial Secretary would have some reply to the observations of Mr. Jennings, because this matter is very important.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I was going to say that just before recess the Colonial Secretary and I conferred in relation to the matter. I hope to have a conference with Mr. Jennings and others to see if the desired end cannot be brought about.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman: With respect to this vote for Brigus of \$320 for the operators in the telegraph office there, I notice that there is an increase there of \$120. Now, I must strongly protest against this vote, because I consider that the Government has established a principle whereby they are spending money unnecessarily, for no useful purpose whatever, and merely, as far as I am informed, to meet the requirements of certain supporters of the Government. Now, Mr. Kent raised a principle here this afternoon, namely, the filling of vacancies in the civil service by promotion. If a vacancy occurs, the person filling the position immediately below that should be promoted, if he is found to be qualified for such promotion. In the telegraph office at Brigus there was a vacancy some time ago, and the assistant, instead of being promoted to the office, had to give way to a person who had no experience whatever in telegraphy. The consequence was that there was great dissatisfaction amongst the people there. Now, I do not understand, Sir, how the Government can think that appointments of this sort in any way help them or tend to increase their popularity. I venture to assert that in this particular instance, that appointment has done the Government a great deal of harm—much more than will offset any good that they can possibly derive from it.

I have to object to this increase of \$120, when there has been no increase in the receipts of the office (the receipts of that office have averaged for the last four years in the neighbourhood of \$238), and when

there is no increase in the work to be done. I consider, Sir, that this is one of the cases in which the Government is using the public moneys in an extravagant manner. There is an office at Clarke's Beach, the operator of which gets \$120 and the assistant \$36. That office has to do an equal amount of work, if not more, than the office at Brigus, and yet we find this difference of over \$100 between the two offices. The only answer that can be made, so far as I have been able to learn, is that the Government has had to satisfy the demands of certain supporters who have been looking after these positions.

This is the system that has been followed on for years. The point that was raised by Mr. Kent here this afternoon should be followed out by the Government. These positions should not be filled by persons who are not qualified for it; simply because they supported the Government in the last election. We have heard here of the demoralization that has occurred in various departments. Assistants in these offices find that despite their long years of service, they are set aside for those who have no qualification whatever. There should be something done to remedy this condition of things. I should like to ask the Minister here to-night, to put in other offices the \$120 voted for Brigus, which does not need it. The Ministers believe that there should be a readjustment of the expenses in connection with some of the offices. I have found out that in these two offices alone the Government can meet the need and satisfy the people much better, and also the assistants, showing them that fair play will be given them in the future. I should like to say that this vote of \$120 increase should be divided up between Clarke's Beach and Port de Grave, more especially Clarke's Beach. The

Colonial Secretary is well acquainted with the receipts that come in from that office, which are just as great as those coming in from the Brigus Office.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Chairman: I may say in reference to the remarks made by Mr. Grimes, that the member referred to the appointment of an assistant for the Brigus office. The assistant in that office is considered by the Postmaster General to be too young. She is only fifteen years of age, and too young to have that responsibility. She was replaced by an older person, with the hope that before long she would be capable of resuming her duties in that office. But there has been no desire to treat her unfairly.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: I think that it is a very serious matter when a member complains that too much money is spent on his own district. The Government ought to give it due consideration. That is a very poor answer to the member's question that the girl is too young. It is very rare that you will find that members get up and protest against so much expenditure in their own district.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Chairman: I may say that this sort of thing has been going on year after year. I do not see why the Government wants to drop this grant this year. The Government is continuing this extravagance, and I do not agree with it. I think that the people ought to be given a fair show. The office was only put there for the use of Dr. Smith. Brookfield is one of the fishing stations as well as any other place. It does not require great expense on the part of the Government to put somebody there. The Government should carry on this grant. I hope that this will receive due consideration.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Chairman: I wish to say that this

office was originally opened when Dr. Smith was at Brookfield. Afterwards Dr. Kean succeeded Dr. Smith, but he was not an operator. I have no doubt, however, that the Government will provide for it. I can assure the hon. member that if it is found practical to open that office, it shall be opened. The only reason why it was closed, was because of the want of accommodation.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman: The people of Cupids again ask for a telegraph office. They want the telegraph office. They want the telegraph line to extend from Brigus station to that place, which is a distance of about a mile. A man would be only too ready to take charge of it. It is not convenient for them to go two or three miles in order to send a message which may be very important. For the small outlay I think that the Government would do well to consider this request.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The hon. member has already written me in respect to it. I wrote to Mr. Saunders on the matter. He said that since the office was put there it did not warrant that expense, because the business there is too small. That phase of the question has never been represented to me. I will take a note of it and see to it.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman: In reference to what Mr. Saunders said, the man who controls the office there is a business man, and the people there do not want their affairs known to this man. I think that if the Colonial Secretary would consider the matter, he would satisfy the public generally.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Chairman: We have already presented a petition from the inhabitants of Trinity East for a telegraph office. I think it would be only fair for them to have one. I notice that \$120 is dropped this year

in connection with Clarenville. I think that if that \$120 was given for an operator in Trinity East, it would be a good thing.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Chairman: The people of that place are not at all satisfied with the condition of things there. I got several letters about the matter. I would like the Colonial Secretary to have a change made so as to give satisfaction.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman: I have not had any notification about dissatisfaction with the state of affairs down there. At least not within my memory. If the hon. member has had letters I will see what can be done.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Chairman: The fault down there is not with the operator but with the fact that the office is in a business place. There are several people speaking about it.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Chairman: I have also had letters from the same place about the same thing. Two petitions have been sent to the Postmaster-General, but I don't know what has been done in the matter.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman: The objection is that the office is in the chief business place of that settlement. The people object to having the business and telegraph office in the same place.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: I know something about this matter. The trouble in that place is that you have got to pass through Button's store in order to get to the telegraph office. What is transacted in the office is known outside in the shop. The office ought to be put somewhere else. If you do what our men ask, you may be taking some of our votes from us, for that is the sort of thing that sent us here.

MR. COAKER.—What is the explanation of the increase of vote at Springdale from \$120 to \$360?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— I am not in a position to answer that question just now. I will take a note of it and let you know to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman: I notice a number of places where an allowance is made for messengers. In Fogo District there is not a messenger in any of the Telegraph offices. Application has been made for a messenger at Fogo, and I would suggest that when Supplementary Supply is brought down that the Minister will take a note of this and allow a sum of money for a messenger at Fogo proper. It has been brought to the notice of the Government and I see no reason why there should not be a messenger in Fogo Office as well as in some others.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman: This afternoon I referred to the matter of the repairing of telegraph lines after interruption. I have here now a statement that I can give to the House to back up what I stated. The branch line connecting Twillingate and Fogo on Feb. 11, 1914, was interrupted and it was not repaired until the next day at three o'clock. Feb. 26th, line interrupted at Change Islands for two days. April 15th, between Clarendville and Brooklyn, line interrupted, took two days to repair; April 16th, interruption at Western Cove, took until the days to repair; April 16th, interruption at Change Islands, took three days to repair. From Beaverton to Change Islands should not take longer than six hours to get over. Why that interruption took so long to repair we ought to find out. What we want to know is are these officials at their posts? June 16th (in the summer) an interruption at Musgrave Harbour which took two days to repair; June 20th, interruption at Moreton's Harbour which took a day to repair; July 6th, another interruption at Musgrave Harbour took one day to repair; still an-

other interruption at Harbour Breton took another day; another interruption at Northern Blight took a day; Oct. 3rd interruption at Herring Neck; it is not a very long distance there, and yet it took two or three days. October 4th, interruption at Musgrave Harbour again took two days to repair; October 17th, interruption at Tilt Cove took one day. October 18th, interruption to Coachman's Cove took two days to repair; 19th, interruption at Parsons' Pond, two days. Another interruption at Old Perlican took two days to repair. That is a serious matter. There are two repairers and it took them three days. On Nov. 25th Port Saunders interrupted, took two days; 26th Bay de Verde took four days to repair. At Bonne Bay it took one day to repair. These are serious matters, and it is evident that the repairers are not doing their work. That is not a very creditable showing for the Department, and the head of the Department is not doing his duty, when he permits this to go on. I know enough about repairing lines and the cause of interruption to show you that these men are not doing their duty. We have a large number of repairers; they cost us \$12,000 a year, and we ought to get better satisfaction from them. We ought to have an enquiry into this matter and find out where the trouble is.

SUB-COLLECTORS.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Minister whether the salary on the Labrador represents one or two collectors?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I think that vote covers the two.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Government to take me into their confidence on the question of sub-collectors. I believe there are a lot of sub-collectors that could be done without. There are two

that I know of, one at Exploits and Moreton's Harbour. The man at Herring Neck gets \$150. Herring Neck is certainly as important as either of those two places and gets just as much work. If the collector at Herring Neck gets \$150, then they can do the work for the same figure at Moreton's Harbour and Exploits. These men have other work to do and yet they are paid these salaries and they allow their work to interfere with their duties of collecting. They have nothing to do but to go around talking for the Government or something else. I think we will save quite a considerable sum if this collector system was done without.

MR. COAKER—There is quite a lot of that talking for the Government by these sub-collectors, or something worse. There is certainly a considerable amount of money expended in this work that could be saved. This man at Moreton's Harbour is unnecessary. I am sure that I could get a man who would do the work for \$50 while the Government is now paying \$360, and I am sure the man would feel himself well paid at \$50. The same applies to Exploits where he gets \$400. You could easily get a man there for \$50. There is very little work to do as sub-collector. These matters are too serious to be passed over lightly and as I have stated many times already it is by collection money and votes as these you lose your votes at the election. It is by wastage, such as these that we got our votes in the last election.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have been wondering all along how you ever got in; now I know.

MR. COAKER—Well now you have the mystery solved and I hope you will take my advice.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Just one or two

words in reply in regard to Lewisporte. There is a great deal of work to be done there. It is a distributing point for two steamers. The amount of duties collected there last year was \$4000, and the salary paid was \$500. In regard to Moreton's Harbor, that is a change asked for by the people. The schooners going to Labrador clear from there. The duties collected, shown here, were \$1000. The salary of \$360 is paid to that officer more as a preventive officer than anything else.

MR. COAKER—**Mr. Chairman:** I may say there is no need for a preventive officer at Exploits or at Lewisporte; but even if there is any preventive work to do you could easily get a man to do it just as effectively for \$50; I see one man here is getting \$15 and he is doing just as much work as the man either at Exploits or Moreton's Harbour. He is giving satisfaction. That man ought to have his photograph put in the House here. The duties of the man at Lewisporte I well know, I worked at Lewisporte as an operator for twelve months and I know what he has to do. It is not a busy port now although it is a port of distribution. We could get a man to do the work for \$50. If you will pay the man I will appoint one who will take \$50. It is now costing \$900.

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—He is limited to \$700.

MR. COAKER—Last year he got \$900. He is a good man, I have nothing against him. He is fit for some responsible place like Grand Falls where he would be required; but it is not necessary to pay him that much at Lewisporte.

MR. HALFYARD—There is a new appointment at Fogo. Do you know who that official is?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think the appoint-

ment has been made, but I do not know the man's name. His salary was in the Estimates last year. I do not think it is a new appointment.

MR. COAKER—What is the amount of the contingencies expended last year by the Customs?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I cannot say off-hand. Something over the amount voted.

MR. COAKER—If I had a statement of how much contingencies were expended we would know how much you were overdrawn.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I have given replies to that question to several members.

MR. KENT—Not as to Departmental contingencies.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The Customs was not overdrawn.

MR. COAKER—I see here Mr. P. T. McGrath received \$600. Might I ask what that is for?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think that you will find that is in connection with the Commission here this summer.

MR. COAKER—And Dr. Grenfell \$200.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That was for services in connection with some diphtheria cases which broke out in St. Barbe district. At least that is what I fancy it is for. He was ordered to go there by the Government as Doctor.

MR. COAKER—I see here Mr. Warren received a certain sum of money.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That was when he was sent home to England as Speaker for the Colony.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I

consider the Minister of Finance and Customs has indeed earned his conduct money, and I congratulate him on the manner in which he has controlled his temper. He lost his temper rather on the first evening, but apparently he has repented, and if he keeps on as he has been going we shall have no fault to find with him. I presume we shall refer to these matters again, as I have several matters in connection with which I would like to make a few remarks.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, and asked leave to sit again.

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

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Administration of Local Affairs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I beg to make a few observations relative to this bill. This bill seems elaborately provided with many sections to meet I suppose every consideration possible. A great many abuses have arisen during the course of the history of local affairs. I would like to read to the Committee the following:—"During the winter of 1914 a petition signed at least by Mr. Halfyard's strongest supporters, and forwarded, we presume, to that gentleman had failed to elicit favorable results. Therefore it was inferred that it was"

useless to approach the member for Fogo district with our grievances." Now before I make any comment on this extract, I would like to know exactly what funds are at the disposal of these Boards.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—I think the Hon. member will find that the money allocated in this respect is given to any Board on the recommendation of the sitting member.

MR. HALFYARD—That brings me to the point I wish to set before the Committee. This grant of twenty thousand dollars has caused more trouble and abuses than any other grant we have in the public service. Moneys solicited nominally for public benefit are very often diverted to private uses by unscrupulous men to advance their own interests. The district of Fogo receives \$691 which I understand from the remarks of the Premier is its share, but I know many examples of the abuse to which this benefit has been put. I am aware that at Tilting an allocation has been sent to Mr. P. T. Brien in this manner. I made enquiries from the Minister Marine and Fisheries who informed me that the Deputy Minister Mr. Goodridge had given authority that this be sent out. Later I learned that this authority emanated from the Executive Council. Mr. Goodridge at the time was away with the First Contingent. I intended making enquiries on his return but learned through the papers that Mr. Crosbie was the authority for the allocation. With permission of the House I will read this. "The public wharf here had fallen into disrepair, and the Road therefore to the Postal Telegraph Office, had been left in an unfinished state. Through the kindness of the Hon. J. C. Crosbie a grant was secured and both wharf and road

have been put in excellent condition. Why this should have been left to the member for Bay de Verde to look to, is difficult to explain but it caused many to regret that we had not secured such a representative for the district as Mr. Crosbie."

I do not suppose Mr. Crosbie did this for the sake of advertisement. I regret that he is absent from this chamber now. Later I learned something further in that connection. With the permission of the House I will read this "During the winter of 1914 a petition signed at least by Mr. Halfyard's strongest supporters and forwarded we presume to that gentleman, had failed to elicit favorable results. Therefore, it was inferred that it was useless to approach the member for Fogo district with our grievances."

This brings me to the point I wish to make in connection with the allocation of these small grants. Why should one member interfere with matters in connection with the district of another. It is mean, small and contemptible. I cannot understand it. Perhaps the hon. member will explain.

Now I do not blame the Prime Minister. In fact, I take this opportunity to say that I believe his intentions are quite good in regard to the rights of sitting members. I believe his intentions are to carry out the statements that he made last year. In regard to this particular matter the Executive Government evidently did not know anything about it, because when I drew the matter to their attention I received a very courteous reply. It is unfair to the Prime Minister for any member of his party to go beyond what he said and do such a thing. In doing that they show they have no respect for their leader or his statements; by their actions they contradict his statements. Now Sir, I

do not intend to let this matter go without some remark because if any member of the Executive can send \$60 to Fogo district he can do the same thing for the whole eighteen districts in the Island. I would like to know how, say the member for Piacentia, would like to have some other member allocate money for his district. I ask any member of the House to take it to himself and ask himself how he would like it. We have a very small grant and we are trying to do the best we can with it and nobody else has any right to come in and send down allocations. I hope that by drawing this to the attention of the Government such a thing will never happen again. It is the same old thing, if you are not in the Government you cannot get anything. We are now bringing in an Act for the administration of Local Affairs. It is a very important thing to have these boards elected and to give them the power of spending all the money to the very best advantage. I think there is a great deal in what has been said by the member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, when he stated that each locality should be given control of the Public Health, the Road money, Marine Works and other local matters like that. They should be made to depend upon themselves and they should assume the whole responsibility and it should not be the business of the Government to be dabbling in every petty matter of local interest. I hope this bill will be the means of giving the people a more independent spirit in that connection, but it will be of no use while we are giving some districts a certain sum of money for building a road and then giving to another district a special grant at the expense of the other districts. We must make it equal in every locality. Every district should share in the

grants as they share in the making of the revenue, and when they know that no one else is being treated any better at their expense they will use their money to the best advantage and tax themselves for their own improvements. Without wishing to occupy the attention of the House on this matter any longer I trust that by next year this bill will be put in operation and that we will have no further cause for complaint.

HON. MR. CROSSIE—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the matter referred to by the member for Fogo—the expenditure of the \$60 in his District—I may say that when that was done there was no intention whatever of interfering with his rights, at least so far as I am concerned. As far as I remember the facts, I received a letter from a man in that district who is a friend of mine. As far as allocating the money is concerned I had nothing whatever to do with it. I simply sent that letter to the Board of Works. Whatever happened after that was none of my business. I had nothing whatever to do with the allocation of the money and had no wish in any way to interfere in Fogo district. I hope that explanation is quite clear.

MR. HALFYARD—Then it was done by the official in the Department.

HON. MR. CROSSIE—I do not know. If a letter comes to me from any other district, I simply send it to the Department. I then feel that I have carried out my obligation. I never troubled about it. I do not wish to hear anything about what I did. Someone wrote in the paper praising me in connection with it. I would be much happier if he had held his tongue.

MR. HALFYARD—Then I understand that you sent this letter to the Department without any representation whatever.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—Yes that is it.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if this Bill is as good as the one which he promised last year. Did he not promise that every member should have the allocating of his own money. The money that is allocated to the District of Trinity is \$1800.00, and out of that sum there was \$850.00 sent to different places without our knowledge. I suppose that will not happen again.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I do not know anything about that at all, but I will make enquiries.

MR. TARGETT.—But after this bill is passed I want to know whether the sitting members will have the expenditure of all the money or will the same thing happen again?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No, nobody will have anything to do with it except the sitting members.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman: In regard to the matter referred to by the learned member for Trinity, Mr. Targett, I explained that a couple of days ago. His colleague, Dr. Lloyd, was satisfied with the explanation. He asked me for an explanation of these allocations and I pointed out what had occurred, and Dr. Lloyd complimented me on the matter. He did not hold me responsible in any way. I know how it was done. I would not have done it if I had not thought it was for the benefit of the district. I could not get into communication with any of the sitting members on the questions. The allocations were made for useful public works, and the works were performed, but had I known that I was not doing something for the benefit of the district I would not have attempted to interfere at all. Certainly after this measure passes no one will be able to interfere. I had no intention but the most honourable one at the time. I thought I was doing right, and I

would do the same to-morrow if I thought it was for the benefit of the district. That is the only explanation I can give. Dr. Lloyd stated that he thought I was doing my duty. I am quite satisfied as long as the other members are satisfied.

MR. TARGETT.—We may be satisfied for what has happened in the past, while we may not be satisfied if anything similar is done in the future.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I will not interfere with Trinity again, anyway!

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman: It may be that my colleague, Dr. Lloyd, may not have known the number of allocations made by the Minister. Of course we do not blame the Minister altogether. We think that someone else was in this matter with him. There was a sum of \$20.00 allocated to Heart's Content. There was \$50.00 to Chance Cove, and \$100.00 to another place. Those allocations caused considerable trouble; the total was \$805. We had requisitions filled out and sent them to the Department, that we had promised the various localities out of these grants, but we never had the money to do it. We went up to the Department and found that \$805.00 had been spent without our knowledge. I hope that in the future we will have no further bother with the Department. With regard to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, we are quite satisfied. I believe that the Minister is very conscientious and is going to do what is right by the members of the Districts. I congratulate him on the stand which he has taken. If other Ministers took a similar stand we would have no complaints at all. We have never had any complaint to make with him on that point. I believe that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is doing what he can for the benefit of the people.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman:

While on this subject I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works to let me into the secret of how the money is allocated in Trinity and in Bay de Verde. In 1914 I received repeatedly letters from the district, asking if there was any money and if it was going to be allocated. I sent letters to the Minister of Public Works, ten altogether, and I never received any reply as to whether or not the money had been sent to the District. Finally these people wrote me charging me with not giving any attention to their questions. One man said I was not giving the information that he wanted and that he had written to Mr. Morine to see if he could get it. I have no idea as to what has been done in the district. I was surprised when the member for Fogo stated that my colleague, Mr. Crosbie, had sent \$60.00 down to Fogo. The public wharf at Freshwater has fallen down, and there has never been any money allocated to repair it. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that no money has been allocated. I would like to know how matters in these districts are being attended to.

HON. MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman: Before this Bill goes through, I would like to say that I am in full sympathy with it. I regret that during the past few years this statute was not on the book, and in working order. When I took hold of the district of Fortune in 1908 I found that the whole area of country from Garnish to Pushthrough had about six or seven boards. The result was that only the large places in the District received any public moneys. The smaller ones were entirely neglected, and some of them, under the old system, were receiving no money at all. I hardly see how the District of Fortune is going to take advantage of this Act. It will be difficult in that district to find sections with eighty qualified electors residing within certain areas. In fact

I know of only two places where that will take place. I find myself that the best results that can be obtained are obtained in these small places by giving these places separate boards. In fact some places have only a half dozen people, but even in that case it had its board. That board might only have one representative, but the money went directly from the Department to that man, and did not go through different channels. I find in the District of Fortune Bay, under the system that I have inaugurated, that there are only a few places that would be able to avail of this Act: St. Jacques, Harbour Breton, Garnish, Pushthrough, Ship Cove. These places will have elective boards, but my only regret is that these are the only places that will come under the Act.

MR. KENT.—The present existing boards will remain, no matter what the number of voters is.

HON. MR. EMERSON.—In the District of Fortune Bay there are forty boards that receive their money direct from the Department, and everything works very well, but I am sorry that they cannot all come under this Act, because these representatives of the people will have some experience of these matters, and I consider it a very good thing that sitting members should have nothing to do with the expenditure of public moneys. It would relieve him of a lot of responsibility; doing away with a considerable amount of correspondence concerning road boards; attending to petty claims which only make him most unpopular, there is no doubt about that. No matter how much you work in a district; no matter what you may do to get a lighthouse or other public work erected, when it comes to an election the greatest trouble you have is over the man you have appointed to look after it. It is the same way with the Road Boards. The member for a district should not have anything to

do with recommending the boards at all. There should be some other system by which it is done. This bill, to a very large extent, remedies these troubles because the distribution and expenditure of the moneys is in the hands of local boards, and these boards are responsible for the expenditure, and if they do not do as well as might be, as far as expenditure is concerned, the people can no longer blame the members. In Fortune Bay they will still have the same old system to a certain extent, because they cannot take advantage of this Act. I hope that this Act will be found to work well, because it is a matter which it is very desirable to carry out. It is intended that the people should have control of the moneys for their localities and its expenditure, and to relieve the members of the district of a great deal of this responsibility.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Chairman, just a word in connection with this matter. I am agreed that under the act as it now stands, we cannot have an election this fall. The areas and their boundaries have to be defined by thirty voters, and the people who are away fishing will not be home till after the election. It will be impossible to define any areas under those conditions. I think it would be a good thing if the election was postponed, and held next year instead of this; then when the men come home, they can arrange the elections and define the areas for themselves. I would move an amendment to section No. 12, providing that Burin should be excepted for this year. As soon as there is an opportunity, an election will be held. I think it would be well if the election took place in January or February instead of in November.

MR. LEFEUVRE—Mr. Chairman: I fully endorse the remarks of my colleague, Mr. Currie. It is impossible

that the people of Burin can have their election when so many of the men are away from home.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The position in Burin, is, Mr. Chairman, so far as I understand, that seven or eight settlements appoint a man each and then these men meet and transact the business. I should suggest that it would be better to exclude Burin—that is, the settlements of Burin proper. The difficulty is got over by excluding Burin for the time being, with the right to come in later. I see no objections in making this amendment. It will not affect the advantages of the bill for the whole island.

MR. CURRIE—There are only five people representing all these places. A place can appoint a road board for itself and the same thing will apply to the other places. Some of the places are so small that there are only four or five voters there. Let the people take it up themselves and decide for themselves and then they can have their election. The most that we can do is to make a recommendation to the Minister of Public Works who is in control of these matters, not the members, they only represent the districts. In my district several amounts were allocated by Captain Bonia; and I am glad, if it was necessary to have it done, that Captain Bonia did make these allocations. It seems to me that a certain amount of responsibility must be left on the Minister.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, is it right that the Minister of Public Works should take upon himself the right to make any allocations to any district. When it comes to the building of a wharf that will cost \$500 or \$600, then it is all right for the Minister to grant it; but in the case of small sums it is different. The place must be kept in repair, and under the existing conditions the representative

of the district should know as much about it as anybody else.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask on what authority, a sum of money was sent to Bay de Verde in 1914.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—If the hon. member comes to my office we can talk the matter over. I will be only too will'ng to agree with the hon. member.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will find me at my office at any time, if he wishes to see me, when I will try to fix the matter up.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that there will be some difficulty in carrying out some of these provisions. How will you conduct repairs in regard to the main line. Between one point and another there are at present four or five boards. At the present time it is under the directions of a commission. There are other places to which the same may be applied. I think the Government might grant that without further consideration. I agree with the election of boards generally, but I just wanted to point out how difficult it will be for the Road Boards to conduct affairs in connection with the main road.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—

Just a word or two, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member. I think that there is a misunderstanding in connection with these Road Boards. Wherever there is a Road Board, the election is to take place in November next. No attempt has been made to alter the present area under those Boards where main lines go through four or five districts. Take the main line from St. John's to Carbonear. The first section is in St. John's. That section runs as far as Donovan's. The next section is in Harbor Main; the

next is in Brigus; the next is in Hr. Grace, and the next in Carbonear. Where any portion of that main line is controlled at present by a Road Board, that will continue to look after it. In other words, the duties of a Commissioner under the regular Road Act are not intended to be in any way affected. So that I think it will be found that this Act, although it seems a bit cumbersome, will work out very simply. The main principle is simply that boards will be elected and not appointed. The jurisdiction, as regards area, will be the same as it is to-night; but if Boards wish to break up—if, instead of having one Board in Placentia they would like to have three; or instead of having one Board in Fortune they would like to have two; and so on, then a certain number of electors can petition the Governor in Council and that will be done. As regards the case of Burin, a section might be added to meet that difficulty. This might be added to section 2: "Provided that this section should not apply to the Councils in the district of Burin until such time as the boundaries under the jurisdiction of these Councils shall have been defined, in order to come under the provisions of this Act. Upon the said boundaries being defined, an election shall be forthwith held, as provided for in this Act." I think that this would meet the difficulty.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I don't altogether agree with the Premier as regards main line grants. I think that all moneys should be under the jurisdiction of the road boards and should be spent by the boards and not by commissioners.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I was going to say that at present nearly all moneys are spent by these boards, and will continue to be. But there are portions of the country

where there are no boards. Take, for instance, the section from Placentia to Cape St. Mary's—over thirty miles—where there is no board at all, and which is not within the jurisdiction of any board. Commissioners have to be appointed in cases such as that.

MR. COAKER—In places where there are no boards, of course, moneys will have to be spent by Commissioners; but in cases where there are boards the money should not be spent by Commissioners. In the northern districts we would prefer that our moneys should be spent by our boards.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It will work itself out. Of course, it is not possible to deal with every case here now; but as they arise we will be able to deal with them by amendments.

MR. COAKER—In that section 2 (b) just what are to be the qualifications?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The hon. member will remember that the Committee considered it desirable that where the jurisdiction of a Board is to be broken up, it must be at the request of a large number of voters. Supposing half a dozen people are dissatisfied with a Board in a settlement; the very first thing they want is a new Board. Thus, you lay it down that the jurisdiction of a board cannot be altered except at the request of a large number of electors.

MR. COAKER—Make it 50 per cent.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I don't see any objection to that. Eighty per cent. ought to be enough to change any board.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: I don't understand the suggestion made by Mr. Coaker about 50 per cent. Is that 50 per cent. of the electors in the area?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. COAKER—If a settlement has one board, and the people want it split up into two boards, 50 per cent. will have to petition to have it split up.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I move that the words "per cent." be inserted after the word "eighty" in sub-section (b) of section 2, so that the section will read: "Eighty per cent of the qualified voters residing within the said limits." Then go forward to section 2, page 2, sub-section (c), third last line. That will read: "Eighty per cent. of qualified electors" instead of "eighty." Then strike out "existing" in the last line of that section and put in "described." There is an amendment also in section 23, after the word "availed" put in "or shall not hereafter avail."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reported that the Committee had considered the bill to them referred and had passed the same with some amendments.

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

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Second reading of Bill dealing with the management of the General Hospital.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. I don't intend at this hour to go into the Bill at any length. I would ask that it be read a second time. Any observations that I may have to make in connection with the matter I will take the opportunity of making later on.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the General Hospital," was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 5th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 5th.

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

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs tabled Report of Auditor General on Municipal Council Accounts.

PETITIONS.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from William J. Morehen, Brigadier of the Salvation Army, asking that the Salvation Army may be incorporated. I will give it to the clerk to read to the House.

(Petition is read by Clerk.)

I beg that this petition be referred to a Select Committee.

On motion the petition was referred to a Select Committee as follows:

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister; Mr. Piccott; Mr. Kent; Mr. Clift; Mr. Lloyd; Mr. Morine; Mr. Jennings.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Harvey and Co. and others, asking that a sum of money be granted for the erection of a Government wharf and store at Rose Blanche, so that steamers calling there will not pile their goods on their premises, for Harvey's want the use of their premises themselves. In the winter it is very difficult to get the stuff ashore from the steamer by the use of boats,

and Rose Blanche is a very important settlement; quite a lot of business is done there. Fifty thousand qtls. of fish were landed there last year. I am aware that it will take considerable money. We have eight or nine wharves to keep up on \$490 a year. It is impossible to build a wharf out of that money. I hope that the Government will grant \$3,000 for this purpose. I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Black Head, Bay de Verde. They ask that a railway station be built at that place. When the railway was first put there or rather near there, it was intended to put a station half a mile between that place and Adam's Cove. Since then something happened whereby it was decided to put the station at Adam's Cove. The people of Black Head have to travel to Adam's Cove, a distance of 1½ miles in order to reach the station. I hope that the hon. Colonial Secretary will give this his attention.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Wm. Woodford and others of Northern Bay for a small sum of money to build a road; also a petition from the residents of Red Head Cove in reference to the placing of cod traps. I beg to refer these petitions to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the Revd. J. T. Richards and others asking that a ferry be placed between Port Saunders and King's Cove. I shall read the petition. (The honourable member read the petition). I submit that this matter is rather important to the fishermen of that place and I trust the Department will put the ferry there.

It would not cost much and would be of great benefit to the fishermen.

QUESTIONS.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a question which I asked in relation to some moneys sent out in 1912-13 in relation to Catalina.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That information is being prepared.

MR. STONE—I do not think that is any answer. There is no preparation; as far as I can learn no returns have come in. I have had several letters in relation to this same amount. It was the Relieving Officer who had the money and it seems that the people were not in very good circumstances down there and the least he could have done was to spend the money and give employment.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—There was \$20 returned and \$5 spent. There are no returns of that.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to lay upon the table answer to questions asked by Mr. Kent, Mr. Halfyard and Mr. Grimes.

MR. KENT—May I ask the Minister of Public Works if he has got a reply to the question re Bell Island?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I am having it copied now.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the agreement made between the late J. O. Fraser, as Chairman of Public Works, in or about the year 1886, and Mr. Clement Hudson, of Pouch Cove, in the District of St. John's East, in relation to the right to land supplies, etc., for the Light House at Cape St Francis, and to state why the said agreement has not been carried into effect during the past few years.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—There is no contract or document in our department. I think the honour-

able gentleman called at the office and was given the same answer.

MR. KENT—I think there was a document in evidence at one time. I think it was there after the fire of '92 and you will find it if you search. Mr. Hudson has no copy of it. He always depended on the copy in the Board of Works Department.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The Secretary has searched and informs me it is not there. He never saw it and knows nothing about it.

MR. KENT—It was there after the fire. I saw it myself.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing how the sum of \$1,600 voted for the two Road Inspectors in St. John's East and West, was paid in the years 1912-13 and 1913-14, stating proportion paid to each Inspector, together with a copy of the vouchers therefor.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table that.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all payments made from July 1st, 1914, to date, under the following heads: (1) Public Works Contingencies; (2) Justice Department Contingencies; (3) Customs Contingencies; (4) Agriculture and Mines Contingencies; (5) Colonial Secretary's Contingencies; (6) Prime Minister's Contingencies.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The answer is being prepared. It will take some time.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement, in detail, showing all moneys paid out of the vote for Tuberculosis campaign, \$24,000 from July 1, 1914, to date.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The answer will be up in about half an hour.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works what is the present allocation for the road from Avondale to Gaskiers, District of Harbor Main; what the amount was for 1914, and a copy of the returns of the expenditure of said amount, and by whom.

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I will have that answer this evening or early to-morrow.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to table a statement showing to what district the vote for telegraph construction was allocated the last fiscal year, and the amount expended in each district.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This information is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD.—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a copy of the representation under which an allocation of \$69 was made to P. J. Bryan, of Tilling, Fogo District, on September 25th, 1914.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That has already been answered, to-day.

MR. STONE.—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing (1) Names of firms from whom purchased and prices paid per knot for cable laid in the following places—Exploits, Woods Island, Bonne Bay, Parsons Pond and Hawk Bay, Flat Island, Placentia Bay, Gaultois, Placentia Bay, Notre Dame Bay, Great Burin, Ramen; giving the actual purchase price per knot for cable supplied each place, and the total strength of cable laid in each place; (2) How many knots of cable have been bought for local cable construction up to the end of 1914; (3) How many knots have been put in use, and how many knots now on hand, and where is cable on hand now lying; (4) What was the total length of the three cables and the weight of same for which C. F.

Lester was paid \$200 for loading from the Empire wharf on board of the S.S. Baleine; (5) Was this contract or days work, and how long was he at the job, and what was the weight of the cable landed; (7) In connection with S.S. Baleine charter, Captain George Mercer, \$175, claim for loss of contract. The Baleine being under charter to the Government at \$100 per day, which covered all expenses, wherein was the Government liable to the Captain for loss of contract, and what contract did he base his claim on? (8) \$52 for board of Government employees. Who were the Government employees for which the amount was paid and to whom was it paid? (9) \$39 for board and lodging; to whom was the amount paid; and for whom was it paid?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This question is rather comprehensive and will take some time to prepare. As I get the information I will table it.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows—Education, \$5,300; Lighthouses, Blockhouses, etc., \$109,175; Roads, Bridges, and Ferries, \$175,426; Customs, \$260,715.

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Administration of Local Affairs," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, as the lobster fishery is practically nil, I think this vote for it should be dropped.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, the fishery is still being carried on even though some districts are not taking it up like in the past. We have issued about seven hundred licenses.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Report of the Fisheries Commission be tabled before we take this vote. Are we never going to have that report. It seems monstrous that the House has been in session four weeks and that report has not been tabled. I would like to have this Report tabled before we go through these Estimates.

I would also like to know what has been done with regard to carrying out the Pure Food Act. We know nothing of course save that Mr. Davies has been appointed analyst.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say that Inspector O'Brien has been appointed Inspector under this Act, and he and Mr. Davies, under Dr. Brehm, are in control. Only last week arrangements were completed and in a few days the Bill will be in operation. Last night's Gazette contained these appointments.

MR. COAKER—Is it only recently that this Act has been put in force?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Only recently. Owing to the outbreak of the war and other things it was shelved for a time. I may say that it has never been lost sight of and the

Premier and myself have had the matter in hand.

As regards the Fisheries Report it was only this morning that it reached my office. It has to go to the Governor and copies will be typewritten and placed on the table of the House.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, it seems too bad to be finding so much fault. I know the Government has a lot of work to do; but it seems monstrous to expect us to go through the Fisheries Vote without having that Report. The House has been in session ever since the first week in April. It ought to have been called in February. Now we are expected to rush matters through. We cannot discuss the fisheries until we get that report and see what is in it.

Now with regard to the Pure Foods Act. That Act was passed last year and not put into force until recently. But Mr. Davies has been drawing a salary since last May or June. He has been receiving a large salary of \$2,100. Last year I noticed a lot of boys going along the street offering beef for sale at \$4 a barrel. Beef was also advertised for sale by a Water St. firm at prices which showed it could not be fit for human food. I sent a copy of the advertisement to the Premier but I do not know if anything was done in the matter. This beef had been lying around their store for a long time, and was being sold to outport men. Now there are a lot of things to be done in connection with carrying out this Pure Food Act, and if you are going to give a salary of \$2,100 to Mr. Davies, make him go to work and earn it.

Now there is another matter to which I wish to refer. This is the matter of the travelling expenses of the Governor. I noticed from a statement the other day that \$2,500 was voted for travelling expenses and en-

entertainment. We heard nothing about entertainment when we passed the vote. When we increased his salary we were told that this increase was necessary because for one thing he had to do a lot of entertaining; particularly last year, as he had to entertain the Dominions Trade Commissioners. Now the vote for travelling expenses laid down in the Estimates was for travelling expenses and not entertainment. Now his salary was not enough for him, and you go to work and allocate that vote for travelling expenses to him monthly giving him \$208.52 a month. Now last summer our men came here and offered our services to the Colony and sacrificed their time, and did not ask for anything for the session; and His Excellency instead of economising and keeping down his expenses goes and gets this \$208 a month from the Government. There has been no more monstrous transaction by the Government since I have been a member of the House than that one. When His Excellency the Governor, the highest in the land will stoop so low as this what can you expect from smaller men who work for the Government in all parts of the Colony. I regret that this thing has occurred, and if His Excellency had any respect for his position or the Government for theirs it could not have happened. I am sorry that owing to the actions of His Excellency no member of the F. P. U. has been able to accept an invitation to Government House, nor will we while His Excellency is there. Last year the Fishermen's Union prepared a petition asking for his recall, but we did not send it because we did not wish to embarrass the Home Government. We still have the petition, however, and we certainly do not intend to remain quiet if His Excellency attempts to keep

on taking that \$208 from the vote. It does not belong to him and should not have been paid without he had vouchers to show the amount actually expended.

We are again asked to vote \$24,000 for Tuberculoists. What good has that vote done? I notice that some are getting a lot of pickings from that vote. The most notable case is that of the Doctor, who gets \$3,700. It would surprise anyone to go through the accounts in connection with that vote, and see the amounts paid out for eggs and milk. I have asked some of the doctors what good has been done by this vote, and they said none, it was no use at all. You are asking the fishermen of the Colony to pay an additional half a million dollars in taxes and you go and throw away \$24,000 in this manner.

I do believe that when this campaign was started first with a young man going around the country lecturing that the money was well spent; but now it is simply money thrown away. If you were to go into the expenditure and see the amounts paid for drugs, eggs, milk and other things, I am sure you would think that there were strange things going on in connection with this expenditure.

Now as to the vote for agriculture. The first thing that strikes my notice on a perusal of these figures is the extraordinary way that out of the ninety-one societies this year, we only get forty six reports, and any one who reads these reports will see at once that no startling amelioration has resulted. Indeed it is far short of what we were led to expect by the Premier. For instance he said that we would get twenty barrels of potatoes for every one we now get. Unfortunately the quotations I have just read convinced me that the people had no use for the

potato seed distributed by the Government.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think the hon. member will find that there are not only twenty but thirty in some cases. This fact can be proved by the evidence of people whose word the hon. member cannot doubt.

MR. COAKER—For every one you find thirty I can find fifty that do not find ten.

I may say that the quality of horned cattle supplied to places like Placentia Bay was most unsatisfactory from what I can gather. Whether the Society could not examine the animals or whatever happened, the people found that they were no improvement on those which they were already using. Now I want to know are you going to continue to spend money in this way. We might experiment in this fashion if we had a surplus revenue, but the results of last year's experiment would not justify the further expenditure of twenty thousand dollars again this year when conditions are abnormal.

I think we could very well get along without this. I would also like to know if you are going to devote any money this year for the propagation of lobsters. As regards that I have rather unique experience which I think might be regarded as useful information for the Government. Last year when I was down at Green Bay I saw the men throwing away their lobsters for which they received ten cents each according to the statute thereto relating. I was confidentially informed of a somewhat curious dodge employed by these fishermen. If these spawning lobsters are dropped near their pots they are easily caught again, and one lobster may be productive of many ten cent pieces. I remarked that I thought the

Government were doing its best and that they ought to help, but they seem to regard such a chance of getting ten cents for each lobster too good a one to be despised.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Will you give me this man's address?

MR. COAKER—How do you expect to get that address from me? Why do you ask?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I leave you to draw your own conclusions. I am sorry to know that any fisherman would make such a confession.

MR. COAKER—They are not all salata any more than they are in the Executive Council or anywhere else. A fisherman would consider himself a fool if he missed the opportunity (or at least some of them would) but I think this could easily be remedied by allowing no one to catch lobsters at all. I was also told that one of the inspectors said that he would rather pay them two dollars than ten cents. Can we expect under these circumstances to have an abounding lobster fishery? Can you blame the fishermen behaving as they do under these circumstances? And how can they be prevented? I must say that throughout these Estimates the Premier has been most reasonable, but there is one more matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the Government. I notice in the Estimates passed yesterday that there are still some Postmasters in the Island receiving \$5.00 a year. Could not this be raised to fifteen dollars? There are one hundred and sixty-six Postmasters receiving \$10.00 and about nine receiving \$5.00. Fifty-two men on the Labrador receive \$110, but I suppose they only work for three months of the year. Men will have to be better paid than this if we wish them to do their duty. I suppose some of these men deserve \$100

for the work they get through. I wish all men in the public service had to work as hard as these men. The Hon. Colonial Secretary promised to give me certain information.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I might say that I have looked into this matter and asked Mr. LeMessurier at the Post Office, but he said that owing to the absence of the Postmaster General, so many points being involved, nothing could be done until he returned; as soon as he comes back we will receive the necessary information.

MR. COAKER.—I am sorry, as I desire to get through the Estimates as quickly as possible. How can the Committee rise until we get this information? I do not want to see these things carried on from day to day. I want to see this matter finished. How about discussing it in the Additional Estimates? I hope you will not have any additions to salaries or other sums voted under the Audit Act section 33. There is about \$25,000 that has been voted in that way this year ending 1914. Money voted, to quote Dr. Lloyd, "in spite of section 33." I am desirous of making this second term of the Morris Government a model one. We do not want our four years work in the Opposition here to go for nothing. We wish the Government to get value for every cent it spends. We wish morally to uplift them. I hope in the year ending June 1915, there will not be one cent of expenditure unauthorized by the House. Can the Minister promise me that?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I will try.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in relation to lobsters. Last summer I obtained some information from a man who seemed to know a great deal concerning the habits of lobsters. He

told me that in his opinion a lobster had its own nest, and that when once it was put overboard it would go back. He knew this because he marked them from time to time. I am inclined to accept this as this was a man who was particularly observant. Perhaps this information will be of some use to the Inspectors in this matter.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay this House but I would like to make a few remarks about the matters now up for discussion. I have thought a great deal about this fishery problem. This is a fish country and the lobsters, salmon and cod and all the other industries form our staple industry, without which I am afraid poor old Newfoundland would almost be forgotten. I have been surprised to hear the statements that have been made by the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, and while I express no doubt of the veracity of his remarks I must admit that I do not consider it fair to the people of Green Bay to deliver such information to this House and throw it broadcast to this Colony and countries where our newspapers circulate and let these people think our fishermen are so fraudulent and untrustworthy. The next thing we shall find the hon. gentleman saying is that the lobsters are harnessed by a patent harness so that they cannot get away at any cost. I am of opinion that the fisherman who told the President this story was merely getting a clever one off on him. I must say that I would like to know the man's name. I really would. The propagation has been taken up by the Department of which I have the honour to be the head. They receive a grant of \$5,000. We all talk of the poor fishermen and what we are willing to do for them, but I do not consider that talking in

the manner of the President of the F. P. U. is uplifting them in any way. He says it is human nature that they should put lobsters down and catch them again. Now, Mr. Chairman, before these fishermen receive their money they take an affidavit and if the fishermen behave as the hon. member for Twillingate said then they are perjuring themselves, and when the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Dee wanted to give two dollars for lobsters I must state that I do not believe him. I do not believe a word of that is true. Anyway this is not the sort of thing you would expect a representative of the fishermen to talk about. Instead of having five thousand to run this Department effectively, you would want three times that. If you look up the report of the United States you will find they spend an amount equal to our public debt on the lobster fishery alone. Go to Nova Scotia or Canada and you will find that they spend hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to improve them. Only last summer I had a letter from the Deputy Minister of Fisheries in Canada asking me to let them know how our propagation system was progressing. He said that the Board there had arrived at the conclusion that the best thing was to try and allow the lobster its natural resources, to let them breed as nature intended them until a time arrived when this industry could again be resumed with greater profit and satisfaction. We do not wish to lose this fishery but we have to do something to get the fishermen of the country to take an interest in it, and in the work which we are doing so that the fishery may not be destroyed. In St. Barbe district the fishermen will tell you that the fishery is on the increase because of the propagation policy of the government because the people of this district

are taking an interest in it, and if you go on in this way you will find that the fishermen will see its usefulness and become more interested as time goes on. I have letters here from these people this year. They heard that the Government was going to have a close season and they have written in and telegraphed to say that they do not want a close season, but they will guarantee that if you will continue the propagation they will give every assistance towards carrying it out. There is a great deal of good in the system we have inaugurated and by it you will interest the people; and if it is carried out properly it will ultimately revive an industry which was going to the wall. Bay St. George is another place. If you travel through that Bay the fishermen will tell you that they have a very small lobster, two or three inches in length. When the report of the Fishery Commission comes down I think you will find that the propagation work that has been carried on during the past year or two has done more good than anything like it in the past. I am sure that this House and the honourable gentlemen on the other side of it, if they will only take the matter up, will be able to do a lot of work to help this policy on. I am sure that they can give us a great deal of information in regard to the fisherman's opinion about this matter, and we are only too glad to take any information that they give that will be of benefit to the fishermen, and the same applies to any other member whether he be on this side of the House or not. I am a Newfoundlander and believe that this is the best country under God's Heaven, but I believe that we do not try to do enough for the benefit of the fishermen and in the interest of the industry which is the life of the coun-

try. We are talking about granting \$20,000 to the Tuberculosis Commission. That is very good. It is money very well spent. If it saves two people from death through that disease it will be money well spent, but if we brought forward a bill to expend \$150,000 for the benefit of the fishery there would be more discussion and more fighting over it than is necessary. We have no information about the price of fish; about the markets, the places to which the catch goes; or anything about the fish itself, and there should be a vote in that department not of \$100,000, but of \$500,000, and then you would get a certain amount of satisfaction and it would be money well spent in the interests of the industry. It would not then be necessary for fishermen to go to Gloucester for work. If we only carried out what I believe is in the best interests of the country there would be no men going out of the country now; and when you would go to the country for an election you would be elected because they would know your worth, not because you had given them something themselves, but because you had done something for the benefit of the country. They would cast their votes for the men who did the best work. Now as regards our lobster fishery. The price at present is very low and there are only about 600 licenses given out whereas there are usually about 1200. This vote is for the purpose of sending men around the Coast to see that the lobster beds that we have around are not destroyed. We should have a vote to get men to watch the lobster and find out their movements so that we might know what we are talking about when it comes to a debate like this. I visited a lot of Lobster hatcheries before ever I thought of becoming

ing a member of Parliament. In the United States and Canada there are men who know quite a lot about these fish, and they have the means to carry out improvements. We have not got the means to carry things out on a large scale such as they do. Our lobster fishery is one that we should take an interest in and I believe we will because after the war the price of lobster is going up. The catch is small this year and it was small last year. There are conditions in the catching of lobsters that we know nothing about. There are temperature conditions which keep the lobsters in deep water; there are weather conditions which carry them around to different places. We have given considerable thought to conditions which affect our agricultural produce. We know one year and another why our turnips or potatoes do not grow, but we have never given a thought to what is happening in the Ocean. We do not know anything about the movements of the lobster or salmon; and we have not got the men to find out these things for us, or to keep in touch with the knowledge that is gained by other countries, such as the States and Norway. I am sure that if the Government would take this matter up the Opposition will work with the Government in the interest of the people so that something definite may be done next year that will give employment to our young men and keep them in the country. It is not my fault that the report of the Fishery Commission is not yet tabled. It is no one's fault; it is one of the things that move slowly; but I believe that you will see recommendations there that will please everyone, and that we will all be anxious to carry out, but I think it would be better for me not to say anything about it until we get the

report. There is one thing certain that the Commission has taken an interest in the work in connection with the fishery and their findings are the findings of men who have taken a lot of evidence and given it considerable thought, and I believe that their recommendations will meet with the approval of the House.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, just one or two words in reply to the Honourable Minister of Fisheries. I do not object to the vote of \$5000 being passed if they are going to spend it in a sensible way. If you are going to spend it in the way you have been spending it, then I say do not spend it anymore. By all means go around and collect the lobsters and place them in certain sections but do not permit any man to mark down the number of lobsters he catches and allow him to throw them away when he catches them. That only creates fraud. You spent \$9200 last year, that is \$4200 more than the grant, and out of that vote \$4500 was spent in motor boats. That is not spending \$9000 on the work of lobsters. I agree that the policy if properly carried out will increase the lobster; take the spawny lobster and save it and place it in a reservation and you will improve the fishery. The next point that I wish to mention is the reference made by the Minister to the fact that he wished he had a vote of \$100,000. If we could have a vote like that and get a man from Norway to supervise and inaugurate some satisfactory work in connection with the Fishery there would be no objection from this side of the House. It is a reflection on this country that we have had Governments in the past who did nothing to carry out a policy such as that which is carried out in Norway. I believe that a great deal of support would be given to such a movement,

and we should have no hesitation in backing you up. In regard to the price of lobsters, today it is true, that at the present price they will hardly pay the fishermen, and if only you would have a close season it would do an amount of good. The lobsters purchased last year are still in stores in St. John's. I have 400 cases from last year's catch. There is no one to buy them, and with the lobsters that will come in again in September I do not know how we are going to get even \$10 a case. I mention this so that the Premier may be able to take the matter up with people abroad. Why not get the Government of Great Britain to take the matter up. They might take them in France. They do not take them at present because they are not stamped. They have to be marked with a stamp or print before they go into France. Cannot something be done to have this remedied during the war, in order to employ the fishermen and get rid of our lobsters? I suppose there are 5000 cases that might be sold in France. If the Premier would take action it would be a great thing to get clear of those lobsters of last year. The Minister of Fisheries was quite right when he said that we would back him up in anything that was for the benefit of the Fisheries.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, there are just two or three words that I would like to give expression to on this matter. One is that I quite understand the problem of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He will give voice to an appeal and a sentiment that is very popular. No one will dispute the propriety of spending all the money you can get for anything that goes to advance the Fishery, by the propagation of lobsters or any scientific investigations along the lines followed in other countries; but for

this business of propagation of lobsters. I believe in what has been said by the member for Twillingate. I quite agree with the honourable Minister that this is a very fine country, one of the best in the world, but I suppose that the Minister is well aware that you will find dishonest people in this country just as well as you will find them in other countries. That is the point. If you are going to give ten cents a piece for lobsters and have no check on the men then you will have to pay a large sum of money, and you will have men who will take advantage of you and charge for lobsters they have not thrown overboard, and that was all that was said by the member for Twillingate which brought forth that appeal of the Minister to popular prejudice. Some provision should be made to carry out this scheme better to keep some check on the number of lobsters caught and thrown overboard. Having such a system as the one described is only putting temptation in their way. I wish now to refer to the vote for tuberculosis. Not on the point as to whether you should spend \$25,000 for that, but as to whether you are spending that \$25,000 in the best way. Are you getting good results for the money which you are spending? I am one of those who believe in the expenditure of money in the direction taken by the Committee of which Hon. John Harvey was the leader. You will get better results for the country at large than you will get by the expenditure under Dr. Rendell. We all agree with the Minister of Fisheries that in the cause of charity the expenditure of money for the saving of life should be little limited; but the point is that you are spending the \$24,000 to save the lives of people suffering from this disease, and the question is whether

you would not save more lives throughout the country by going to work along the lines laid down by that Committee. I believe that you can do more good to the health of the people and save a great many more lives by another system than you can save by the system that he follows. Another objection to that system is that you are taking this sum of money from tax-payers of the Colony and spending it in one place among a certain number of people, when the people of the Colony ought to have some share and ought to get an opportunity of the improvements and benefits which that expenditure ought to bring about. It has been found in other countries that as far as the treatment of consumptives is concerned the period of the illness being so long that what they want more than anything else is proper nursing and open air and good clean food, and that instead of sending them to a hospital, they should as far as possible be placed near a place where their relatives and friends are. They should be surrounded by their friends or easily reached by them. They will not be so homesick; they will be helped by their friends who will bring things to them. A number of small sanitariums around the country near the towns would be most beneficial and many of the people will go to this place and receive treatment, and the cost of keeping such an institution would be very much less by the contributions of friends by the bringing of foods and other things by these friends; whereas if you take them from their homes you will have them in a place where money is needed and where they have no friends. If you are going to make this expenditure you ought to put these small sanitariums around the country and I hardly think it fair that you should spend all this money for these

individual consumptives at the cost of so much when you might be doing much better and more effective work in another direction. If you cannot build these sanitariums then send around to the various outports and distribute all these benefits throughout the island, and in the long run you will save a great many more lives than by taking chronic consumptives and treating them as you are now doing. At present you are treating only the hopeless cases. What you ought to do is to get after those cases which are in the early stages. You are treating these hopeless cases, you are only helping to prolong life, and while that is very desirable in the interest of charity we can hardly say that as public men we are justified in taking \$10,000 for that purpose to save perhaps one life or prolong one life, when you might have saved twenty if you had been spending it in the right way. Now I approach this subject not from any partisan view, not from any suggestion of politics, not from any suggestion of politics. I say that this system which is followed out now is not the best way to deal with this subject. We have to approach this subject with a broad mind, and we must realise that the only effective way to deal with it is by a system something on the lines of the work which was carried out by that Association of which Mr. Harvey was the leader. There is no one here more interested in this work than Mr. Harvey, and I think that he disapproves of the work as it is now carried out. The work outside has been dropped, and the work seems to be brought down to sending people to a hospital in St. John's; people who are bad cases. I was surprised the other day when I took up the vital statistics to compare them with those of other countries, and find the tremendous proportion of consumption in this

country; all throughout the country. That is the point we have to grapple with. It is all over the country. We have to teach the people the causes of consumption in order to save the thousands and tens of thousands that are growing up in danger of this disease. This is the day of Commissions. This is a matter that should be grappled with by competent medical men from all over the country. Why not have a Commission of these men and have them give the Colony something for the money they are expending. Act upon their report and do not allow this money to go on being wasted as it is with, so very little being done. I know that the Minister who spoke a few moments ago will agree that this money could be spent so as to give the best results and the best way to get this is by appointing a Commission of professional and lay men to decide what is the best course to follow. I will give any support to this vote. I took up this matter some years ago in this House. I will therefore give my support to this vote of \$24,000, but I do appeal to the Government to stop and consider long enough to take up this matter seriously, and I hope that when we next debate the subject it will be upon the report of a strong commission of professional and lay men.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER —
Mr. Chairman: Just a word or two on the question of Tuberculosis. I may point out to the honorable members that we had a commission here for this matter for quite a number of years. The initial work was carried on by a Society presided over by the Hon. John Harvey, and as has been pointed out good work was done. Lecturers were sent all over the island, and by such general methods the attention of the public was arrested, and very perceptibly so, to this

great scourge. Very few people could be got to realise what this disease was. Had it been smallpox, diphtheria or any other well known illness which was spreading throughout the country at this tremendous rate, they would have been frightened and have called the police to protect them and placard the infected houses, but tuberculosis being a silent and insinuating disease, slow and gradual in its work, they sat down and gave it no attention.

For many years, Mr. Harvey and his associates did great service, entirely voluntarily and with no contributions from the Government. It was not till 1909, when we came in, that a commission was appointed consisting of Hon. J. Harvey with as associates Drs. Rendell and Keegan, and that they obtained a grant of \$5,000 per year from the Government and worked assiduously for three or four years. Last year this commission reported in favor of a department being created for this work. On their own recommendation Dr. Rendell was appointed to do this work.

There is something in what my learned friend, Mr. Morine has said, when he said that a great deal of attention has been given to this matter in St. John's, and none in the outports. There are several explanations for this. The Reid Newfoundland Co. offered sanitariums for each district, and last year, when the Duke of Connaught was here the first corner stone was laid. I have seen the plans and am told the erection will cost from sixty to seventy thousand dollars. It is proposed also to have small ones stationed all over the country, which would be less expensive to keep up. I think if I wished to get the records I could show to this House and the whole country that a great many outport patients had the services of Dr. Rendell at his dis-

pensary, and this is supposed to be one of the best and most effective ways of treating this plague. Not all who are affected with this disease require hospital treatment. Some have not reached that stage when they are seriously ill. Those who are can be effectively treated by the doctors in their own homes, and many are treated in that way. There are certainly a great many sufferers in St. John's. The total amount voted last year for this work was \$24,000, but of this, only \$13,000 or \$14,000 was spent, and out of that \$3,000 was for the sanitarium site at Waterford Bridge. Of course it is distinctly understood that this is not a party matter, and I am sure both sides of this House are united on this great question. The establishment of sanatoria will place every doctor in a better position as regards such patients.

As for a doctor to take charge of this work, there is none better than Dr. Rendell. He went abroad at the expense of the country to London, Edinburgh and studied there. Then he has spent a great many years at the hospital under Dr. Shea, and having had about twenty years' experience, has had an excellent opportunity of studying this; and if he does not now know what is necessary it will be difficult to find one who does.

The manner in which Dr. Rendell is now doing the work is that recommended by Sir Wm. McGregor, who is a doctor of medicine, and who knew somewhat of the conditions here. So I am hoping that with the present outlook this plague will be fully grappled with, and feel sure that when we have a sanatorium in every district the spread of tuberculosis will be checked.

Another matter mentioned by Mr. Coaker was the increase in the Governor's travelling expenses. This vote

is necessary on account of the many trips made by him to outport places which in former times used to be neglected by Governors. Governors McGregor and Williams travelled all over the country and interested themselves in the lives of the people and became acquainted. Sir Wm. McGregor went twice to Labrador, and to do so found it necessary to travel in small schooners on several occasions. The position of the Governor today is very different from what it was in Governor Boyle's time. Governors must entertain very largely. Last year for instance we had the Duke of Connaught here, and the hospitality which had to be extended to the many invited to meet him meant a great expense and cut a large portion off the Governor's allowances for affairs such as this. The cost was not so much for the entertainment of the Duke, but for guests. This is a practice which has grown in every country, and is an advantage to every country. Besides this Royal visitor we had the Royal Commission, of which fourteen or fifteen members stayed at Government House. This is not like a place like New York, when such visitors would go to an hotel. Here the one place is Government House, and there they must be entertained. This I think will explain the necessity for that vote. As to the Governor giving a voucher for every dollar spent, I think that this is more than ought to be asked or expected of him. When Governor Boyle went away the attention of the Government was forcibly called to the small salary allowed a man in such a position. Voting this amount is for ourselves and in our own interest as it is in our interests that the personal representative of the King should entertain in conformity with his position. Now there were some other matters re-

ferred to here today, but I do not know that it is necessary for me to speak of these at the present moment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Chairman: I would just add a word or two to what has already been said in this connection, and in reply to the statement asked for by the Hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker. As all are aware the amount voted was an customary \$24,000. Of this there was expended up to June 1914 \$12,000. A further deduction of \$1,000 for the site of the hospital at Mount Pearl made the total expended \$11,000. The expenditure of the amount voted since July first and up to April 1st is \$11,266.26. That is about the average expenditure under the present arrangement. The staff of the Tuberculosis Cottage Hospital is, a medical superintendent, a nursing superintendent, (Miss Campbell) and 5 probationary nurses and some servants. The report of the medical superintendent as to the work being done there I will table. Referring to the report it will be seen that the average number of patients there is 14 or 15 per day including those in camps. As has already been said here the work has chiefly been in and about St. John's, but at the same time no application has come in from the outports and remained unattended to. The difficulty about outport patients is, as Dr. Rendell says, that if he goes to answer a call it is necessary for some one to take his place, as his place in St. John's ought not be without a supply. Although it is quite impossible for the Doctor to leave St. John's yet nurses can and will be trained to take his place either there or here and attend to cases requiring attention, and I have no doubt that this service will be satisfactory. The acquisition of the Reid Sanatorium to this service will have a telling

effect, but of course with the increased expenses made necessary by the maintenance it is quite evident that \$24,000 will not be enough. When the Government asked for this sum, they did not anticipate that it would all be expended and in fact but \$15,000 has been spent. The remainder has been transferred to the General Hospital grant. I think that this explanation ought to be sufficient.

MR. MORINE—Just a word or two, Mr. Chairman. We are not talking about last year, but this year, and I suppose that the reason we are asked to vote this sum is because we are asked to. I think I find an error in what the Colonial Secretary has said. He thinks Dr. Rendell well suited to the work because of his experience as a physician. But Dr. Rendell has not conducted this campaign in the line laid down. I have heard the Hon. John Harvey and the Doctors who advocated the establishment of this department and they say that the work now is being done in a mistaken direction. What is attempted now is to have patients treated and cured of tuberculosis. This is where the physician Dr. Rendell comes in. All that is needed to cure this is time, fresh air and good food. This carrying on a curative business is a departure from the recommendations of the commission, as I think their idea was to have a board which would serve more as a bureau of information than as a hospital staff. This is why I think this a mistaken work. It rests with the government to confer with these gentlemen who recommended this. They ought to find out how much of this \$24,000 is going to be short and vote accordingly. If some of it is to be transferred to the General Hospital, have that done here now. Most of this curative work can be managed by the doctors of the various patients. The outports it has

been admitted get very small advantage from this system. They find out they have tuberculosis and take medicines which every doctor can tell them are no better than water. What the country wants is to have its attention centered upon the causes of and the way of preventing this disease. This is the only good department of this sort can do.

This situation is a peculiar one indeed. It is not a case of scarcity of money but to discover the best way to spend it. I agree most emphatically with those who maintain that the proper thing to do is not to spend this on people, individual cases, who having concentrated the disease are doomed to die, but to educate in hygiene the people and the children who have not yet contracted it and are likely to. The Premier ought to have this matter enquired into. There can be no doubt as to which of these two treatments is the better means of investing our money.

DR. LLOYD—I would add just a word or two Mr. Chairman to what has already been said on this matter. I do not wish to question the great work that is being done but the fact of dealing with patients already sick. I do not question the expenditure, but only wish to emphasize what has already been said by the member for Bonaville, Mr. Morine, which was that the present system was a mistaken one. The opinion of Governor McGregor has been quoted, but it will be remembered that he laid special stress on the necessity of educating the people along these lines. It will be remembered that the idea of the committee was that lectures be given all over the country, and that the school children be taught on such matters. This I think is the programme as they wished it, and think that should it be followed out it would be the means of great bene-

its being done to the whole community.

The unfortunate part of the present campaign is that that aspect of it is being dropped. You had only to go into any public office, or any private office, when that campaign was on, and you saw little signs such as "Don't Spit"—Don't do this— Don't do that. All that has gone. Why? The need is as great today as it was in those days. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Bonavista, the main problem that we are up against is not the cure of those already afflicted with consumption, but it is to prevent the spread of consumption to those who are not afflicted today. Prevention, more than cure, is the main problem that we have to tackle; but at the same time I am not in any way deprecating the good work done in connection with efforts to cure; what I am regretting is that the campaign of education has been practically dropped; and though I have not had any conversation with Mr Harvey, nor do I know much of what he said, I venture to assert that that is the aspect of the present work—the dropping of the campaign of education—that he is deploring. Now, Sir, in connection with this fund a very remarkable thing has happened, there has been a surplus; and although that surplus has been turned over to the General Hospital, yet I think it would have done far better service if it had been spent in continuing the education campaign which was introduced by the Committee. I would strongly advocate that during the forthcoming year all the money be spent and that what is left over and above the amount actually needed for the treatment of consumptives be spent on education. I don't think we can afford to drop this phase of the question. Nothing that could

happen to Newfoundland, not even the war that is at present raging, is as dangerous to us as the ravages of consumption; and if we are ready, for the sake of our honor, to make an expenditure of \$1,000,000 in connection with the war, we surely ought to be prepared to spend \$10,000 to put down this greater evil that has been ravaging our people for so long. Now, Sir, I merely wish to add the force of my remarks to urge upon the Government the necessity of utilizing the whole of the grant, and of directing Dr. Rendell to take up, as well as the work which he has undertaken, the educative part of the campaign which was conducted by the Committee.

Now, there is another matter in connection with which I would like to make a few comments, I would like to ask the Premier if he would table the actual vote made last year in connection with the Governor.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You mean the general Estimates.

MR. MORINE—The slips that go through the Clerk's table.

DR. LLOYD—I mean the allowances to the Governor, I want the votes that were passed in connection with allowances to the Governor.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You will find them in the Estimates of last year.

DR. LLOYD—My understanding was that there was a vote of \$2,500 for travelling. My recollection, right or wrong, was that that vote was not to be spent in connection with entertainment. My understanding of the matter was that the Governor's salary was raised—and very properly raised—very considerably. We on this side of the House gave our assent to that increase on the very pretext put forward by the Premier and assigned as a reason for increas-

ing the salary. It will be remembered that the unusual course was taken of tabling letters from the Governor dealing with his expenses at Government House and stating how much money he was out of pocket; and that afforded a pretext for asking for an increase in salary which this House very readily granted. But there was no suggestion whatever that the \$2,500 was to form part of an entertainment fund, and I think that no matter what has been the practice in the past that practice cannot justify wrong. No matter what Governors may have done in the past, that does not justify doing anything that is not right now. It may be that those concerned with this vote have not given proper thought to the matter, but, as I take it this is an allowance to form a fund from which the Governor may draw for actual travelling. Now, speaking again from memory, I have some recollection of reading that this question was contested in Canada not very long ago in connection with a Chief—I think the Chief Justice of British Columbia.

MR. MORINE—One of the Judges of British Columbia.

DR. LLOYD—He claimed that he was entitled to the travelling expense vote, received the money, and refused to return it even when a claim was made for its return on the ground that he had not actually expended that sum of money in travelling. That led to a claim being made upon him for the return of the money, and the case was tried in some Court in Canada. I do not know what Court.

MR. MORINE—Exchequer Court—before Judge Cassels.

DR. LLOYD—What happened in this case was this: The Court held that the Judge had no claim on the vote except for actual out-of-pocket expenses in connection with his trav-

elling, and what he had not actually spent for travelling he was forced to return. That is analogous to this case. Here we have a vote upon which the Governor may draw for actual out-of-pocket expenses in travelling; but it was never intended by this House, no matter what the practice may have been—at all events when I gave my assent to it I did not understand that it was to be paid out in monthly instalments simply as a supplement to salary, and I do not think that should be done. I am not blaming the Governor and I am not blaming the Government, but I am pointing out what the position is so far as I can learn it. I think that the Governor has no right to the money and that the Government has no right to pay the money; that the whole transaction is absolutely illegal, and that the Government ought to make a demand for its return. If the decision of the Government is that the Governor's present salary is insufficient, and that it ought to be \$2500 more than it is, the Governor paying his own travelling expenses, because that is practically how it is working out at the present time—then let the Government have the courage to say that and bring down a vote for that figure and give us their reasons for doing so, and the matter will receive full consideration. But I, for one, am not prepared to assent to the manner in which the thing is now done. I call upon the Government to act promptly in this matter, and ask for and obtain the return of that \$2500, illegally paid and illegally received.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman: It is very unfortunate that in having to deal with such a distinguished figure in this community as the Governor, we have to consider a question in which there has been illegality. Now, I have no doubt that so far as the Governor personally is concerned, he

has merely been following what the Premier has told us has been the practice, and therefore we can at once acquit him of any wrongdoing in connection with the matter or of any personal knowledge of its illegality, and consequently we can discuss it without in any way impugning his conduct. At the same time, it is quite as clear as that point is that the payment has been illegally made, and the Auditor General of the Colony has been very remiss in his duty in permitting it to pass without notice. The vote is for travelling expenses, and even if it were for entertainment it should not be paid except upon proper vouchers, as in the case of any other expenditure that passes before the Auditor General; and I venture to say that if it were an expenditure in the office of the Department of Public Works, for instance, for any ordinary service, that the Auditor General would insist upon vouchers in accordance with the Audit Act. This is a very delicate matter and apparently it has been allowed to pass by, but as we have an Audit Act, it is in the interests of any Government of this Colony that it should be strictly carried out. Now, if you are going to give the vote to the Governor to cover his travelling expenses and his entertainment, then why not accept the invitation just made by the hon. member for Trinity, change the vote, and let the Governor get it as he wants it. The unpleasant position exists now that the Governor has been receiving this money illegally, in violation of the statute law and also in violation of the understanding of members of this House as to what the money was voted for. I have read the reports of last session, and my memory confirms that of the hon. member for Trinity, that the increase of the Governor's salary was granted specifically upon the ground of the large expense to

which he was put for entertainment; and therefore that the vote of \$2500 was not for that same purpose is abundantly clear.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I think the main argument that I made was that the Governor's salary had never been raised after it was cut in 1895.

MR. MORINE.—That was the main argument for an increase in salary?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes. The other may have been an additional argument.

MR. MORINE.—If I had been here I should have supported the vote upon the grounds which have been given. I admit that there is a great deal of expense at Government House that is in the interests of the colony, such as the entertainment of the Commissioners and all that sort of thing, and that sort of expense is inseparable from the ordinary expenses of the Governor in entertaining his own friends. You cannot make any demarcation between them. If it is necessary that he should have this additional amount, then pass the vote in such a way, if you like that he will be able to draw it without any voucher. At the present time the Department of Finance is not justified in paying any part of this sum except upon a properly made voucher, as pointed out by the Audit Act. Put the thing in such a way that no question can be raised in connection with it, and at the same time protect the reputation of any man who may occupy the position of Governor of this colony.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this matter of the Governor's salary, last year we permitted the vote to go through as it stood. We raised no objection, as we thought that the Governor was entitled to what he asked so far as his salary was concerned; and when he asked to have his travelling expenses rals-

ed from \$1,000 to \$2,500, we consented to that also; but I want to state here now that if you alter the vote—if you want to give him an additional increase—we will not support it. We don't intend to vote for anything other than that which was passed last year. That \$2500 was voted for travelling expenses, and if you alter it in any way we will vote against it. Last year, everywhere we went in the North, we were told that all we had to do was to vote increases to the Governor. I am willing to allow that amount to go through for travelling expenses, but we will not support any alteration.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman: I would like to say one or two words about the matter now under discussion in relation to the Governor's salary. My recollection of the reasons for changing the vote last year is that the salary of the Governor was increased because, first, his salary had been reduced some years previously and it was the intention to replace it, and second, that the expenses at Government House by reason of entertainment and such like necessitated the Governor's asking for the increase. Then there was a separate vote—that now under discussion of \$2500, which, I think, was an increase of \$1500 on the amount previously voted, for travelling expenses. That was expressly what it was voted for. I don't think there was any suggestion from any quarter of the House that this vote was intended to cover anything else than travelling expenses; and on that understanding and with that impression every member of the House voted. I quite agree with what has been said by the Hon. members for Trinity and Bonavista with regard to this vote having been illegally used during the past year. I see a justification of the way in which the vote has been dealt with in the practice that

has prevailed here for a number of years. Probably the payment of the amount in monthly instalments, at the same time as the salary, is due to the fact that the question of the legality of these payments has never been raised before. Now, Sir, that the illegality of the proceeding has been pointed out to the House, while we are still in Committee considering the Estimates, I think that the Government ought, if they intend to carry out that practice and pay that amount in monthly instalments, make it what they intend it to be; or else leave it as it is and make it payable in the manner in which all other travelling expenses provided for in the Estimates are paid. In every other instance throughout the Estimates where money is provided for travelling expenses, it is paid upon vouchers furnished by the persons spending the money. I remember, Sir, that when I was in the Justice Department, all moneys which were spent in connection with travelling expenses in that department, and which were voted by this House for that purpose, were paid on vouchers, properly furnished and certified. Now, if this vote is to remain as travelling expenses, I don't think either the Governor or the Government ought to be put in the position of continuing this illegal practice. As to whether this vote should be paid irrespective of travelling expenses or not, is a question which the House cannot discuss at the present time, because it has not got the necessary information before it. If it is necessary to change the vote and make it an addition to the Governor's salary, then I think that some justification for that change ought to be given. You have men throughout the whole civil service to-day, good, competent officials, who are unable to support their positions upon the salaries that are paid, and every argument that applies to Gov-

ernment House applies also to them. I referred the other day to several departments of the civil service in which the earnings were limited, and every justification that applies to the Governor applies throughout the whole service. The question of increasing salaries is a very big undertaking, I know, and this is certainly not the time when it can be properly undertaken. But, Sir, whatever the intention is in this connection, I think the vote should be so dealt with that there will be no suggestion of illegality in the payment of it.

There is another matter which I wish to speak about. There are two road inspectors in St. John's getting \$1,600 between them. Now the Inspector in St. John's East is getting \$700, while the Inspector in St. John's West is getting \$900. That is not fair, because the Inspector for St. John's East has a very large area, under his care. Why should he not get the same salary as Mr. Murphy? He is a very competent man who gives satisfaction to members on both sides of the House, but is not at all partisan. He is an honest and reliable man, and there is no reason why he should not get the same salary as the Inspector for St. John's West. I think it is very unfair.

MR. HIGGINS—Just a word, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the matter concerning the Inspector for St. John's East. It would be an injustice to a good official if I did not take this opportunity of giving my opinion on this matter. Mr. Kent has not exaggerated the tremendous amount of work that lies under the jurisdiction of the Inspector, St. John's East is a net work of roads, I think it would be ungracious of me if I did not say that all that the Leader of the Opposition said, was quite true and that he (the Inspector) is one of those good officials who do their work without any

partisan spirit. I am sure he will hold that position irrespective of any change of Government. I hope that this matter will be taken into consideration. The territory of the East End road inspector is a vast one. Since Mr. Kent referred to this I thought it my duty to say a word in regard to the matter.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Chairman: I wish to endorse what these members have said. To make a road in St. John's East is not the same as making one in St. John's West and there are many more roads in St. John's East.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, the Inspector for St. John's East is a very efficient man. There is no doubt about that. We shall do what we can in the matter and try to please everybody.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I think that it will be found that when the increase was made, there was a junior road inspector, which made the work easier. Mr. Murphy, on the other hand, has been holding that office since 1890, and was entitled to an increase. But nevertheless the Government will be glad to consider the case of Mr. Parsons. I think that I can endorse what has been said about him by the other speakers.

MR. KENT—I am glad that the Premier will give consideration to the matter, because it is only an act of justice. The road inspector for St. John's East, is an exceptional man in his work, and I hope that the Government will increase his 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 motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report on the Tuberculosis Service from June 1, 1914, to May 31, 1915, with statements of expenditure.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

PERMANENT DISASTERS FUND BILL.

Hl. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Establishment of a Permanent Marine Disasters Fund.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, May 6th, at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 6.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Sibley's Cove, asking that a change be made in that settlement in relation to the Post Office. It seems that the one in charge of the office now cannot do the work satisfactorily and must apply more or less to the school children to get them to read the addresses on the letters. The petition is signed by James Sparkes and several other residents, and I ask that the Government give it consideration.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Samuel Ford and others of Wellington, Bonavista Bay, asking for a special

grant of \$200 for a road, to be extended by the Road Board of that place, I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I wish leave to present a petition from Joseph P. Newman and other residents of Boyd's Cove in the Electoral District of Twillingate asking for telegraph communication between that place and the central stations. I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and I ask that it be referred to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

MR. MORINE—With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance and Customs to a question that I asked on April 27th, asking for a return of expenditures on Executive Responsibility.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that a question which I asked on April 30th, has not been answered.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to table the answer to that question asked by Mr. Morine.

MR. MORINE—I asked the Premier the other day for a copy of the assignment of the Critz Patents.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have no such assignments.

MR. MORINE—Then I asked a question as to arrangements re water powers on Labrador.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There has been no arrangement.

MR. CRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works what grants were sent out to Chapel's Cove (District of Hr. Main) for local, main line, and other purposes for 1914; to whom sent, and a copy of the returns.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I shall have this prepared during the

week.

MR. CLAPP asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the amount of seed potatoes, number of pigs, sheep and bulls which have been sent to the District of St. Barbe in 1914-15 and the names of persons to whom sent, and if seed potatoes are being doled out for the present season.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—This has been prepared. I expect it here any minute.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to obtain from the Department of Agriculture and Mines, and lay on the table of the House, a statement, in detail, of all amounts paid out of the vote for Encouragement of Agriculture, \$20,000, from July 1st, 1914, to date.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I expect this here also at any minute.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House (1) A statement showing the names and ages of all persons in Bonavista District who have received the Old Age Pension since March, 1914, to date; (2) A statement showing the names and ages of those in said District who have made application for the Old Age Pension, but are not receiving it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—This is in course of preparation.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House copies of returns for the propagation of Lobsters in Bonavista (a) showing number of traps; (b) Date of each trip; (c) Names of places called at in each trip; (d) And returns showing what was done on each trip.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg leave to table required information.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Civil Government	\$215,443.33
Administration of Justice	179,377.34
Public Charities	424,384.00
Agriculture and Mines	19,200.00
Marine and Fisheries	111,040.00
Postal and Telegraph Dept.	703,729.20
Contingencies	10,000.00

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

On motion that the Order of the Day be deferred, Mr. Morine moved in amendment, and Mr. Kent seconded, the following Address to His Excellency the Governor.

"May it Please Your Excellency:

"The House of Assembly desire to draw to your attention the practice of expending large sums of public money upon what is called Executive Responsibility, for purposes not provided for by the Legislature and not coming within the provision of Sec 33 of the Audit Act.

"The House respectfully protests that these expenditures are in violation of the spirit and letter of the Statute Law of the Colony, and subversive of the constitutional right of this House to institute all aids and supplies to Your Excellency, and that it leads to wastefulness in public expenditure, wherefore Your Excellency is respectfully but urgently requested to withhold your assent hereafter to all expenditure not authorized by the Legislature, except such as fairly and properly fall within Sec. 33 of the Audit Act."

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move this resolution which I intended moving the other day in Committee of Supply, in reference to moneys spent on Executive Responsibility and unauthorized by this Legislature. This matter has already been discussed in Supply and I do not intend further dwelling upon it this afternoon, but merely desire that our sentiments may be formally expressed and a vote taken. The Audit Act contemplates that all moneys paid into the Revenue go towards making up Consolidated Revenue Fund, out of which money can only be taken in the following cases, that is to say—firstly, by vote of the Legislature and secondly under section 33 of the Audit Act which prescribes certain formalities and which limits its privileges to certain cases, through which money can be taken for what are known as emergencies. Any expenditure not foreseen by the Legislature, but which is urgently and immediately required, would come under this Act, if the spending were necessary for the public good. Section 33 provides that when any sum of money has been granted by the Legislature, the Governor may under his sign, manual, counter-signed by members of the Treasury Board authorize expenditures of that money. The Governor here is distinct from the Governor-in-Council, because it is the intention of the Act to place all possible guards on this privilege. I remember that when this Act was being discussed even Sec. 33 was resented and strongly fought against by that watch-dog of the Treasury Governor Murray, who said that there ought to be no way by which moneys would be spent except upon objects for which they were voted by the Legislature. But it was argued that in new countries, such as our own, unforeseen contingencies

might arise that would require immediate attention, such as would not arise in older centres of civilization, and Sec. 33 was copied from the Canadian Audit Act, which provided a way by which money could be obtained in cases where the Legislature did not provide for the expenditure. Now I have the returns brought down, which show astonishing figures. In the first place it shows that since the Audit Act was passed there has been spent the sum of \$1,513,000.00 under section 33, and upon what is called Executive Responsibility, for services not previously provided for by the Legislature or an average spending of one hundred and forty thousand dollars a year. This has afterwards been indemnified by Parliament under the principle that it is useless to lock the stable door after the horse has been taken out. Of that large sum \$391,000 has been spent under Sec. 33 of the Audit Act, following out the provisions therein, and so far as my remarks this afternoon are concerned largely coming under the meaning of that Act. I am sure that these items were put under this heading because the Government did not know where else to put them. But even assuming that the \$391,000 were urgently and immediately required for the public good, I still find that since 1898 \$726,000 has been spent upon matters which were neither urgently nor immediately needed. For if they had been thus urgently and immediately required the Government would have had these put under Sec. 33. This money which amounts to nearly three-quarters of a million has been spent without lawful authority under cover of this section of the Act. It is an expenditure for which the government can personally be held liable, from the Governor down to the smallest official who paid out

the money. The Governor and Ministers were violating the spirit and letter of the Act, likewise any official who was in any way involved in the payment of that sum. In addition to the above the sum of \$366,000 was spent out of money borrowed for which there was no authority under any Act, but which was afterwards covered by a loan Act. The grand total which I have already quoted has been spent illegally and in violation of the privileges of this House, and of the rules and constitutions which were the very salvation of our economic system. The statement which I hold in my hand shows that the greatest expenditures which took place under Sec. 33 and upon Executive Responsibility were made during election years. In 1904 \$46,000 were spent under Section 33 and \$95,000 under so-called Executive Responsibility, while only \$37,000 were spent the previous year. In 1908 \$15,000 were spent under Section 33, but \$86,000 were expended under Executive Responsibility. The expenditures were neither urgent nor necessary and did not come under the Act. In 1913 \$54,000 were spent under Section 33 of the Act and \$127,000 under Executive Responsibility. These facts prove that during election years larger amounts were spent than during any other year, and the system has been so abused that each election year showed us a larger expenditure than the preceding election year. One has only to look at the Auditor General's report to see the manner in which those large sums of money have been illegally expended without warrant or authority since 1898 when the Act was passed. Without going into details I have no hesitation in making the assertion that all these expenditures were unjustifiable, politically corrupt and improper—not corrupt in the sense of its spending, but expended from the standpoint of political expediency. The Governor

acted upon the advice of his Ministers in sanctioning the payments but no Governor was justified in allowing his Ministers to defy the spirit and letter of the law of the colony and if the Ministers advised the Governor illegally he should dismiss his Advisors. The Council simply proceed in this manner. They present minutes to His Excellency which state that such and such an expenditure is required and that no permission has been granted by any Act of Parliament, and that it does not come under Sec. 33 of the Audit Act. This mode of procedure was clearly a violation of the Statute, and the Governor had no right to fix his sign manual to a document authorizing the payment. If he does so he is personally responsible. As far as this address is concerned, it does not make the slightest difference if it falls to pass—it being sufficient for this debate and address to be brought under His Excellency's notice, in order that an end may be put to this illegal and pernicious practice of paying out money of the Executive Council without any authority. I beg to propose the Address.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker: I wish to make a few remarks on the matter just referred to by Mr. Morine. He has brought to the notice of this House a state of affairs which I do not think ought to continue I think we ought to observe that Act which expressly provides that unless money is authorized to be spent by Parliament the Executive Government or any other authority has no right to spend public money. We have the rights by special provisions in case of emergency under section 33 of that Act, a provision which in its original conception was most necessary in the case of a contingency arising when the House was not in session. I will quote this Act in order to emphasize the points upon which I desire to remark. (Hon member quotes

Act). This, as will be observed, is the only Act investing the Government with any authority to spend public money without direct authority from the Legislature. It is the privilege of this House to discuss public expenditures in a practical manner and to keep a close check on every sum we spend, and the violation of this Act is fundamentally opposed to the principle of our constitution. The only exceptions to this case are the emergencies which I have just read, cases such as the sealing disaster, public necessities requiring immediate attention are the sole occasions where money can thus be spent unauthorized by legislation. This spending on Executive responsibility is in opposition to the spirit of the whole Act.

It is now brought before the House in the form of a special resolution. Every member of the House knows exactly how the matter stands. If the Audit Act does not suit the requirements of the Public service then amend the Act; but no payments should be made outside the law. All these payments made by the Governor-in-Council under Executive responsibility are illegal payments. There is no authority for them, and when they are made they are dependent upon the sanction of this House in regular session. The evil to my mind is growing from year to year. Every year we have the Auditor General dealing with this matter, and complaining in his report to the House that the Act is being violated in this way. The Auditor General is, of course, an officer of the Legislature. He is not a servant of the Government. He is a servant of the Legislature, and it is his duty to report to this House on all matters relating to the finances of the Colony, and in the discharge of his duty he has brought this matter before us year by year

for a number of years back. I think practically since the Audit Act was first passed. Most are familiar with the methods by which the Government measures are dealt with, the proceedings by which the money is voted in this House and ultimately reaches the service for which it is intended. All moneys are voted to the Governor, as representing His Majesty, and they are under his control and subject to his order under the Audit Act as I have pointed out. If his Excellency the Governor had advice on this point and had the wording of the Audit Act drawn to his attention he would immediately see that moneys so expended are not authorized, and that there is no justification whatever for them. In dealing with this subject I wish to say that my position is that the matter having been brought to the attention of this House as to the illegality of the payments, and these methods of handling expenditures having been pointed out it is the duty of this House of Assembly to condemn them by the adoption of the resolution as asked or to amend the Audit Act in such a way that it will meet the requirements of the public service. Personally I think that the Audit Act should be allowed to stand as it is. It is a very complete code of law covering the payment of public moneys, and every proper provision is made in the Estimates, and there is no need of any such expenditure as that which we are pointing out to the House this afternoon. These expenditures, such as increase of salaries, and allowances of that kind should be provided for in the regular Estimates, and not dealt with by the Governor-in-Council; that is taking away from this House one of its special prerogatives—the control which it ought to have over public moneys. The Governor-in-Council takes upon

himself to grant sums of money and when he does so he takes away the control of public moneys out of our hands. By doing this he is placing this House in a position it ought not to be in. I have, therefore, very much pleasure in seconding the motion made by the member for Bonavista.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Speaker, just one or two words in reply. In the first place I do not think it at all necessary that this motion should pass—for the reason that it is an unnecessary reflection upon those who are here, and upon those who have been here in this House. The hon. introducer of this measure has practically made an indictment against the gentlemen with whom he is associated, because he has charged them this afternoon with conniving at these expenditures. In 1908-9, without the authority of this House, a sum of \$15,000 under one head, and \$85,000 under another was made by the Government of which the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Justice. He has charged my friend who became a member of this House in 1904 and who was a party with Sir Robert Bond and others to the expenditure of \$30,000 under one head and \$46,000 under another, with a violation of the Act. He has charged every member of that party with illegal practices, and that is the same charge that he made this evening in relation to those made in 1913-14. As a matter of fact with very few exceptions every dollar that was spent in these three years must have been certified under section 33, because anyone who reads the section will see that he can get a certificate from the Auditor General for all these expenditures, and before this House closes I intend to produce evidence of the character of all payments certified in the past under sec-

tion 33 to show that if you require to avail of it there would be no difficulty in getting a certificate for every payment that has been made in the public service. We have only to look at the section and we will find that all the payments made by Sir Robert Bond, Mr. Kent and Mr. Clift in 1904, when they advised the Governor of that day to make these payments, could all have been certified under Section 33. Does the honorable member mean that the money that was spent in the election year 1908 when Mr. Kent was Attorney General, and Mr. Clift, Minister of Mines and Agriculture, when they advised the Governor to spend \$98,000, was that a corrupt violation of the Audit Act? A corrupt and gross violation? I say that all these expenditures of Messrs. Clift, Bond and Kent were not corrupt but were necessary. Let us get the items of expenditure. It is a very easy matter to bring down these items, and that will be proof to the House as to whether the late Attorney General, Mr. Kent, when he advised the Governor to make these payments was or was not conniving at a corrupt violation of the Act. Let us get the items and let this House and the public outside pass upon these expenditures, and they will see the money so expended. There are a thousand and one matters happening every day; there is hardly a day out of the three hundred and sixty five, even including Sundays that some unforeseen expenditure does not become necessary, and the mere fact that the certificate of the Auditor General is not availed of is in all cases merely a matter of form. These expenditures are not a violation of the Audit Act, neither in letter nor in spirit, and I am surprised that my learned friend on the other side of the House would be a party to attacking

those who are not here to defend themselves, and who if they were here, would defend these expenditures in the same way in which I am. I did not think that there were men in this Chamber who would give such a certificate of character to their late leader. I never expected that I would have to stand up here and be counsel for Sir Robert Bond, a man whose highest boast was that no charge of corruption, no taint of corruption, was attached to his name. I was with him for years in the Council and out of it, and I think I know as much about him as any one in the House. And I know that there is no expenditure in the years in which he was leader that he was unable to justify here under the Audit Act or without the Audit Act. I have sat in this House year after year and session after session and passed votes of indemnity for expenditure of this kind both with Sir Robert Bond and those who preceded him, which to my mind is the best proof of the reading that ought to be given to the Audit Act. I am prepared to admit that the Audit Act did not contemplate increase of salaries to a very large extent, but that is a matter that can be covered under section 33. But nearly every other payment whether under section 33 or Executive responsibility is for a requirement that does not need either section 33 or any other provision; and it is only when honorable members have had the experience of trying to carry out the public service of the Colony that they will find how necessary it is to make these expenditures.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, before the resolution passes, I wish to say that I am very fortunate in being here to offer my hearty support to the resolution as proposed by the member for Bonavista, and seconded by the leader of the Opposition. I think

it a very fair and proper one at this time, and should find a place in the records of the House. Because expenditures have been made in the past contrary to the provisions of the Audit Act is no reason why they should continue to be made. The Premier has said that the Leader of the Opposition when the Minister of Justice, and that I, when member of the Bond administration were parties to those expenditures contrary to the provisions of the Act.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I did not say contrary to the provisions of the Act. I was defending you.

MR. CLIFT—I did not want anyone to defend me. I do not want anyone to defend anything that was done during the Administration of Sir Robert Bond, or the administration of his predecessors. If money was spent that should not have been spent under the Audit Act or if the Audit Act was violated it is no justification for the continuance of this practice.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Do you admit that the money they spent, that \$86,000 was a corrupt violation of the Act?

MR. MORINE—I did not use those words.

MR. CLIFT—There was nothing in the language of the proposer of this resolution that in any way reflected upon any previous administration.

MR. MORINE—What I said, and I said it very distinctly, was that is corruption in the sense that to increase a salary of anyone employed by the Government during a time such as an election year is looking for voters and is very likely to influence votes.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have no desire to misrepresent the hon. member, the words as I took them down were "corrupt expenditure."

MR. CLIFT—I did not understand

the honourable member to mean it in that way. It is a practice going on to such an extent that we ought to deal with it in some way. Every year, for the past six years at all events and for a few years before that, the Auditor General has complained of expenditures made in violation of the Audit Act,—expenditures for public services that do not come strictly within the provisions of section 33. Expenditures in the way of salaries in new office, increase in salaries and such like expenditures; expenditures that could have been foreseen when the Legislature was in session and should have been taken in the vote for supply; and for that reason and for that reason only, I am going to support the motion made now. If we have an Audit Act on the Statute Book I think we should live up to it and not be continually violating it by spending money which has not been voted by this House. Section 33 provides for special emergencies. If things that could not have been foreseen occur during the year the Governor is perfectly justified under that section in signing a Minute of Council for the expenditure of emergency money. Moneys for salaries or increases of salaries are not emergency moneys, and should not be made by the Executive Government. I support the motion to-day for the simple reason that I think the time has come when the representatives of the people of this country should be more particular as to the expenditure of public moneys. We should economize more and we should keep the expenditure more in accordance with our revenue. When the Minister of Finance came down the other day with the Estimates he was asked for certain information from our side of the House as to where he was going to get the money to meet the proposed expenditure. He was asked for some

information as to the present financial condition of the country, as to its liabilities, that information has not been given and I submit that we should not be a party to the passing of Estimates until we know where the revenue is coming from. We were asked to spend something in the neighbourhood of \$4,000,000 to provide for the public service, when we knew that during the past year our income was not as great as that for the year before. Our income for 1915-16 is liable to be less, and the Minister should not ask us to vote an expenditure until we know what our income is going to be, and if we have not voted enough there will be further expenditures on Executive responsibility. Under the Audit Act there is some authority for expenditures by the Governor which if lived up to would cause no complaint. We ought to live up to that Act more closely. It is no defence to say that it has not been lived up to in the past. If under the Bond administration, money was expended under the Audit Act which should not have been expended I say that that is no reason why the practice should be continued. I am quite prepared to justify any expenditure made by that Administration. I believe they were proper expenditures, but I think the Audit Act as it is, is very complete, and it is for that reason I am prepared to support the resolution now before the House.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I would like to add a few words. I have already expressed my opinion in another debate as to expenditures made which are reported upon by the Auditor General from year to year as contrary to the Audit Act, and if we come in here year after year and have reports like this to the Legislature of illegal expenditures I am prepared to do what I can to repudiate them, and

It does not matter to me one way or another under what administration it was done. It was clever of the leader of the Government, and he is very clever in all his Parliamentary tactics, to stand up as a champion of Sir Robert Bond. I should like to know what Sir Robert Bond thinks of the championship of Sir Edward Morris.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—He would be charmed to see what splendid champions he has on the other side of the House.

MR. LLOYD—He will be very pleased to see because what I am going to say will agree with his views. He would also feel very proud at having his doings championed by the members on that side of the House. I have been a supporter of Sir Robert Bond, a political friend of Sir Robert Bond, and I am no less an admirer of him to-day than I was before. Even if it were not that the practice has received the stamp of Sir Robert Bond's disapproval, I would still stand up and support any motion against illegal expenditure. The Premier has already told us that that expenditure was justified under Section 33 B of the Audit Act, although his remark about that Act is that that sub-section would justify anything. If this is so, even if this expenditure is justified by section 33 C of the Audit Act, that does not make the practice proper. If they have used it wrongfully and if expenditures have been allowed to go under section 33 C of the Act, which ought not to have been, this section does not justify it or their continuing it. There is no doubt about the practice. Now a report is given us by the Auditor General for the past year and he would not make the same remarks from year to year if it were not so; and as far as I am concerned, I don't care who started it, it ought to be put an end to.

The only fault is addressing the Governor. There is little use in addressing the Governor on a matter like this. He can only refer it to the Cabinet. I think that the Governor ought to be in the position of the King of England, ought to be constitutional, but unfortunately under our Act he has personal duties. He is actually bigger than the King of England, and because of this we have to place ourselves in the unfortunate position of having to approach and ask him to take this course even without the advice of the Ministers. I would like him to make enquiries as to the practice. I notice the Act provides that if the Auditor General refuses to issue cheque the Attorney General is called upon to offer his opinion. That is by Section 33, and his opinion having been offered the Auditor General proceeds to carry out instructions. That this has not been strictly carried out may be seen by reference to his report where he not only calls attention to these expenditures which he calls illegal but asks this House for the opinion of the Attorney General. I would like to know if such is the case I have never come across it before. Mr. Kent as Attorney General might have received such reports, but I have no recollection of them. I would ask the Government if there is a practice of taking the opinion of the Attorney General.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—I think so. As a rule these are passed at Council meetings and no record kept. There they would be passed by him.

MR. LLOYD—He is called upon by Section 33 to give not only oral but written decisions. I would like to know if this rule is enforced? If during this administration this has been done? I would ask the Minister of Finance if he has got these.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—I will let you know.

MR. LLOYD.—I understand it was said that section 33 (b) offered extraordinary latitude in making expenditures, and this is what has reference to when the Attorney General is asked. "If upon any application for a cheque, the Auditor General has reported that there is no Legislative authority for issuing it, then upon the written opinion of the Attorney General of the colony that there is such authority citing it, the Minister of Finance and Customs may authorize The Deputy Minister of Finance to prepare the cheque, irrespective of the Auditor General's report."

There is not much scope in that. (c) If, when the Legislature is not in session any accident happens to any public work or public building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen and provided for by the Legislature is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Customs, that there is no legislative provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor-in-Council, may order a special warrant to be prepared etc."

The one point is that this section is being improperly interpreted. It is merely a statement to the effect that under this section of this Act improper expenditures have been made. Expenditures have been made under this section which have not been justified by this section, and for the last few years the Auditor General has reported that extraordinary and illegal expenditures were being made under section 33 (c). This was especially so about the time of the last election; last year in the House we pronounced upon it and the increases granted pri-

or to the day of election. No attempt has been made at justification of these increases. No justification at all, but they are directly contrary to the Audit Act. It is against this that we are protesting. Now, Sir, I have said what I wished to say. I am merely saying what I have said last year. I have merely said as I have often said that these expenditures are unlawful, and should have been voted by this House. It would not be so serious had it started from this House, but I resent, we resent Sir, its starting from the Upper House, and being passed by the Governor-in-Council, and I strongly support any measure to put an end to the practice which is growing of this illegal expenditure of public moneys.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker: If every one who wishes has spoken, I propose to close the debate with a few words.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE.—Just a word or two, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. If one would think that everything said here this afternoon was said in earnest he could not but think that affairs were in a very serious condition. Since 3.15 p.m. we have been trying to get this matter settled up. This is not the first time the Audit Act has been disputed. When I heard all the members speaking I could not help thinking of how favoured this House was to get all this advice free. How much such legal advice would cost if we had to pay for it, but we get it here this afternoon for nothing. It ran through my mind as I heard the members speaking that this was nothing more or less than an attempt to block business. There could certainly be no other motive. There is absolutely nothing in the charges which are being made.

The very man who brought in that

act, was the first one to break it, and that was the gentleman who introduced this resolution this evening.

Now it has been the practice since the Audit Act came into existence, to make from time to time certain expenditures. For instance, last year a vote for the Marine Disaster Fund something like \$25,000 was made. Over 250 men had lost their lives within a month, and the Audit Act allowed the Government to draw about \$25,000. That is what the Audit Act is for, cases of emergency like this.

Every expenditure cannot be foreseen at the beginning of the year and to meet emergencies governments find it is a necessity that some section allows payments to issue. This is an acknowledged fact and I am surprised to find the time of the House being taken up with such nonsense. Even the President of the F. P. U. looked disgustedly at the bringing in of this motion. The first year of the Audit Act's being in force, the Auditor General brought in this report of expenditures not authorized by it; the year after the Audit Act was introduced, under the very government that introduced it. Ever since the Audit Act has been introduced this practice has been continued, and probably Dr. Lloyd has made the same speech as he has today, and will make it until it will be his pleasure to defend it from this side of the House. The hon. member Mr. Clift, made the remark that the Minister of Finance did not come down with information satisfactorily because I did not have the Budget prepared to hand down before the Estimates. I do not think I need refer at any length to any of the remarks made here. I agree with Mr. Coaker that this matter is not being properly taken up.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, just a word or two. The Minister of Fi-

nance thought I was disgusted. Well, so I was. I was disgusted with the defence he was putting up. I think the adoption of the resolution would do a lot of good. It would certainly stop the expenditure of nearly \$50,000 without satisfactory explanations. The Minister said I was a very charitable fellow. Well, I think I am, at least I try to be.

I know this afternoon if he had stood up and said: We have erred, we have strayed in our ways like lost sheep, we have done wrong, but we will amend and try to do better in future, I would certainly have been glad to let it pass and give him any assistance I could. But at the same time I cannot say that I did not enjoy his speech. I do enjoy a good warm debate. I felt refreshed as I heard him deliver his defence of what had been done in the past. I don't quite understand why he tried to bring in what Sir Robert Bond had done. I agree with Dr. Lloyd that Sir Robert Bond would not thank anyone on the other side for introducing his name. Be that as it may, however, I hope that we shall have many a warm debate before the four years that we have to spend here together are up, and I shall never feel aggrieved with the Premier's speeches if he doesn't get any warmer than he did this afternoon.

With regard to the matter before the House at the present time, I may say that I certainly do give it my full support; and not only that, but I want to state here from my place in this House that if I am ever supporting any government that attempts to infringe upon the Audit Act, such as has been done in the past and such as has been referred to here this afternoon, I will no longer support that government. I will see that they live up to the law with regard to the Audit Act. We members of

the Fishermen's Union in this House have had our eyes opened during the last two sessions in regard to this matter. The expenditure under this head last year were very considerable. We protested and expressed the hope that it would not happen any more. I am very sorry that this year we have had to show up weakness in that way again, but it is not half nor quarter as bad as last year; and I venture to hope that next year, in view of this discussion this afternoon, will show a much greater improvement. The resolution now before the House will certainly tend to deprecate anything of that nature.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to the hon. members on the other side of the House on having become so suddenly righteous, now they are occupying seats on the other side. I think it is quite true, as was pointed out by the Premier, that the hon. introducer of this resolution went out of his way to be particularly harsh in his expressions as regards the moneys that have been spent by the Government on Executive responsibility. I am surprised, sir, at the accusations that he made in charging this and previous governments with improper conduct. Since I have been a member of the Executive Government under Sir Edward Morris expenditures have been made occasioned by circumstances that could not possibly have been foreseen, which arose and had to be provided for at the time. It may not be proper in the eyes of some people, but it was entirely unavoidable in the great majority of cases; and I repudiate the charge of any improper or corrupt conduct since I have been a member of that Executive Government. He pointed out that in 1913, the year of the election, a large sum of money was spent, and insinuated

that it was done for corrupt purposes. The same thing was done in 1904. In the election of that year I had the honor to be a follower of Sir Robert Bond; and I believe if Sir Robert Bond were sitting in the House this evening he would repudiate any such insinuations as we have just heard. It is extraordinary that at this time all kinds of resolutions and motions are being brought in. If there have been sins in the past, if improper conduct has existed in the past, I can fairly claim that nothing of the kind exists to-day, and that everything that has been done, every dollar that has been spent, will be found to be justifiable. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, wish to place myself on record that I have still sufficient confidence in the honesty and integrity of my colleagues to believe that they will not sanction any unjust expenditure while they are in control of the affairs of this Colony; and I see no reason why any such memorial or resolution as has been proposed should be forwarded to His Excellency the Governor.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say half a dozen words off my own bat and in my own way in connection with this matter, and I won't occupy the time of the House very long. Of course, where lawyers and doctors differ it is hard for laymen to come to a decision, but thinking it out in my own simple way it appears to me that there is an Audit Act passed for the purpose of preventing any improper expenditures. The wording of that Act, however, appears to be such that the effect of the Act is about equal to locking a door and leaving the key in the lock—It is possible to open the door without probably breaking the letter but certainly breaking the spirit of the Act. Now, I have noticed that the greatest expenditures under that Act have been in election years. It looks terribly suspicious to an outsider like

myself—because I consider myself an outsider. Of course, anything that may be improperly done in this respect not only affects the Government but the country. I believe that no man lives to himself or dies to himself. If I am guilty of an improper action, somebody else probably follows my example. The feeling in the districts, so far as I know anything about it (and I figure I know a little) is this:—If you want to get a grant, ask for it in election year. This may have been brought about by the improper actions of governments in the past, but I think that if the Audit Act does not provide sufficiently against improper expenditure it should be amended, so that the door may be properly locked, the key taken out, and everything made fair and square.

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared for the amendment: Mr. Morine, Mr. Kent, Mr. Clift, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Stone, Mr. Jennings, Mr. Targett, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Clapp (13); and against it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Devereaux, Mr. Downey, Mr. M. J. Kennedy, Mr. F. J. Morris, Mr. Moore, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Le-Feuvre, Mr. Currie, Mr. Higgins, Mr. George Kennedy, Mr. Young, Mr. Walsh, (20); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion was put, and there appeared for the motion: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Marine & Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Devereaux, Mr. Downey, Mr. M. J. Kennedy, Mr. F. J. Morris, Mr. Moore,

Mr. Moulton, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Le-Feuvre, Mr. Currie, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Geo. Kennedy, Mr. Young, Mr. Walsh (20); and against it: Mr. Morine, Mr. Kent, Mr. Clift, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Stone, Mr. Jennings, Mr. Targett, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Clapp (13); so it passed in the affirmative, and was ordered accordingly.

STAMP DUTIES RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the whole on certain Resolutions on the subject of Stamp Duties.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—

Mr. Chairman: In bringing in this resolution the Government has endeavoured to impose as light taxes as possible. The resolution is that "No cheque upon a banker issued by the authority of a department of the Government, or issued by any person or body who is permitted by Order of His Excellency the Governor-in-Council to issue unstamped cheques, and no Post Office Money Order or Postal Order shall be stamped, and any such cheque upon a banker, Post Office Money Order, or postal order not stamped, may be pleaded and given in evidence, and shall be admitted to be good, useful and available in law and in equity." It means that all Government cheques are good unstamped. At the present time it is a waste of money and time to put stamps on the cheques. It was formerly the intention to tax Post Office Orders. But, on account of the information received from the committee it was decided to cancel that. It was specified in the resolution what receipt meant. What we intend to do can be done under the

rules and regulations, by the Governor-in-Council.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, take the case of the receipt for a Life Insurance premium. That would be a receipt for money, but according to the rules and regulations, it would not apply.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—According to the definitions, Life Insurance premiums are exempt.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, I think that the point was that the bill in this amended form, meets the objection that Dr. Lloyd raised. That objection is now disposed of.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, it is well known to the members that the Act was passed last year in a hurry. I think that if you are going in for this policy, you ought to have a much more elaborate Act. There is a lot of machinery necessary in connection with this that is not incorporated. You have very often a maze of legal inconsistencies. In the case of a shipping receipt the stamp is to be affixed by the shipper. I think that the Governor-in-Council has no right to say whether it is for the drawer or drawee to do this. It has no right to define the legal rights of these two parties. The person who gives the receipt under the Act is the person who should stamp it. Now in shipping receipts, the shipper does not give a receipt. It is the carrier who issues the receipt. If it is necessary to give a receipt, the giver should put the stamp on it. These distinctions ought to be made. The present rules are very confusing and are likely to cause a large amount of trouble. I think that it is a mistake to extend this policy so far as a receipt stamp is concerned. It is a policy that is going to lead to a lot of confusion and trouble. The people generally will not take kindly to putting a stamp on receipts. In my opinion I think that

you have gone far enough in this direction; there are other documents that might be taxed. I think that when this receipt business gets working, you will find that it will cause a lot of irritation.

DR. LLOYD—A little while ago, Mr. Chairman, we were discussing expenditures of money on executive responsibility. We are debating now, not expenditure on executive responsibility, but taxation on executive authority. What is the difference? My objection is that the executive council should have any say at all in the matter. It is the function of this House not of the executive council to decide such matters. If there are to be changes made, let them be made here.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I don't see the advantage of this bill. I ask the Government to drop this two-cent business. This will bring in no or very little revenue as far as I can see, and will confuse and worry everyone. The increase in revenue will not justify the trouble that will result. If I were to buy anything at any of the large stores, I should not ask them to put a stamp on a receipt that I get there. Most of the people will not know about this new law. Take our fishermen for instance, what will they know about these stamps? Then by and by they may find out that their receipts must be stamped. It was the experience of Canada some years ago that this sort of thing was not desirable and did not work at all; and so they abandoned it. I urge upon the Government very strongly to abandon this idea.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, in the case of a Bill of Lading where a vessel is chartered, the person who chartered the vessel had to put the stamp on the Bill, but the man who owns the vessel should do that. The thing ought to be clearly defined; oth-

erwise there is going to be a lot of confusion as there was last year. If a fisherman who sells his fish has got to give a receipt, it should be specified whether he is to put a two cent stamp on that receipt or not.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words in connection with this matter. This stamp duty has already caused great confusion. The first time it went into force, there was a lot of difference of opinion as to who should put the stamp on the cheque. The practice of this new rule is sure to end in a lot of confusion. Then there is room for a great deal of fraud, because the giver, knowing that he can cancel it himself, can put any sort of a stamp on it. The Government would save a lot of trouble if they made it that the person, who received it should put the stamp on it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, this bill is going to create a lot of confusion and be a nuisance generally. If you were to depend on this for a revenue you would find yourself in a very bad condition. The Government ought to get their revenue in some other way. It will only take up a lot of time and labour. We are too busy to have to put a two cent stamp on every receipt that is issued.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman, there is something that I wish to understand about this bill. Who has to put the two cent stamp on the receipt? If a receipt is not given, what about it then? I oppose the measure for this reason. A lot of trouble is going to follow from this.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, there is one other point; an ordinary bill is not a receipt unless it is marked paid. Is it not possible that a person could pay for his goods without taking his receipt?

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, the Government have asked us to vote five or six amounts of twenty or

twenty five thousand dollars for purposes that anyone with common sense knows you can do without, and now they are putting a tax on receipts; all over the country, North and South, East and West, you are going to cause the trade and everyone else no end of trouble. And for what? What is it going to amount to?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—About \$25,000.

MR. COAKER—Then you must have a wonderful idea of how many receipts there will be if you can estimate it that way. You will do well if you get \$5,000.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—If we get only \$5,000 it cannot cause much inconvenience.

MR. COAKER—Even then it will cause inconvenience. Put a tax on something else that will not cause so much trouble, and if you want \$25,000 you will get it. You have told us that this is a war tax; but even if it is I intend to vote against it. I do not intend to go to the Northern Districts, or any outpost and try to justify voting for putting a two cent tax upon receipts. I voted for every other one of your war taxes, but I am not going to vote for this.

MR. CLIFF—Mr. Chairman, I think the last time this matter was up it was deferred by the Minister because it was too indefinite. The meaning of the word 'receipt' was not properly defined, and it does not seem any more clearly defined in the present Bill.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—It says: "receipt for any sum of money exceeding ten dollars."

MR. CLIFF—It seems to me to be indefinite, and it does not say who shall pay the tax. It seems too indefinite to vote upon in its present form.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The man who gives the

receipt pays the money.

MR. CLIFT—That may be your opinion, but it does not say so in the Act. I am not objecting to the matter of taxation; but you might put a special tax of one cent on letters like they do in Canada. That would be better than putting it on receipts. While not objecting to the tax itself, I think it ought to be got differently. Any measure imposing taxation ought to be definite, so that we shall know exactly who has to pay the tax. There is no penalty for not putting on these stamps on receipts, and nobody charged with the duty of seeing that it is done. I would suggest that the Minister reconsider the matter.

MR. KENT—I think there is a general penalty in the Act of 1898, I am not referring to the Act passed last year; but I mean the Act of 1898. I think there is some penalty for issuing unstamped documents.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, in the War Session Act of 1914, there is a penalty of \$10 for drawing cheques on a bank and not stamping them, and I think in the Stamp Act of 1898 there is a general penalty for not stamping documents which require to be stamped, and it would appear that that hardly could be enforced in cases under the present Act. There is one principle I think that the hon. member opposite ought to bear in mind, and that is the principle which the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, suggested. As he has suggested we are now dealing with a war tax and I do not think that this enactment any more than the measures of 1914, ought to be viewed merely in the spirit of taxation such as would be levied in ordinary circumstances. It is merely a war tax, such as is being levied everywhere else.

Now there is another point. We must all acknowledge that there

was considerable force in the position the Opposition took the last time this matter was up, that two dollar receipts were too small to levy this tax on; but now we must remember that ten dollars is the amount. That I think, fairly corresponds with the class of receipts that are taxed in other countries. Again, it must be remembered that it is not much of a hardship on a man who is paid ten dollars to put a two cent stamp on the receipt. I do not think that men will do as suggested by the hon. member for Brigus suggests, make out a number of small receipts in order to evade this two cent tax. Of course it may cause a temporary upset and confusion, and there will no doubt be people from whom we will not get this tax at all; but I think generally, Sir, you will find that as in the case of the 1914 enactment in the main the people from whom we get the revenue will follow out the law.

Now I am sure my friend, Mr. Winsor, did not mean what he said about the trouble this tax is going to cause for the Government in the Northern Districts. I have too much respect for the loyalty of the people in these districts not to feel that they will with pleasure put a stamp on their receipts, in the same way as will be done all over the country. It is only a temporary law and we all hope and trust that it will not be of long duration. Now I would like to point out to my hon. friend that this will not be as great a hardship as has been suggested, and the great amount of revenue is going to come from the people doing the big volume of business, and the casual man and the small business man will not be inconvenienced to the extent suggested here.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, that

is a very clever bit of special pleading. Apparently you can cover anything under the name of war and then it becomes right. This is no more a war tax than any other tax. It is all going into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and is all to be spent for the general requirements of the country. It is not a question of raising money to spend on war, but as to where we are going to get money to pay our bills. It is a very clever bit of special pleading.

MR. HIGGINS—I only spoke on the same lines as the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd.

MR. MORINE—If that is so, I disagree with him also. It is not a question of how we are going to spend the money, but how we are going to raise it; and we should not raise it in this way. Now it would be much better to put an additional cent on letters and have the postage three cents instead of two.

Now the point has been raised that a receipt need not be stamped to make it valid. It need only be stamped when you have tabled it in court. Not one in ten thousand will ever come before Court; and if one does, you can stamp it before going into Court. This enactment is altogether unsuited to our conditions of business. It is true that this stamping of receipts is common in the Old Country, but there conditions are altogether different from here. It is going to cause great confusion and inconvenience. Now I do not object to you getting this revenue, but I think you ought to get it in some more suitable way; and do not try to justify everything with the plea of war. If you have to raise this money raise it some other way.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I still adhere to my statement that this is a war tax. This method of taxation

was introduced last session—the War Session—and this Bill is merely an amendment of the Act passed then. These taxes were found necessary to meet the conditions that then were. I do not say it is a better way of raising revenue than by increasing the postage on letters; but it is infinitely better than trying to raise it through the Custom House, where the cost of collection would come out of the revenue.

MR. MORINE—I entirely disagree with my learned friend. The cost of collecting the revenue would not be increased one iota. You have all the necessary machinery there now. This enactment is altogether undesirable, it can be violated in a thousand ways and the amount you will get from it is small.

Mr. Morine proposed an amendment which was lost.

Mr. Coaker proposed an amendment which was lost.

MR. CLIFT—Before you put the vote I wish to say that I shall vote against the Bill because I consider it too indefinite.

MR. KENT—I am going to vote against the amendment. My reason is this. I consider the responsibility for this tax rests upon the Government, and I have already expressed the opinion that I do not like the tax. I think it is wrong and going to lead to confusion, but at the present time in a matter of this kind, I think the responsibility rests on the Government and I am going to vote against the amendment.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received.

On motion for the adoption of the Report Mr. Morine moved an amendment that the second Resolution be stricken out.

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared for the amendment:— Messrs. Morine, Chft, Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Jennings, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes, (10); and against it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hona. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereux, Downey, Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, LeFeuvre, Currie, Higgins, G. Kennedy, Young, Walsh, Kent, Lloyd, Stone (22); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the House divided, and put, and there appeared for it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hona. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister Marine and Fisheries, Minister Public Works, Messrs. Devereux, Downey, Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, Le Feuvre, Currie, Higgins, G. Kennedy, Young, Walsh, Kent, Lloyd, Stone (22); and against it: Messrs. Morine, Chft, Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Jennings, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes (10); so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

The bill entitled "An Act to amend 5 Geo. V., Sess. 1, Cap. 10, entitled: 'An Act respecting Stamp Duties'" was then introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

At half past 6 o'clock Mr. Speaker left the Chair until 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at eight o'clock.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion

of Hon. Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the General Hospital."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that on Tuesday night last I informed the House that I would owing to the lateness of the hour, refrain from making any remarks on the matter now before the House. I felt sure that hon. members would prefer my not detaining them later after a day's strenuous work. Therefore I asked the House to go into Committee this evening for a few moments until I explained this measure which circumstances have brought about. It will be remembered that last year the then hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, asked a question in this House in reference to certain alleged irregularities taking place in the General Hospital. It was then alleged that Dr. Keegan was taking certain supplies for his own use, and the question then arose as to whether he was justified in doing this. The Government through the Prime Minister, stated that they had no knowledge of any such thing happening, but upon enquiry, it was found that Dr. Keegan admitted that certain supplies were taken, but that he had thought he was entitled to these by virtue of his office. The Government intimated that his office gave him no such right and requested him to discontinue the practice, which, I am able to say according to the Commission he loyally refrained from. Unfortunately, this was not the sole trouble at the General Hospital, and for some months previously, I, as Colonial Secretary, and therefore departmental head of

the Institution, was aware that a great deal of misapprehension, quarrelling and friction was existing in that Institution. I might say that one of the first duties that I had to perform upon assuming my office was to go down there and try and straighten some little difficulties that had taken place between two of the officials, but which I am glad to say, subsided. However, as time went on, these difficulties and misunderstandings became more frequent and more serious, and I found that it was utterly impossible for me at least to adjust or prevent these incidents from happening. I had immediate interviews with the Medical Superintendent and interviews with the Superintendent of Nurses and several nurses and others of the staff, and found things had been so serious that it required some special remedy. I further informed the Executive Government, as far as I knew, how things stood, and then six representatives were selected to form a committee as the only way to find out the nature of this trouble as to appointment of a commission of enquiry. This all took place last year—about this time last May, and the Government decided to appoint a commission of three gentlemen whom they considered would make an unbiased and thorough enquiry into all matters relating to matters of that Institution. That Commission consisted of the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, the Hon. J. Alexander Robinson and Hon. M. P. Gibbs, K. C. These gentlemen agreed to accept the commission entrusted to them, that was to take evidence and generally delve into the state of affairs existing at that Institution, a matter which, I believe, required the best part of the past twelve months. About two or three weeks ago they sent in their report to the Government, a copy

of which has been placed in the hands of every member of this House. It is therefore unnecessary for us to go into the contents of this report. I have no doubt that every member who has read it, will conclude that the recommendations made by that committee are such as will immensely aid in the future the proper government and control of that Institution. The amount of evidence that was taken was very large. I have not had an opportunity of reading that evidence myself, as I was content to take the report of the Commissioners, who, I know, framed the report from all the evidence they had in hand. I do not desire to know the different interviews held in that Institution, nor what one official said before the Commissioners of the other officials. I am content to take my opinion from the report I have just alluded to. That report is the basis of the bill now before the House. It is well known, not only in official circles but generally throughout the country, that the conditions existing in the General Hospital have not been all the Government would require. I believe that a great deal of this work is due to non-appreciation of the relative positions of some of the officials on that staff, that there has not been a proper definition of duties. The duties of Dr. Keegan never were clearly defined, neither were those of the Superintendent of Nurses. I think the time has now come, when we must consider the results of this Commission which lies embodied in the bill now before us.

Our duty is to safeguard the people that are in the Hospital and see that they receive proper nursing and proper medical treatment. Our duty is to see that the Institution is conducted in such a way that it will be conducive to the betterment of the health of those who go there. I think that it is

a deplorable fact that such an institution as we have, and I have no desire to cast any reflection upon those in charge of it, should have a bill of this kind brought. I think that the callings of nursing and medical professions are of a particularly sacred kind, but this kind of thing has been going on for a long time and it might transpire that in the near future such a thing might arise that might endanger the lives of some of the patients. A short time ago I had a memorandum from twenty-eight nurses giving me twenty-four hours notice that if I did not take a certain course of action they would leave the institution in a body. That was a very serious matter, practically the whole nursing staff threatened to leave in a body. I immediately saw the seriousness of it and took action, the only action that could have been taken that would not endanger the patients—and we appointed a commission to report on the institution and they have reported in favor of this bill. As I said before it is a deplorable fact that we have to bring in a bill of this nature. The calling of these nurses is one of the highest callings that man or woman could attain to. The great war which is now raging on the other side of the world in which the greatest nations of the world are now engaged, has shown us one side of human nature; shown us how men are busy day after day devising means for killing one another scientifically; shown us how Europe can be turned into a slaughter house by the application of science; shown us a side which makes us wonder whether or not the Christian Doctrine has been a failure. The best minds of the day are devoting their energy to the invention of machinery for destruction, machinery to destroy their fellowmen, and the one bright spot in the whole landscape, the only bright

side of it, is the noble work that has been undertaken by the men and women who have gone forth from their comfortable homes, from their good positions to undertake the nursing and care of the sick and wounded. It is the one bright feature in this great conflict. It is a calling for which we all have the highest regard, and which places men and women on a higher footing in the world than any other calling outside of the Church; and I say it is most unfortunate that here in St. John's where we have an institution of this kind, run entirely by the government it should be in such a condition that it becomes necessary to introduce a bill of this nature. A great deal has been done the last few years to improve and extend the work of the hospital, and make that institution more up to date and when we look back on the past we cannot but have admiration for the great strides that have been made in this country. In 1913 Dr. Keegan in his report gave a synopsis of the growth of hospitals in St. John's, and I think the Committee will observe from this report that in the old days very little attention was given to those who suffered in health and were thrown upon the public charity (Honourable member reads from report). I merely give you that quotation to show you what the people had to put up with, and what little attention was given to their comfort (Honourable member continues reading from report). Going back to the present institution I might say that in 1911 the Nurses Home was opened by Governor Williams, and called the King Edward Home. Previous to that time the nurses had to occupy beds in the hospital itself, they had no sitting rooms, bath rooms, and everyone was delighted that those who were devoting their lives to this work should have a comfortable place to live in. Besides it was absolutely

essential that such a home should be built. Therefore it was commenced in 1910 and opened in 1911. There is a paragraph here in the report to which I will refer the Committee (Honourable member here reads from report of Dr. Keegan). That paragraph is in keeping with the last paragraph of the present bill which provides the machinery for collecting fees from those who avail of the institution, more especially those who can afford to pay. This institution is run entirely by the Government. It is supported entirely by the votes of this House, and it is costing a very large sum of money annually. I have had prepared a statement which shows the growth of the cost of the institution in the past seven years. In 1909 the total cost was \$34,138.69; in 1910 \$42,273; in 1911 \$42,750; in 1912 \$51,409; in 1913 \$63,583, and in 1914 \$75,837, so you can see that in the past six years the upkeep of the General Hospital has more than doubled. The number of those engaged on the staff is at present eighty one. The number of patients on an average is one hundred and ten. All the beds are filled all the time. The average cost per capita is sixty cents per day, that is for attendance. In other words the attendance to patients costs per capita sixty cents per day.

The average cost per patient, including all expenses, maintenance, salaries and all the expenses included in that \$75,000, is \$1.90 per day. So that every patient that is down in the General Hospital to-night is costing the Colony \$1.90 per day. I understand that this is not in excess of what it is costing institutions of that class in other parts. I have been informed by one of our medical men that there is a hospital just outside of New York which is about the same size as the General Hospital here; they have, I think, 180 beds; and he states that the expenses as shown on our ac-

counts is very much in line with what that hospital costs. Ours is a little higher, of course, but that would be natural because we have to pay a higher price for certain supplies than they have. Now, Sir, since the year 1909 a large amount of money has been spent on the extension and improvement of the General Hospital. The Nurse's Home, to which I referred before, has been built; also a new boiler house, a new laundry and new kitchens have been built and equipped with every modern appliance; the wards have all been remodelled, extensions built, and the place made capable of accommodating the number of patients to which I have referred. The amount spent in the year 1908-9 was \$19,244; in 1910, \$8,344; in 1911, \$18,025; in 1912, \$59,183; in 1913, \$39,625; in 1914, \$11,917; and to the 5th April, 1915 \$2,092. This makes a total from the 30th June, 1908, up to the 15th April of this year of \$158,429. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think you can realize that having spent this large sum of money, and continuing to spend such large sums annually for the upkeep of the hospital, the least that can be expected is that things would be carried out down there in a way that would be in keeping with the efforts that are being made in the way of improvement. And I feel sure that this Bill points out that way. I believe that it is only necessary to put the different clauses of this Bill into operation to once and for all put every official in that institution in his or her proper place. Each official will know exactly what his or her duties are, and I hope that a better understanding will be arrived at. I hope that the Board of Governors contemplated by this Bill will be men who will not alone be capable, but will undertake the work from a humane standpoint. It has been contended that it will not be easy to get men to undertake this work, but if I know the

citizens of St. John's as I claim I do know them, I think we could get 60 men, if we need them, every one of whom would be entirely capable. We heard here only yesterday, in connection with the tuberculosis campaign, of the work which the Hon. John Harvey did in endeavouring to fight that great scourge, and I have no doubt that there are many men in the community of the same temperament as Mr. Harvey, if they are given the opportunity. Why it was only last year that the affairs of the city were taken over by a voluntary committee, every one of whom was a busy business man, who very rarely have a minute to spare, but I am proud to state that they have found time in which to make an effort to improve conditions in this city, and that is a greater undertaking even than this work at the hospital. Men could be found for that, and I have no hesitation in saying that six good men will be obtainable who will undertake this work and who will perform it from the standpoint of the highest ideals. They can do a great deal because this Act gives them great powers. They will be representative not alone of St. John's but of the whole country, and they will be men who will not be bound or influenced by Party politics, denominationalism, or in any other way; they will be free and untrammelled; they will meet as a body, and they will endeavour, I am sure, to find out everything that appertains to that institution, and once they determine on a step they need fear no criticism from outside. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this is a big stride towards the goal that we are all so anxious to see attained in connection with the General Hospital. I have felt all along that it was very undesirable and very unfair that the gentleman who should happen to be occupying the position of Colonial Secretary

should have the responsibility of such an institution as that thrown upon his shoulders. I feel that difficulties have arisen down there during the past twelve or eighteen months, which if there were men in charge who had a thorough knowledge of matters such as this board would have, could have been easily adjusted. I therefore think that the appointing of a Board of Governors is a step in the right direction and the keynote of the contentment and good feeling which should exist in that institution if the work for which it is intended is to be properly carried out. I think most of the difficulties that have arisen there are trivial and have been due to a misunderstanding and misconception of the different positions, and I think the best way out of them is the appointment of a Board such as this Act contemplates; I am sure that that Board will not be in operation very long before all these difficulties will be straightened out. It is not necessary for me, Mr. Chairman, to go through the different sections of the bill. It has now been before the Committee for the last two days, and I am sure the members of the House have given the matter their very earnest consideration. I now lay the matter in their hands, and I would ask them, in discussing it, to remember that we are actuated by the very best motives, and are endeavouring to do what we can to make that institution all that we desire it to be.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman: It so often falls to my lot to criticise, in a spirit that may seem to be fault-finding, measures that are introduced into this House by the Government, that it is a very great pleasure to me this evening to be able to give this Bill my hearty support. With the exception of a very few verbal criticisms

which I may make as we pass along more for the purpose of assisting in carrying out what appears to be the object of the Bill than anything else, I think the bill is really a remarkable one in every respect. The Colonial Secretary said that it was deplorable that it should be necessary to introduce the bill. I am rather inclined to think the opposite. The circumstances to which he has referred may have been deplorable, but this bill is such a very great advance upon anything we have had, that out of what was certainly a very complex and difficult subject great good has already come. I entirely sympathise with the Colonial Secretary, as head of the Department which has charge of the hospital, and with the Government generally, upon the great difficulties with which they had to deal in connection with the administration of the hospital; and also one can quite sympathise with those who had charge of the hospital and who were coming daily, and hourly perhaps, into contact with irritating things that jarred upon the nerves of all. We are perhaps apt to forget that they do not look at the sentimental side of their work; it becomes to them a matter of daily labor, and all the irritation which one feels in almost any avocation is perhaps doubled in their case by the strain and stress of the peculiar work which they have to perform. Now, I know, and have for a great many years known, a good deal about the daily working of the hospital. I always took an interest in it both in the Government of the country and the Opposition, and followed its working closely, and I am bound to say that I think that even those warring factions in the hospital are, most of them, persons who have got into that condition through the deep interest which they took in their work. I be-

lieve that if they had less interest in their work there would not have been as much friction between them as there has been. I know personally, as most members of this House do, those who have perhaps been the causes and at the same time the victims, of the greatest amount of trouble, and we know that they have been in their individual capacities remarkable in the discharge of their duties; and one can only hope that this Board of Governors when it comes in, will so clear the atmosphere that everything will sink back into its proper place and that things will work along harmoniously. I would like to say in passing, too, how much I enjoyed the really remarkable report which the Commission present upon this matter. Knowing how difficult were the various subjects they had to deal with, how extremely hard it was to get at the truth of various matters, I must say that I think it would be extremely difficult to find three persons who could send in a better report. It is well written, goes straight to the point, and ends up with concrete recommendations with which, I think, all of us can agree. It is one of the best reports that I have ever seen presented in this colony on public matters, and I congratulate the gentlemen who were members of that Commission, and also the Government, upon the work. I believe that you can get good men to form this Board. I would express the hope, however, that they will not be persons who take no interest in political affairs, because that class of man would not take much interest in the affairs of the hospital; but I do think that none of them ought to be members of this House. As far as possible they ought to be withdrawn from active partisan work. If they are members of the Legislature at all, perhaps one or two

that we have in our eyes who are members of the Legislative Council might very properly be on that Board; but certainly they ought not be any closer to active politics than that, because the questions that will arise there for a long time will be questions that will border upon the domain of politics, and it will be better for the Institution and for the Government if the Board are entirely outside of it, so that the Government, when they are approached, as they will be for some time following the old practice, can say with perfect truth. This is a commission over which we have no control; they have charge of this matter and we cannot interfere with their decision. I understood from the Colonial Secretary that the Commission will be representative of the whole country. I hope that it will not go outside of St. John's. I quite agree that it should represent the whole country, but the members should be resident in St. John's so as to be able to give daily assistance. I may say farther that I think you will find from experience elsewhere that a great point will be to get as Chairman a broad, executive man, who will put his heart into the work. If you get the right Chairman you will have very little difficulty. There are a few verbal alterations that I will suggest as we go along. I think myself that perhaps, as has been suggested, the Superintendent should have the power of suspension, because I do not think that you can have any institution thoroughly efficient unless there is a man at the head of it with full and complete responsibility. However, the Commission, after it has been appointed and has had some experience, will be able to tell us what is the best to do, and to ask for amendments to this Bill. As we go through the bill section by section I will suggest the alterations which I would like to see made.

In the meantime, I have the very greatest pleasure in giving the bill my support. I think it is one of the best that has ever been presented.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman: I also take very great pleasure in giving my hearty support to this bill. I think it is an excellent measure. It is based upon the report of the Commission which the Government saw fit to appoint last session when the serious conditions existing at the hospital were pointed out to them. The gentlemen on the other side of the House, and particularly those sitting on the back benches, are noted for their enthusiasm in trying to do all they can in the interest of every institution. We certainly give them credit in that respect, and I have no hesitation in saying that the outcome of this Bill is due to the interest taken by Mr. Coaker last year when he asked certain questions about the hospital. When these questions were asked the Government immediately made enquiries, and owing, as the Colonial Secretary has said, to the fact that there was continuous trouble existing down there, the Government was compelled, in the interest of the institution and of the whole country, to appoint a Commission. I read the report of that Commission, and I must say that I do not think that report could be improved upon; and I am quite satisfied, from what I saw of the evidence, that the report is based upon the evidence. I believe that the measure which is now before the House, and which is the outcome of that report, will be beneficial to the institution and will put it on its proper basis. I was very much interested indeed in the extracts read by the Colonial Secretary, from Dr. Keegan's evidence, because it brings us back to the old days when the sick and feeble were not as well looked after as they are to-day. The

present hospital is built upon the site of the old military hospital. It was a great pity, as Dr. Keegan pointed out, that money was spent in extending the building on that site. It is a barren spot, it has bare surroundings, and the outlook is not in any way helpful to convalescence. We have the beautiful Waterford Valley, and several other pleasant sites around St. John's, with plenty of trees growing around them, lakes and rivers, healthy surroundings, which would have been much more suitable than that bleak spot where the hospital now stands. It was an awful pity that so much money was spent on such a place. With respect to the condition of the institution at the present time, it was very annoying to the Government that these complaints should have been coming in, considering the amount of money that we spent on the hospital since 1909. The figures have already been given by the Colonial Secretary. They have been increasing year after year. The expenditures in connection with the Nurses Home and the extensions to the buildings were very great. We did not hesitate to spend that money, because we fully realized that the object was a worthy one and that we could not spend money in a better cause, and it was a very great annoyance to us indeed to find that things down there were not running smoothly. Now, I think that the Commission who undertook the duty of reorganizing this institution and putting it on a proper basis have done good work, and I believe that when they recommended the appointment of a Board of Governors they were doing exactly what they considered right, and I also believe that results will justify them in their action. The bill is a very simple one and a very comprehensive one. It has been worked out in every detail to carry out the report of the Commis-

sioners as far as possible, and I have no doubt whatever that when it is enacted into Law, and is in operation, all these little differences down there at the hospital will disappear; that things will go well; and that that institution will be a credit to the country.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: As the definition of "Department" is given for the purpose of saving a repetition of words, and as the word is only used once at the beginning of the second paragraph, I would suggest that you put it in the second paragraph, "The Department of Public Works," and strike out the second definition.

(A considerable portion of the bill was then read and passed, with trifling verbal alterations.)

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the committee rise at this stage and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

PERMANENT DISASTERS FUND BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the establishment of a Permanent Marine Disasters' Fund" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question. It was moved and seconded that

when the House rise it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, May 7th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

PETITION.

FRIDAY, May 7th.

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

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions from Exploits, Tilt Cove and Springdale on the subject of prohibition.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

Mr. Jennings gave notice of question.

QUESTION.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copies of the returns of all main line grants for the District of Carbonear, viz: Carbonear, Victoria and Bristol's Hope, for the years 1913 and 1914; also, the special grants for Carbonear and Bristol's Hope for the same period.

It was ordered that this question stand over until the arrival of the minister.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing what services have been rendered in return for the following payments:—

Burn & Berridge, law fees ..	\$ 520.00
Alfred Birdsall, damages ..	165.20
F. C. Brien, services ..	200.00
Board of Works, expenses,	
R. Power ..	220.00
Louis Buffett, services ..	18.00
Naomi Blunden, horse destroyed ..	100.00
Canada Newspaper Advertising ..	1,218.02
Hon. M. P. Cashin, expenses (Where?) ..	1,360.00

R. D. Curtis, hire of room ..	50.00
Alfred Churchill, expenses ..	45.00
Crosbie Hotel, expenses ..	24.84
Robert Duff, \$40; John Davis, \$20; cab fees ..	70.00
Professor Dunstan, expenses	487.50
Eastern Press Association ..	100.33
Francis Edwards, sundries ..	219.71
Hon. C. H. Emerson, expenses ..	412.00
Financial News, advertising	1,901.73
Field Newspaper, advertising ..	655.05
M. W. Furlong, expenses ..	750.00
Captain T. Fitzpatrick, services ..	100.00
Captain George Harris, detention of vessel ..	1,200.00
Patrick Joy, cattle ..	100.00
Lloyd's Commissioners ..	1,230.92
Hon. P. T. McGrath, services ..	600.00
Hon. D. Morison, cheque ..	43.75
Nfld. Steam Engineering Co, services ..	174.00
S. H. Parsons & Sons Photos ..	250.00
Reid Nfld. Company, services etc. ..	116.33
R.N.M.D.S.F., Dr. Grenfell ..	200.00
Standard and Empire, advertising ..	1,188.79
Warrick Smith, services ..	200.00
W. R. Warren, services ..	750.00
Imperial Institute, sundries ..	1,454.00
Also, the originals or copies of all bills covering the above claims.	

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is being prepared.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act respecting the General Hospital."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

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

STAMP DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled 'An Act to amend 5 Geo. V., Sess. 1. Cap. 10, entitled 'An Act Respecting Stamp Duties' was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

DISASTERS FUND BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the establishment of a Disasters Fund" was read a second time.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker. In moving the second reading of this bill I desire to point out to the House in a few words the object of the bill. I have placed on the desks of the hon. members a copy of the Daily News of August 4th last and if they look inside of that paper they will find a complete report, occupying the whole of page 5, of the Executive Committee of the Marine Disasters Fund, 1914; a most interesting report indeed although we all regret the circumstances which made it necessary.

The bill which I am now introducing is the result of the demands of the committee in respect to a Permanent Disasters Fund as well as to the fund they are now operating.

The bill proposes, as section 1 provides, that

1.—There shall be a Committee to

be known as "The Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Committee" (hereinafter called "The Committee") to consist of nine members, to be appointed by His Excellency the Governor-in-Council; of these the Colonial Secretary and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall be members.

I may say that that is the representation which is acting at the present time.

Section 2 outlines the powers of the committee so appointed.

Section 3 deals with the raising of monies by the committee.

Section 4 empowers committees now in operation to pass over any surpluses they may have to the control of this permanent committee. The Section reads as follows:

4.—It shall be lawful for any Committee, person or persons, corporation or corporations having the custody of any fund now or hereafter raised for charitable purposes, where the objects of the fund have been satisfied, and the surplus of the fund remains unexpended, to pay over such surplus to the committee, and the receipt of the Treasurer or other properly constituted officer of the Committee shall be a sufficient discharge therefor.

Section 5 enables the Governor in Council to appoint the committee as a body or society for the purpose of determining all claims under section 3 of the Act 3, George V., Cap. 28, entitled "An Act Respecting the Assistance of Sufferers in Marine Disasters" and all questions in respect thereof. It will be remembered that in Sec. 3 of this Act it is provided that "All claims hereunder and all questions in respect thereof shall be determined by the Governor in Council, or by such body or society as they may appoint for the purpose." From this it would seem probable that

it was contemplated to pass over any gains after distribution to the Council for them to dispose of it.

When this fund is permanently established it is likely that as in every other country of the world where boats and liners connect, concerts will be held on board in aid of the fund. You rarely travel nowadays on a steamer without having at some time or other on board a concert in aid of such a fund as this. So it will have to be remembered that possibly on our trains and coastal steamers concerts will be held and with such contributions as these would mean the fund might be augmented until the committee would be in a position to give relief to the claims of the people so left destitute.

The committee at present consists of Hon. John Harris, Chairman, The Minister of Justice, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. George Knowling, Hon. Robert Watson, Mr. J. C. Hepburn and the Hon. J. A. Robinson, Secretary. These were the members of the Disaster Fund of 1914. The total amount collected was \$309,870. The expenditure amounted to \$41,000, leaving a balance of \$268,870.

The total number of beneficiaries under this fund were 721, of whom 164 are widows.

On Thursday, April 9th, this Marine Disasters Fund Committee was appointed. The reasons for appointment were these:

(1) To establish a relief fund for the sufferers from the disasters at the ice

(2) To arrange for its collection and distribution.

(3) To establish a permanent Fund for the relief of sufferers from Marine Disasters.

The committee since that time has been at work and I do not know if

it is possible to find any words expressive of the immensity of the service and work done. One has only to read that report to be convinced about it, and I would suggest that the hon. members preserve it for that purpose. It is only necessary to read it to see the satisfactory way in which the committee has handled it. According to that report it will be seen that 78 members of the crew of the "Newfoundland" and 174 members of the crew of the "Southern Cross" lost their lives, or 252 in all.

Subscription lists were open till the last of May, and in two months the sum of about \$310,000.00 was realized.

The plan adopted, Mr. Speaker, was as follows:

(1) To aged or infirm widows or parents, and in few instances to other relations who were wholly dependent upon the deceased, life annuities have been granted.

(2) To the younger widows, and adult dependents similar annuities have been granted for a period of five years. Should re-marriage take place the annuities will cease. On the other hand, should circumstances, as is probable in several cases, render it necessary that the grants should be continued for a further term of years or for life, provision has been made in the form of a reserve.

(3) An annual grant of \$20, is made to all children of deceased, and to many little brothers and sisters who were more or less dependent on them; these grants to cease on reaching, in the case of boys, 15 years, and of girls 18 years of age.

The grants of \$100 given by the Government under the Marine Disasters Act of 1913, have been paid through the Treasury direct to the beneficiaries, or their trustees independently of this Committee, except that the claims have been certified

when possible by the Secretary.

Provision has been made for the education of the children and this will be paid for.

From these 255 men who have lost their lives, it will be found that there were 721 dependents, constituted as follows:—

Adults.		
Widows of deceased	95	
Fathers of deceased	93	
Mothers of deceased	111	
Male dependents	13	
Female dependents	26	23*
Children.		
Sons of deceased	114	
Daughters of deceased	90	
Brothers of deceased	78	
Sisters of deceased	87	
Boy dependents	5	
Girl dependents	11	283
		—
Total		721

This gives the total as 721

This figure may be increased when further information is received, and may possibly be decreased when all age certificates have been forwarded. Not infrequently it has been found that the ages given, and the ages on the church registers, differ considerably. It is, however, a safe estimate to place the maximum number of dependents as from 720 to 730. The 721 estimate was as at July 31st 1914.

"An outstanding feature in the disasters" the committee goes on to say, "is the youth of those who have been lost; many of them being under the age of 21, and some as young as 15. Several of these young men were married as the 95 widows indicate, many of whom are girls, of from 18 to 23, whilst their children are very young, and must remain beneficiaries for from 14 to 16 years. As a matter of fact, about 80 are under 3 years of age, whilst the number of posthumous children will be over twelve. In El-

iston one family mourns a father and a son. In Little Catalina, two sons, a brother and a nephew, have been called from one family.

At Clarke's Beach, two young men have been called from one family, leaving a sickly father to support 5 children between 3 and 15 years of age. At Hr. Grace is a widow of 21 with six children, the youngest of whom is not one year, and the eldest not yet 12, and in Tilton was a family of six. The father, a widower, and the brother, aged 23, have been taken.

Out of the 721 beneficiaries, the numbers according to districts are as follows:—

St. John's	89
Petty Hr.	12
Punch Cove, Outer Cove and Torbay	25
Carbonear, Freshwater, and Perry's Cove	44
Kelligrews, Foxtrap, Seal Cove, and Long Pond	65
Hr. Grace	49
Spaniard's Bay and Tilton	44
Topwell Chamberlains, Manuals and Paradise	21
Upper Island Cove and Bryant's Cove	40
Conception Hr. and Colliers	22
New Perlick	9
North River and vicinity	10
Benavista and Newman's Cove	45
Catalina and Little Catalina	27
Brigus and Cupids	42
Greenpond and vicinity	34
St. Vincent's, P.R.	22
Newtown, Wesleyville and Cat Hr.	16
Doling Cove	14
Elsewhere	72
	—
	721

Then attention has been given to the needs of survivors. Consideration has been given this matter and allowances in the financing made. The report in this connection reads as fol-

low:

"Consideration of the survivors of the Newfoundland disasters presents problems of a character almost wholly different. In the matter of those, who have been called away, the committee have been enabled to deal with facts as they are. Their enquiries have been exhaustive and every aid that sympathetic hearts and willing service could render has been promptly given. But the problem of the survivors rests for solution in the future. At present the position stands thus:—The survivors number 45. These may be classified thus.

(1) Permanently Incapacitated	11
(2) Partially incapacitated ...	10
(3) Temporarily incapacitated	9
(4) Uninjured, and 'as well as ever'	15
	<hr/>
	45

In relation to the powers of the Committee you will notice at the end of the report that they addressed the Supreme Court in this matter. Their petition read as follows:

Petition.

Hon. Sir William Horwood, K. C.,
Chief Justice of the Supreme
Court of Newfoundland.

Hon. George H. Emerson, Judge of
the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

Hon. George M. Johnson, Judge of
the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

My Lords:—

The Marine Disasters Committee desire to call the attention of your Lordships to certain matters in connection with the Fund now being raised and which closes on June 15th with a view to obtaining directions from your Honourable Court, as to their powers.

The great generosity displayed by citizens, both at home and abroad,

will place the Committee in a position to meet every reasonable and just demand, on a more generous scale than heretofore attempted.

It may be that the Committee's powers do not permit of the diversion of any moneys subscribed for the relief of the sufferers from the Sealing Disasters of 1914, but there are many contributors in St. John's, and there is good reason to believe, elsewhere, who desire that the benefit of the Funds subscribed may be extended to those families of our countrymen who have sustained similar losses of life at sea.

The Committee, therefore, desire to ask your Lordships:

1. Whether it is within the power of individual donors to the Fund, to direct that their gifts or a portion thereof may be utilized for Marine Disasters other than those especially under consideration.

2. Whether the interest on the moneys subscribed, which at 4 per cent. compounded quarterly, will be a considerable amount for some years to come, may be used for the Permanent Disasters Fund.

3. Grants to young widows are for five years. Should they marry again these grants terminate. Similar lapses may occur through excessive mortality. It is suggested that these lapsed balances be transferred to the Permanent Fund, subject to the permission of your Honourable Court. This permission is respectfully asked.

The following is an extract from a letter dated June 8th and directed to Hon. John Harris, Chairman of the Committee, by His Excellency Sir Walter Davidson, who was in close contact with many of the large givers in the Old Country. His Excellency says:

"I would suggest for the consideration of your Committee that, if it

should be possible to spare some portion of the large sums now in your hands for the immediate needs of the sufferers from this calamity, it would be wise to form a Fund in aid of those who are left destitute through the toll levied on our seamen and fishermen by the inexorable sea."

The Committee is authorized by Mayor Ellis to say, that when in New York, Boston and Montreal in connection with the Relief Fund, the hope was generally expressed that a sufficient sum would be raised to enable the Committee in charge to devote some portion of it to a Permanent Fund for the relief of the families of the Newfoundland Sailors and Fishermen lost at sea.

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Marine Disasters Fund of 1914.

I have the honour to be,

Your Lordships' obedient servant,

J. ALEX. ROBINSON,

Hon. Secretary.

To the foregoing a reply was received from their Lordships, saying that the matter could only be effectively dealt with by special legislation.

In view of this reply the Committee solicited the co-operation of some legal gentlemen, Messrs. Conroy, Blackwood and Warren, who kindly promised to prepare such legislation as may be necessary, in accordance with the resolution adopted at the citizens' meeting in the Court House on April 7th. The present bill is the result of their recommendations.

I would suppose that the gentlemen of this committee would be reappointed, and I have no doubt that they with the experience they have thus far had will know the most deserving cases which come before them, and thus be able to give the necessary relief. As the Fund will be

founded on charity it is to be hoped that it will increase as the years go by.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker: Regarding this bill I think that there can be no two opinions about the desirability of establishing such a Fund for the purpose of collecting the contributions of the people for the purpose outlined in the bill; and of course the discussion here will at most only be upon the wording of the bill. Some circumstances in connection with the changing of some of the moneys of this Fund to a permanent one will have to be discussed here, and this House will be called upon to justify the same. Then again the amount to distribute will vary from time to time, such as when a widow marries again; the children will still be depending upon this fund. The question to be settled is, if the beneficiaries should get greater allowances when the number of dependents has become lessened. This matter will have to be taken hold of by the Committee.

Under this Bill, of course, without special legislation, probably the Committee will have no such power, but as to how far the doctrine of *cy-pres* should be applied is a matter which would require to be very carefully considered and thought out. Then there are other questions of a similar kind. For instance, where persons have given or may give in the future for some definite reason, or for some particular accident that they may desire to assist, I think that these funds ought to be earmarked and not put into the general fund of the Permanent Committee. On the other hand, the existence of this Committee will be an inducement to people who wish to give legacies to this object, or otherwise put into effect their charitable intentions in relation to people who suffer from disasters of this kind. We discussed

this matter at some length when the Bill was before the House in 1913 providing for the payment of \$100 to the dependents of those lost at sea. The nature of the avocation in which our people is engaged is surrounded by dangers, and it is only right that we should have some such safeguard or assurance as is provided by a permanent fund against accidents of this kind. As far as the details of the matter are concerned and as to how they can be cared for in the bill will be discussed in Committee, but the idea of establishing a Permanent Fund is one which will be acceptable to all parties who desire to relieve the distress of those who suffer from accidents arising from the sea.

The Bill having been read a second time, was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

PATRIOTIC ASSOCIATION BILL.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Newfoundland Patriotic Association.

PACKING CO. RESOLUTIONS.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions confirming an agreement between the Government of the Colony and The Newfoundland American Packing Company, in relation to the establishment of Cold Storage and other matters in connection with the Fisheries of Newfoundland.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, May 10th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 10th, 1915.

The House met at three of the

clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Commission on Fishery matters.

PETITIONS.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present some petitions from the inhabitants of Green Bay about timber reserves. I would ask that these be referred to the Department of Agriculture and Mines for their consideration.

MR. STONE—I beg leave, Sir, to present a petition from Hillview people on the subject of Prohibition. The petition is largely signed by the people of this place including Rev. Cater Winsor. I ask that this be referred to the Colonial Secretary's department.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Clarke's Beach and Barenced on the same subject. I need make no remarks in this connection, as the subject has already been fully discussed here.

MR. HALFYARD—I beg leave, Sir, to present a petition from the inhabitants of Victoria and Rogers' Coves, Fogo, asking for the sum of \$150 to repair a bridge destroyed by fire in the year 1912. Great inconvenience is caused by its not being there, and I trust the Government will take this matter into consideration as soon as they can.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Kent gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that the Labrador Pulp and Lumber Co. and other lumber companies be heard in pursuance of their petitions to that effect, at the Bar of the House.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question.

QUESTIONS.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House copies of returns of expenditures of all monies allocated for the construction of public wharf at Point Leamington. These allocations were made under different headings, some of which were as follows:—South West Arm, New Bay; Point Leamington, New Bay; Chairman Road Board, etc., but were all for the same wharf.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns for amounts allocated to Capt. Darius Blandford, in the years 1913-1914.

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 5 George X, Sess. 1, Cap. XI, entitled 'An Act to increase the Revenue by the Imposition of certain Duties on the Estates of Deceased Persons'" without amendment.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

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

PRODUCTS CORPORATION RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of

the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I take the opportunity of replying to some remarks made by the Premier a week ago, when, through indisposition, I was unable to answer; and at the same time to make some comment upon the amended resolutions before the chair.

Before doing so, I wish to refer to certain bad motives which have been attributed to me in connection with my opposition to these resolutions by certain "low fellows of the baser sort" outside this House. I am not in the habit of explaining my conduct I prefer to let time explain it for me; but I think I may be excused for referring very briefly to two insinuations which have been made, namely, that I have been moved in my opposition (a) by hatred of the Reid Newfoundland Company and (b) by the money of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., which has retained me.

Now, Str, I want to emphatically deny that either of these has played any part in my opposition. I have given no evidence at any time of any hatred of the Reid Newfoundland Company, and I deny the existence of it on my part. To a large extent I hold myself responsible for that Company, although it was incorporated by my successors in office, because I feel that, fathering the contract of 1898, I am to some extent the creator of the enterprise which goes under the name of the Reid Newfoundland Co. Therefore there is no person outside of the Company itself that could have a greater desire for its success than I have, because its success in carrying out its great enterprises will reflect

credit upon me, and justify the boast which I made at the time the Contract was passed and which was quoted by the Premier a few days ago. Certainly, I have never allowed my personal relationships with that Company to affect my conduct in this House, whether at the time when I was solicitor for the Company, or since my return to this Colony; and I challenge anybody to point to anything in my conduct at any time or anywhere which gives any support whatever to that insinuation, which must have found root in the heart of somebody who felt himself animated by motives of that kind, or capable of them, and attributed his own bad heart to me.

With regard to the Harmsworth Company, I may frankly say that I have, since I came to the Colony, been in receipt of an annual retainer from that Company, which retainer does not increase or decrease because of anything which I do in this House. The legal work of the Company is done by Mr. Wood, K.C., who is not a politician and who represents the Company in this connection. The matter was incidentally mentioned to me, but after I had taken my stand here. I think I may say that the Harmsworth Company are not opposing this Bill as a whole. Their opposition to it is entirely in so far as it might affect their interests; and as the section referring to the East Coast has been stricken from the Bill, any ground which they might have had for opposing it has been very largely removed; but this does not affect my opposition.

Reference was made the other day to the fact that in 1905, when the Harmsworth Contract was going through the House, I moved 22 amendments to it. Probably it will throw

some light upon this unfair charge of interested motives actuating me in this House if I say that at the time I fought so strenuously in the House against the Harmsworth contract, I was solicitor for the Reid Newfoundland Company, which was selling a very large amount of property to the Harmsworth Company, very much favored the contract, and very much resented my opposition in the House; but I felt that in this House I represented the people and not the Company, and I took my stand here in opposition to the personal interests of the people by whom I was employed, as I think every member is bound to do, and I hope always to be able to do.

Now the Premier, with malice aforethought, I think, dragged the Railway Contract of '98 into his discussion the other night, because many of the members on this side of the House have all along disagreed with the views which I take upon that contract. I am not now going to deal with the remarks which he made concerning it except in so far as they apply to this matter, because I do not think it proper that anything should turn our attention from the subject before the Chair. At another time I will justify anything which I did in connection with the contract of '98, and in the meantime I do not intend to throw my hat into the ring merely to oblige gentlemen on the other side of the House.

There were two or three remarks, however, which the Premier made by way of argument based upon that contract which he thought justified what has been done in the contract now before us, and these I propose to deal with briefly. In the first place, upon the question of freedom from taxation, which it is proposed to ex-

tend to this new company, he pointed out that freedom from taxation on the railway, the telegraphs and the dry dock, were provided for in the Contract of '98, and he said that that formed a good precedent for this. But if any person will think for a moment he will discover that it is no precedent whatever. To exempt the railway from taxation for the fifty years during which the Reid Company undertook to operate it was not giving anything to the Reids, because if it had been liable to taxation presumably they would have required a greater price for the operation. That freedom from taxation was as much one of the considerations paid them for operating the railway as the land which we gave them. To have left the railway subject to taxation would only have increased the price which we had to pay, and consequently we gave them nothing when we exempted them from taxation. With regard to the telegraphs which they were to operate for thirty years and the dry dock which they purchased from us, the same remarks hold good. To have left the telegraphs liable to taxation would have created the necessity perhaps of a subsidy from us to them. It would simply be taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another; and the same is true of the dry dock. The question will immediately clear itself up if you remember that in the case of the Reid Newfoundland Co. we were direct vendors to them, and they were purchasers from us, or contractors with us, and any freedom which we gave on the one side had compensation upon the other. But we are now dealing with a Company which in the main is not going to get its property from us, it is not purchasing from us, and we are getting nothing from it in the way of consideration; therefore, in dealing

with them, we are entitled to act as we would act with any outside party who came in and proposed to carry on business in this country. The position is entirely different from the Reid Newfoundland Co's, which was directly contracting with us for the performance of certain public services. These men are proposing to carry on an enterprise for their own profit and advantage. None of it comes to us.

Another remark made by the Premier based upon the Reid Contract, can easily be disposed of. Referring to my observation that this contract should have been in the form of three contracts dealing with three different subjects, the Premier said in his exaggerated way that the Reid Contract dealt with thirty-three subjects.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No I did not say that.

MR. MORINE—That was the phrase you used.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No, I gave the number of subjects, and named them.

MR. MORINE—Well, my answer to that is simply this: In the first place I am not responsible for the contract of '98. It was drafted by the late Sir James Winter—a master of clear expression. I have never heard from 1898 down to the present moment, anybody expressing any doubt as to the meaning of any section of that contract. It is as clear as water. There were persons who doubted the expediency of making such a contract, but nobody ever expressed any doubt as to the meaning of the bargain, or as to any phrase or section of the Contract. And that is the difference between that contract and this one. The Reid contract dealt with a variety of subjects in a codified form. It first dealt with the railway

and it dealt with it completely; then with the telegraphs; then with the dry dock; then with the steam-boat service. For instance. We find in the portion of it dealing with the railway a provision that the railway should be free from taxation. We find another section under the telegraph part of it that the telegraphs should be free from taxation. It is all perfectly clear. There is no attempt by one clause to mix up and mystify and muddle the meaning of the Contract. Now, that is the difference between the two, and that is what I am striking at. I do not mean that we should have three separate contracts introduced at three different times, but that the contract should deal with the three main subjects in codified form, and in such a way that by looking at it one could see at once what was proposed. The best proof of the correctness of my objection has been the very proper conduct of the Government in coming here with wide amendments and narrow amendments. The wide amendment, striking out the East Coast, and the narrow amendments dealing with various public rights. Why was that? Because when the members supporting the Government heard the various arguments made by myself and others they saw the force of the objections which we were making as to the mixed and muddled condition of this contract.

Now, as we pass by, I would like to also refer to the statement (made outside the House, not in) that I made an attack upon the Law Clerk of the Legislature, Mr. Furlong. Everybody who heard me here knows that I made an attack upon the Government, not upon Mr. Furlong; that I spoke of him in the most complimentary manner; in fact, that I based my objection to the conduct of the Government up-

on the ground of his ability, and said that there ought to have been somebody else of equal ability, if he could be found, to advise the Government upon this matter. I am not in the habit of attacking anybody in a cowardly manner. On the other hand I am in the habit of saying exactly what I think, and I would just like to add here that I think that the fact that the Law Clerk of the Legislature was a Director of the contracting company should have influenced the Government to invite competent legal men to assist in the preparation of this document.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There has been no consultation since the contract was taken.

MR. MORINE—I did not say there was. I would not assume that there would be. Now, with reference to that remark of mine in connection with the failure of the Government to engage competent men to assist in the preparation of this document, I may say that I am not anxious to attack the Government. I only desire to be fair. I think I am right in saying that the original draft agreement was prepared by Mr. Furlong. The Premier said that it was before the Council on many occasions; that they discussed it over and over, and made various amendments to it; but I think I am correct when I say that he told us that they did not consult any legal men outside the Council, but attempted to put the original draft into shape by making amendments which occurred to them from the discussions of the Council. Now, my original objection, if not clearly expressed before, is this, that after all that was done, a lawyer or lawyers, should have been asked to take this ill-digested mass, and tick it into shape, so that it would express accurately, cleanly,

and properly what was the intention. That that was not done, and has not been done up to the present time, has been the cause of great delay in the House, and will be the cause of greater delay before this becomes law, because this is now a discreditable document—I am now speaking merely from the standpoint of draftsmanship and nothing else.

One other remark made by the Premier in connection with that original contract deserves attention, and that was with reference to my objection to the fact that so many men may be taken out of the fisheries. The Premier referred to my advocacy of the contract of '98 on the ground that it would give greater employment, and said I now argued the other way. Now, that sort of argument might deceive a casual observer, but it will not deceive anybody who will regard the conditions of the country as they were in 1897 and as they are today. At the end of 1897 we were in this position.—We had had the worst fishery the country had known for a great many years; there was more poverty and more unemployment than at any previous time; the railway had just been completed across the country, but it was not in operation; the Harmsworth Co. was not in operation, nor was it thought of at that time, and there was very little, if anything, being done at Bell Island; there was therefore every reason why something should be done to employ the people much more largely. But the position today is entirely different. Now, it is not that we have too many men in the fishery, but not enough. Now, men can get employment at Bell Island, or with the Harmsworth Co., or the Albert E. Reed Co., or they can cross easily to the adjoining province and get employment. We have good fish-

eries and good prices; and one of the strongest arguments advanced here by the Government on the opening day was that the prospects for the fishery the present year were better than ever before, and that the price of fish and the demand for it abroad would make it remunerative for our people to engage in the fisheries more largely than before. That is entirely the opposite condition of affairs to that which existed in '98, when the Reid Railway Contract was put through, and, therefore, the circumstances which justified my argument at that time do not justify a similar argument at the present time.

The Premier said that in connection with the Harmsworth deal I had moved some twenty odd amendments. I am very proud to say that I did. Every one of them was voted down in this House. I think there were only four of us on the Opposition side, and no regard was paid to any of the amendments which we proposed. The most of them, however, found their way into the contract when it came before the Legislative Council, and I was justified in the position which I took. The Government on this occasion has acted very much more wisely, and very much more creditably, than did the Government on that occasion, when they simply put themselves in deadly opposition to the amendments because they were moved from this side of the House. While the present Government, and I congratulate them upon it, have listened to some extent to the voice of reason. Now, when I look over those amendments I like to draw attention to the services which I performed for the country on that occasion. I find that one of them limited the property of the Company which was to be free to taxation, to mill-yards, mill facilities and water power around their

mills; that another one provided that it should be lawful for the people to pass and re-pass by stream over the demised premises. As the Company were taking the whole middle part of the country out of it, that was a very wise provision. Another one provided that the people in that country should have the right to travel over it in any way pending the construction of roads. Another one was that all the preservation of game should apply to the demised premises. Another one was to the effect that rights over certain water-powers on the Exploits River should not be exercised after four years; and another one looked to the right of persons to enter on the demised premises for the purpose of carrying on trade in the way of laws of the Colony with reference to shops and stores, so as to prevent the Company from obtaining a monopoly in this direction. Another one looked to the conditions under which the agreement would cease unless the Company commenced operations within a certain time. Any person who cares to look over the journal of 1905, I am satisfied will agree with the principle of every amendment that I moved on that occasion, and will admit that they were not moved for factious purposes.

Now, let us glance for a few moments at the remarks made by the Prime Minister (and I will take them up as they were mentioned casually). In reference to the objection that this contract gives freedom for ever from customs duty upon all machinery and material used in the operation, the Premier said that every machine means labour and that, therefore, it ought to be admitted free and there ought to be no objection to that provision. In the present condition of the country that may be true, but we have to look forward, we have to take a long, long look, we hope that this country will not always be in the

condition in which it is to-day in that respect. The Premier said that it by and by these things were manufactured here that the Company would buy them here because they could get them here as cheaply as anywhere else, but he forgot the middle state, which exists in this and every new country, when small industries are being started, and when without the imposition of a customs duty it would be impossible to protect them from outside competition. He forgot that it may be the privilege and duty of this Legislature by and by to protect industries which may grow up auxiliary to his big one, if it becomes a fact, for the manufacture of the things which this company will want, and we shall not be able to give that protection to any extent whatever, because under this contract this Company is free from custom duties for ever.

In my opinion, twenty years is quite enough to give them exemption from any form of taxation. The Legislature of that time may continue pursuing the policy to bring in their materials duty free, which we now pursue in allowing them. But they may not, and I claim the right for the Legislature of the future to do as they please in this matter. We have no right to take away from them this right, and to mortgage the future of this Colony. We have to leave to them the same liberty that we found when we came here. We have to leave to future Legislatures the privilege of protecting the future business of this Colony as they see fit. And the same remarks apply with equal force to municipal taxation. At present, with very few exceptions, we have no municipal taxation in this Colony, and we may not have it for years to come. When we do have it, it will bear equally upon all alike, and I see no reason why an industry of this kind, an industry that is destined to be a great one, an industry

that is to be a most profitable one. I do not see why it should even seek to be freed from the ordinary municipal taxation placed upon every other business and every other Company. What would the enterprise be worth if it cannot afford to pay a small amount of municipal taxation which everyone else pays? There is some excuse for freeing them for five, ten or twenty years, while they are building their dams and factories, and getting their business, and while they are contributing to the employment of labour in the country. Up to that time there may be some argument put forward for allowing them freedom from taxation. It may be said that it is desirable to get in here big investors from outside. Suppose we grant all that, why should we grant them freedom from all taxation for ever? If the legislature of the future sees that they are not doing well, they will see that it is not wise to impose taxation upon them and they will not impose it. But why should we take away from the legislature the right to do as it sees fit at that time? Why should we say to this company "You shall receive the paupers' dole" by relieving them from taxation, as you do the very poorest of the poor? They cannot be unfairly taxed, exceptionally. Their neighbours at the fishery are taxed. Men who have to work and struggle for a living will have to pay municipal taxation. Why should not this great company pay it? I lay this down as an unanswerable argument that if at the end of twenty years this company can not pay municipal taxation without injury to its business, then we do not want it at all, because it will not be worth having. To put it another way, if it is worth having, if it has anything like the future before it that has been painted here, then we ought not go beyond a reasonable period of years, mortgaging the future of the Colony and mortga-

ging the future Government of the Colony. There has been no argument advanced in favour of it. There is nothing before the House to show why it should be given. There is no advantage to us in granting it. Is the promoter to get anything he asks for simply because he asks? Because he will never stop asking as long as you are soft enough to give to him. But why should we in this House blindly without any argument before us, without everything before us, except the word of a hungry promoter (I am not speaking of the gentleman personally) why should we grant everything that he asks, mortgage the future of our country, bind the hands of future legislatures, all because the horse leech calls "More, more!" My answer to the Premier on the question of duties is that now the absence of duty may not do any harm. In the future it may not do any harm, but it may be that it will be the saving and the hope of manufacturers that may spring up in the country, and then these manufacturers ought to be protected by a customs duty.

Now another superficial remark of the Premier's, one to which the attention of the House ought to be drawn, is that we have been talking about our natural resources ad nauseam. We have been talking about our natural resources, but nothing ever came of them. We have been talking about our prospects in natural resources and we are still talking about them. That we want to change all that. Let me remind the House that the discovery of electricity is a matter as of yesterday, that the water powers of the continent have been running to waste from time immemorial. No one ever found any value in them until the discovery of electricity, and to-day outside of Newfoundland you would find it impossible to buy a water power at all. In the great province of Ontario, in which

this matter has been gone more fully into than anywhere else, you cannot get more than a lease of a water power for twenty years. They are buying back the water powers which Governments in the past have given away. And the fact that our water powers have been running away for such a time is no reason why we should make haste to throw away the few that we have left. On the contrary, it is our duty to find out exactly what we have and protect them in the public interest. How much would the city of St. John's give to-day if it could get back the water powers of Petty Harbor for the city? And yet at the time when we were passing it into the control of the Reid's, when we were giving them the right to develop the power there, not a voice was raised in the Legislature against it. No one dreamt of its supplying the city with light, heat and power. It was thought impossible to bring it ten or twelve miles. And we all gave it to them without a thought. What a splendid thing it would be for the city if that power were free today. We cannot get a water power near the city now and so we will never be free from this monopoly. As the years go on it may be possible to convey this power many times further than it was possible a few years ago. A day or two ago I heard the promoter say that it was not the intention of the Company to carry on the manufacture of their products at Hamilton Inlet, but just to create power at Hamilton, and transmit it to somewhere in the neighborhood of the Straits of Belle Isle, a distance of 250 miles, and the promoter says that they can do this with a loss of only 25 per cent. We could not have done anything like that ten years ago, and if in the next ten years we can make such an advance in electricity, what may the next ten

years bring forth? If anyone had told us some years ago when we were hearing of the experiments in wireless that we would have sent messages round the world in that way, messages right across the continent, we would have laughed at them, and yet I venture to predict that in not too many years we will be able to transmit electric power by wireless. It seemed almost absurd and impossible to us when we sat round this table some years ago and heard the tick of a machine that was worked by wireless, and we thought that there must have been some wires under the able somewhere connected with it. And here we are today actually stumbling over ourselves in an effort to throw away one of the best water powers in British North America, because we do not see what good we can get out of having it there, because of our own gross ignorance.

The Prime Minister referred to the Anglo monopoly as one of the things that this country had to deal with in the past. It was only a small thing compared with what we are giving now. But even in that case it was found in after years to be a burden. What happened as soon as the monopoly expired? Why we had numbers of companies here, and now we have a large number of cables landed in the Island that could have been landed years before if past governments had not granted a monopoly to the Anglo Company.

To the Premier's remarks regarding the East Coast area it is not necessary now to reply, because he intimated that this section had been dropped and it would only be wearying to go over the arguments that I used against that at the time.

In speaking of the contract, section by section he said that the first section gave nothing but the

water power on the Humber, and that that was already in the possession of other people. One of the things of which I complain is the absence of information under which we are laboring. It is a shame; it is indecent, that we should be dealing with this great area, and that the Department of Crown Lands is not able to give us anything like accurate information. Surely it is not unfair to say that before the Government went into this question they should have had a report from some competent person to lay before the legislature information showing that section 1 only gives what already is in the hands of someone else. Personally, I do not believe that it is true. What about the people that had lands at the bottom of Deer Lake who were given powers under the Act of 1912, but which act has since ceased to go into effect, because the money that was to have been spent has not been put up? Under the resolutions now before us this company may create a power and erect dams at the foot of the lake. Then what about the powers of the streams that may or may not flow into Grand Lake? Who knows the Humber drainage area accurately? Can anyone in the Department of Crown Lands tell me what is the Humber drainage area? Here we are thirty-six members of Parliament, asked to vote away great rights and powers over at least one-third of the island, and I do not believe that there is a single member of the Legislature that knows, any more than I know, what the Humber drainage area is, and what we are giving away, what the nature of it is and what prospects it has. I think I am right in saying that this is a serious matter, and that it is impossible for us to comprehend what we are doing without information as to just what we are giv-

ing away, and where the powers are extending to, and whom we are injuring. I say that it is discreditable to this Legislature.

There should be placed before us the most definite and accurate information as to whether we are not injuring others. There is no excuse for our blindly giving away anything without knowing exactly what it is we are giving. When the Premier says that section 1 gives nothing more than the water powers of the Humber, he errs inexcusably. He is giving, without the slightest justice to those that are there, the right of expropriation which goes with section 1. He gives the power to dam the lake and streams, the right to divert them, and make them flow where they never flowed before. He gives them the absolute right over all the water powers of Corner Brook area, and the Humber area, and by another section over the Hamilton Inlet, and so far as the Humber area is concerned, the right to destroy the property of other people. In giving them the power of expropriation you are violating a great principle of British Justice, the right of property. You are violating the sacredness of ownership. If there is one thing more than another upon which the prosperity of the Colonies has been based, it is upon that principle that an investment once made is a sacred thing. Every British Colony follows the Mother Country in preserving the rights of the investor. They all go on the principle that every dollar spent in a British Colony is as safe as if it were in a British Bank. That is the reason why from all the world over investments flow into the British Colonies.

From the Continent and from foreign countries money will go out more freely to a British Colony than to any other part of the world be-

cause they know the British Colonies follow the Mother Country in their regard of this first right. And yet what are we doing here. We step in and destroy every first right in the areas which we convey, and the mere fact that we provide for arbitration, is no justification whatever. You have no right to take my property that lies alongside of yours, merely because you pay me for it. I have a right to keep it. I have a right to do what I like with it. I have a right to lose it if I am foolish enough to do so. But the bottom of my right is that I can do as I like with what is my own. And when you step in and say to these people who were there before this Company, that they must be violently dispossessed, that their property may be confiscated, you are guilty of a crime. Because by the violence and force of this legislature you are taking away the rights in property of others against their will. You have no right to say to a man, 'I want your property for someone else.' You are using the power of the Legislature to steal, to steal away the right of a man to do as he likes with his own property, and let me tell you that you will rue the day that this bill becomes law, because once you pass this contract, you say to the outside world in no uncertain tone that it is unsafe to invest a dollar in Newfoundland.

Now I heard some language used in this matter that was inexcusable. The Premier referred to "land-grabbers," as if the people in possession of these lands justified that name. "Speculators," "land-grabbers," he called them. The land-grabbers are in this country, and they are the props and supporters of the Government. The land-grabbers grabbed the land and sold it, and the Government stood by and allowed them to go on in face of the advancing value of lands in this

country, they allowed these lands to be marketed in the wildest and most discreditable speculations, and the promoters in this country were men who went into the markets with their pockets full of recommendations from Government members. The grabbers are the men who sold the lands, not the men who put their solid cash into them. On a rough estimate there is in the neighborhood of \$3,000,000 invested in cold cash in the Humber area by men who are of high standing in the cities of the United States and Canada, men of substance, men of standing, men of influence. The Vendors realized \$300,000 from the Company that was to have operated at Deer Lake, and that Company has today spent nearly \$400,000 in cold cash in this country upon the strength of the laws of the colony. Are they land-grabbers? The land grabbers are in this city, and the same land-grabbers are supporting the Government in this iniquitous deal, and helping to take away the property that they sold. The Penn Company, which has a water power can be destroyed by this company, because this company can divert this stream, lower the water power and do as they like. This Penn Company is composed of reputable men in Philadelphia, men of responsibility, and all you give them is a one-sided arbitration. And it is not at all clear even then that they can get more than the value of the water power which is being destroyed.

What about the timber lands which are of no use, only in so far as they can be used with a water power close by? These men are forced by this resolution to scuttle out of the country, and take my words for it, when they get out they will curse the name of this country, that allowed them to be trapped by land-grabbers into making investments that were afterwards stolen from

them by the Legislature supported by men who sold them the lands. There is no man to-day, so far as I am aware, connected with the holding of lands in the Humber area to whom it is fair to apply the stigma of land grabber. I think the St. George's Company has \$350,000 invested in its lands in this area. They are responsible men, men who intended to carry on an industry. They are not land grabbers. The land grabbers were allowed to carry on the nefarious work under the very eye of a complacent government, and they have carried on that work in the name of Newfoundland all over the continent. And now when their work is done, when there are no more geese to be plucked, their victims are stigmatised and insulted. "They are land grabbers. Away with them! We are going to take away their rights and give them to a franchise grabber." That sort of argument ought not to be used.

I am not in a position at the present moment to say exactly how much money is invested in that area, but I know that it is at least \$3,000,000. And one of the indecencies of this whole transaction is that we do not know how much is invested there, who are the men that have invested it, and the fact that these men have not been notified of the bill. They ought to have been notified and they ought to have been permitted to come before this legislature and put up their argument, put forward any request they may have for their own protection.

It is an inexcusable thing that we should go on with this Bill without giving proper notice to those people and an opportunity to come here and protect themselves if they can. In all reason what can you expect if you do this? Wherever one of these men exists, in the United States, and there are some of them in pretty nearly every big city in the United States and

of Canada, the name of this Island will stink, if you allow this Products Corporation contract to go through in its present form—dispossessing these people of their rights without their permission and without giving them an opportunity to defend themselves.

There has never been a contract of this kind brought before the Legislature that we have not heard some claptrap appeal to Demos, some claptrap appeal to popular sentiment, some attempt to stampede the crowd through self-interest; and that manifested itself in the speech of the Premier when he talked about the number of men who would be employed—the great number upon the Labrador who would be able to maintain themselves, and then the hungry thousands who are coming back from Boston, Toronto, Montreal and Chicago, and everywhere else to which they have gone, in order that they might work at Bay of Islands. It is an argument that it is always easy to make, and I suppose it continues to be effective, although it has backed up every bad venture that was introduced into this country since our memory runs. It is an argument which you can make in support of a bad venture just as easy as you can in support of a good one. All you have got to do is to talk in millions, employ men in thousands, and rush the thing through—to be regretted afterwards. The number of promising things that were going to be done in this country during the past few years is greater than the number of members in this House, and they have failed so badly that it would be offensive even to enumerate them. How many men are coming back here from the cities of Canada or the United States to work in any industry that may be started in this country? The most of our people who are away are employed as mechanics; I know a great many of them in the city of Toronto, where they

are working as "handy men"—carpenters, or masons, or something of that sort; and every one of them gets more now than he would be liable to get in an industry of this sort. Probably the same is true of the people in Boston and Chicago and the other large American cities. The most of them, in any case, have been there long enough to get settled down, and they do not desire to return again.

They are not at all likely to come back here and go into the class of work which they could get from an industry of this kind, because this sort of industry will employ probably only two kinds of labor—the common laborer, and he will be the commonest of laborers, and then there will be a few specialists, trained men, who at the outset will be brought from abroad, and afterwards there will probably be young men of our own who grow up with the Company, such as we have to-day in the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company. There will be no place for the most of our people who are abroad; and for those for whom there is a place there will be no better wages than they are now getting in the places where they are. At present there is no wage scale in the Bill, and it is not proposed, I understand, to put one in. The price of labor in Bay of Islands will be precisely the price of labor in Sydney at the most; and there will be no reason whatever why a man at Sydney should come to Bay of Islands, much less why a man at Boston, or Toronto or Chicago should come back here.

The rate at Sydney is the rate at which they can hire foreign labor. A Newfoundlander going from here to-morrow to Sydney has to compete with the foreign elements coming from the continent of Europe, and the average price is all that is paid. That same foreigner can come to Bay of Islands and work there, so that the

average price at Bay of Islands will be based upon the average price at Sydney or any other mining locality. And I say here now to-day, that with fish at the price at which it now is, it is a mistake to the country at large, a mistake to the trade of the country, and a mistake to the fisherman, to take him out of the fisheries at the present time, where he is a specialist, and try to turn him into a day-laborer on an industry like this. The demand for fresh fish as a food will increase, and the price will increase? I am very glad to say, so that we can with confidence look into the future, and say that our fishermen will never be worse paid than they are at the present moment; and surely I am merely echoing the sentiment of this House when I repeat what I heard the Minister of Fisheries say across the floor of the House a few days ago, that the fisherman of this country is as well paid as any man of his kind in any part of the world. Therefore, I say that if you do create an industry at Bay of Islands, in the main it will employ foreign labor and in so far as it takes our men away from the fisheries it will do them no good; and consequently the most of this talk about the men who are to be employed here is claptrap. So far as the talk about employing men on the Labrador is concerned, that is even worse. The Premier spoke of this as though there were going to be an industry created at Hamilton Inlet, or somewhere else where all the 'Iviers' along the Labrador could get employment when they liked. Now, that is a pretty extensive coast, and to travel to wherever this industry may be will be a pretty difficult undertaking for the people on the Coast. The idea that a very great number of fishermen who are now resident on Labrador are going to work in this industry on Hamilton Inlet is a very fantastic notion. We understand that if

a water power is availed of at Hamilton Inlet, a wire is to bring the power to the Straits of Bell Isle, and that somewhere near the boundary line with Canada, one side or the other, the real industry is to be started. That is not likely to prove much of a boon to the people who live in Northern Labrador; and therefore the only object of talk of this kind must be to obscure our intellects to the real question which we have before us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, thus far with reference to the remarks made by the Premier. Now I want for a few moments to outline some of the reasons why I oppose this contract, even in its present form, and with this I shall be very brief indeed.

In the first place there are the provisions which I will gather together under the name of the Taxing Clauses, including customs duties. My objection to them has already been outlined.

It is that they ought to be limited to twenty years in every case, for the reasons which I have already given; and by and by when we come to deal with this, I shall move amendments in that direction.

Then I object altogether to the clauses in connection with expropriation in its present form, because they do not appear to me to meet the needs of the case. I shall presently refer to that at length.

Then there are a number of the existing clauses which require verbal alterations and sharper definition. I will be prepared to deal with those as we take up the different clauses in committee.

There are a number of new things which I think ought to be included, and I would just refer to them to indicate my line of thought. In the first place I think that a provision ought to be put into this contract to the effect that within a limited time the Gov-

ernment must be satisfied as regards the capital subscribed and paid up in this Company. At the present moment it is what I might call a figment of the imagination. It is a paper company with, I presume, three shares each of \$100, not paid up. It has no shareholders. It has no capital. I do not think it is right for the Government to be dealing with a company of that sort, and therefore we ought to provide that within a time to be fixed they shall have a certain subscribed and paid-up capital. That is necessary for this reason. You are providing here that within two years they shall "begin" work, and that they shall complete within five years, and during the whole of that time you are tying up these regions from everybody else; you are stopping development at once; not a dollar will be spent in the Humber region by anybody there after we pass this Act. The people who are there—The Penn Company at Junction Brook for instance—and who have money with which to proceed, will stop immediately—they have probably stopped now, because as long as that blanket hangs over them for five years it will be perfectly useless for anybody to start anything at all. Therefore I think that not more than twelve or eighteen months should be given the Company in which to raise a certain amount of capital in cash, and prove that they have it to the Government, and unless they are able to do that within that time, this whole agreement should become null and void without its being necessary to take any further step, and thus remove a wet blanket from the industries of this country.

Then, Sir, I think that this company ought to be made do what you provided in this House three years ago should be done by the Deer Lake Company. You stipulated that the Deer Lake Co. should put up \$250,000 as

security for the compensation of people whose property was injured. In view of the fact that this Company is going to be a very much bigger concern than the Deer Lake Co., and that many more people will be interfered with and injured, I think it would not be unfair that this Company should be asked to put up \$1,000,000, as a trust fund in the hands of the Government, as security for the claims of persons who may be injured by this Corporation. And I am presently going to move something to that effect.

Then, Sir, I do not think that the arbitration clause has been handled properly. You provide that one arbitrator should be named by each of the contesting parties, but you let the Department of Agriculture and Mines name the other. Now this Company is necessarily going to have a big influence, backed up as it is by the Reid Newfoundland Co. over any Government here, and to a large extent they will own the Department of Mines; and to allow that Department to name the umpire in these arbitrations is practically to confiscate the property of other people unfairly. I think, therefore, that the third arbitrator should be appointed by the Supreme Court Judges, and not the Government—and not by one Judge of the Supreme Court, but by the three judges,—so that there will be at least a fair deal between the people whose property is being taken and the people who are taking it.

There are a whole lot of amendments that require to be made along the lines of the Harmsworth contract concerning public rights, which are not protected at the present time by anything which I can find in these resolutions.

Now, I want to sum up very briefly why I object to the resolutions in

their present form. First, because there is not sufficient information before the Committee as to boundaries to justify it in adopting these resolutions. We don't know where the Corner Brook or Humber drainage area extend to, and we ought to know. Second, as to water power, we don't know. There is the widest possible scope and the greatest conceivable value at stake, and we know nothing. Third, as to the effect which these resolutions will have upon other people with vested rights we know nothing, and we have not sought to know anything. We are carelessly and shamefully proceeding with a measure which may affect other people without even knowing the names of those people or whereabouts of their property. Fourth, as to the value of the franchises which we are giving away we have not even an opinion by a competent person. We have no report from any Government Department or from the Government Engineer. We are proceeding in the sheerest of ignorance. Then, as to the value of the industry which we are invited to assist, what do we know except what a promoter has told us—one of a race that has become a pest, one of a class that as a rule is not believed. I repeat that all that we have before us today as to the value of this industry is upon the unsupported statement of a promoter, who has not a cent in this matter, and won't put a cent into it unless it pleases him; and upon that statement we are giving him franchises of great value in order that he may hawk them around to the investors of a continent. As to the Labrador scheme, why it is tacked on to this in the most casual manner, as though it were not worth ten cents. It is a mere attachment to the Humber area—a mere endeavour to get a Legislative franchise which can be held on to and made use of if it is of

any value and dropped if it is not; and this Legislature, without consideration of any conceivable kind, is running pell-mell, tumbling over itself, as it were, to give a right over that great power down on the Hamilton Inlet without even knowing whether these men are seriously going on or not. Why, it is only a few months ago since we had another gentleman here, a man of high standing, from Montreal, representing foreign capitalists, who had a proposition concerning that water power which might or might not have been of great advantage to this country; and there is no doubt but that we could have many applications for this power in a very short time if we held it to ourselves, instead of giving it away; and yet here we are, as I have said, tumbling over ourselves to give it away to a promoter who won't even tell us what he intends to do with it—who, in a manner which shames our common sense, tells us that he has not a cent in the proposition, that he does not know just what he is going to do, but asks us to give him this power in order that he may hawk it around to see what is in it. If it is worth anything to him it is worth something to the country. Why not keep it until we get something for it?

My next objection is that our manner of proceeding in connection with vested rights will destroy the credit of the country with investors abroad; that we are violating all British principles by not giving fair notice to investors who, whatever we may think and whatever their interests may be, have at least the right which we claim even a German submarine should give to one of our ships. We are proceeding with all the wanton carelessness of rights that the Germans are showing in sinking our vessels without notice, with no opportunity to defend

themselves; and our proceeding cannot fail to bring discredit on the whole colony.

We are granting franchises that will crush out all projected industries, and we are handing over the west coast of this country and the Labrador, as far as Hamilton Inlet is concerned, to speculators, bound hand and foot for years to come. I object to the scheme of these resolutions—not to the industry but to the scheme, because it is badly conceived, badly framed, and without safeguards. The resolutions in every line bear proof of the carelessness with which the scheme has been worked up. I object to it because it creates a monopoly of the whole manufacturing possibilities of one quarter of the country. The whole west coast is tied up and handed over to the Reids and their associate industries by this Bill. All the industries over there will be handed over to once concern, which I am not now attacking, because it is the concern which it is, but because it is not desirable that its monopoly should be greater than it is. I object to the freedom from taxation which you are proposing to give, first, because it is unfair to the competitors who are not also made free; second, because it interferes with future local development; third because it unconstitutionally interferes with our successors; fourth, because it is unnecessary to any growing enterprise; fifth, because it is an unfair discrimination in favor of this enterprise if it is successful and sixth, because it is a useless discrimination if it is not successful. The men who claim to be establishing a great industry are asking to be relieved from burdens which are common to all. The promoter says that this particular industry in the United States has had its capital increased by watering it twenty times. From one million it has grown to twenty millions, not by increase of cash paid

by subscribers, but by accumulating the profits they have paid their shareholders 10 per cent and increased their capital twenty times over; until to day the shareholders in the United States in this industry, he says, who put a million dollars into the concern, are drawing 10 per cent per year on twenty millions. He says that a similar industry in Canada is paying even better than is the one in the United States and that this industry is expected to pay better than either of them. They never expect to pay more than 10 per cent on the watered stock. And the man who says that in public here in St. John's is the promoter of a company which is down upon its knees asking us to give them freedom for ever from every form of taxation. While they make millions out of the natural resources of this country, the people of the country will have to pay taxation which will be imposed upon them to keep up the public services consequent upon this very industry. A more fantastic, a more absurd, a more unbelievable proposition was never put before a sober minded Legislature. If they need this freedom from taxation they are paupers and ought not to be dealt with by the country at all; if they are going to make a great industry, they ought not need it.

We are rushing on like prodigals giving away everything we have—taking the substance which the Creator has given us and throwing it at the feet of these men.

Sir, to content myself with merely criticising has never been my attitude in this House. I have always desired to be constructive, and I can see the basis of an industry which we might help to create in this country, in the Humber area, to which I could give my support. I believe that there are great natural advantages there for an industry of this kind which are enough in themselves, and more than

enough, to give. We can give them the power, the waterside facilities, and the market. They have to go to Cape Breton for their coal, but they could not get a water power there; they have to go to Spain for their pyrites, and to the United States for their phosphate, but they could get neither water power nor coal in either of these places. They can bring their coal and their pyrites, and their phosphate to Bay of Islands at the cheapest conceivable rate, and with the power and the limestone that we can give them, without any of the extraordinary privileges which is contained in this Bill, they could have a franchise which would be big enough for any reputable company, and all that we ought to give. For that purpose I would be prepared to support resolutions to assemble, if I may use the term, all the water powers which the Humber is capable of, into one great power, but I should want first that the area over which the Company would have control should be strictly, and, if I may use the word, satisfactorily, defined; I should want the capital subscribed partially and paid up in part, so that we might know that we were dealing with a company worth dealing with; I should want to see that the vested rights of other persons were purchased by private arrangements with those persons, if possible, within a limited time; and I would be prepared to go even further and make some arrangement whereby vested rights which could not be purchased within a reasonable time should be arbitrated upon fairly; then I should like to see the fourth great principle, that after they had created their water power there should be adequate provision for the use of all surplus power by other people and for public purposes. There is no provision of this kind whatever in this contract in relation to the Humber area, although it finds a place

there with regard to the Hamilton River. There ought to be a provision in this contract that the city of Bay of Islands, or whatever it may be called, and all the industries which may grow up there, shall have the right to acquire any surplus power which this Company may have from its work at a price to be fixed by a fair board or commission. If those fundamental things were provided for, I, for one, would give my assistance to put a fair contract through this House.

I would give the Company unlimited water powers; I would give them freedom from customs duties and all forms of taxation for twenty years; I would provide for a fair arbitration of all rights not acquired within a limited time by private sale; I would give them until the 1st January, 1917, to get their capital subscribed and the necessary portion of it paid up; and then I would provide, what you have not provided for in this bill—a lapse of that water power to this Colony in case the Company did not carry on its industries after it had started. All that you are providing for here is that they shall begin in two years and finish the expenditure of five millions in five years, and then they get a 99-year lease, renewable for ever. They can stop their industries when they please, sit down on their benches, and say to you: If you want the water power of the Humber for any other purpose, you will have to pay for it through the nose. You are putting this company in the position, if they fail by and by to carry on their industry through some new fertilizer being discovered or something of that sort, to hold up the water power of the Humber River and the development of the whole West Coast for ever, or until you buy them out, because you have got no clause providing for a lapse. If you look at what is happening in Ontario, what do you find there? In every case provision

is made in their contracts that if the contracting Company ceases to operate satisfactorily within a given time, the property lapses to the Crown, and not only that, but all the permanent improvement which may be made in waterways also lapse, without payment, because they have become part and parcel of the waterways. The locks and the dams and all the other things that have created the power, lapse to the Crown in that country, without compensation, because the Company has had its time, and if it fails it is not permitted to saddle the country either with non-development, non-continuance of its work, or with a big bill to buy them out. If there are any buildings or things of that sort which can be used, they are bought by the Government at a fair price. Such a clause as that ought to be the basis of any sensible scheme.

Now, I am satisfied that a little reflection will show us that some such scheme as I have outlined is possible, and is the proper one, and all that any reasonable man ought to ask. If Mr. Wilson's carbide industry is one-half as great as he says it is, all the capital that he needs can be got. If we give him any more than I have outlined, we are wasting the valuable assets of this country, we are simply throwing pearls before these people. We will be going very far if we give them all the franchises which I have outlined, and even some of these would only be justifiable because of the importance of unifying the powers of that coast and creating one power; otherwise one could not justify even as much as I have suggested here; but there can be no justification whatever for this contract as we have it before us to-day.

I can realize and sympathize with the desire of the Government to promote the prosperity of the country. The Premier has always been an op-

timist in this matter, and he has always, I believe, been sincere in the delusions under which he has laboured. I don't believe that the Premier ever came down in this House and purposely promoted anything which was fraudulent, but he has promoted some things that were so indefensible that if it were not for my abundant charity I would not say that, because the things themselves have failed by their own weight. And with this optimistic frame of mind which is so natural to him, and which to such a large extent has helped him to his success as a politician—because he has had the power to make other people dream the rosy dreams of his own overnight experience—he has fallen once more into the error of giving an ear to these propositions, which are ill-conceived, ill-digested, and indefensible in their present form; and nobody can probably feel it so keenly as he does when he thinks of it. The Government, probably for the first time in the history of the country, has had the courage of its own convictions in coming down here and accepting to a large extent the objections which were made upon this side of the House. Governments in the past have been too weak to listen to the voice of reason if it came from the other side. They have carried things through with what they thought was strength, but what was really only an exhibition of intellectual weakness. In this case I congratulate the Government upon having listened to the voice of protest, and in many respects agreeing to desirable amendments. Now, I want to ask them still further, for the love of the country which we all acclaim, and which, I think, we all desire to serve, to take time, think the matter over, defer it take some months, if you like, to properly consider every provision there is in it, and all the provisions that ought to be added to it; and even if

it is necessary to come back in a special session of the House to adopt a finished measure, I for one am prepared to come back and serve without pay at any time, for I was never more firmly convinced of anything than I am at the present time, that if we pass this Bill in its present shape we will be participants of a tragedy in the development of this country.

MT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman. I do not propose at this moment to occupy the time of the House at any great length, as I imagine that there are others who have not yet spoken who might care to participate in this debate. But there are two or three points which I should like to give expression to before going further, more particularly in reply to the hon. member who has just sat down. In the first place I should like to disabuse his mind in relation to what he has just said as regards any change of policy with reference to the contract since we have come in this House. Although I have no doubt it was his intention to compliment and congratulate the Government on doing what other governments have failed to do in the past, I do not think it would be fair for us to lay that unctious on our souls and accept that compliment he has so magnanimously expressed, because I wish to make clear, as I have on several former occasions essayed to do, that the amendments contained in this resolution are amendments merely to make absolutely certain that which was not uncertain. I do not admit I have not admitted, nor will I admit that any of the legal constructions placed by him upon that contract can be maintained, but the points having being raised, it is but right and proper that we as a Legislature should not allow any measure to go through this House, where any

possibility of doubt can arise as to this contract proving contrary to the interests of the Colony. This is the first point I wish to make clear, and I desire that it be thoroughly understood. There is nothing whatever to imply that any member on this side of the House has in any way weakened in the supporting of this contract. I have seen contracts go through this House and pass the Upper House and everyone knows as well as I do what happened to them when the Court took them into consideration. But it is impossible to draw up a document on the interpretation of which people can never disagree. Why the Privy Council, as I have said on former occasions, do nothing but set aside the judgments of the highest Courts of the Empire. Look up any of the Privy Council reports and you find them setting aside the highest judgments of the land. None of us claim to be Solomons. Every statute that comes before this House is capable of different interpretations. Where ambiguity has arisen we have done what we could to eradicate it, acting on your suggestion. That is all you have done to change this bill; but when you say that people, who have interests in that area of the Humber drainage, are having their property confiscated, taken away fraudulently from them, you criticize your own interpretation. The main point my hon friend makes is the alleged "piracy" he says it is "worse than the Germans," that we are taking away the property of private people exactly as the Germans are doing without so much as giving notice" and so on. It sounds very well but it is not convincing to intelligent men who see how matters really stand. There has been no attempt to confiscate. The same criticism was offered when the Harmsworth Bill was being passed.

"Every acre of land will be taken by these Harmsworths" said the Opposition. But as a matter of fact there has not been one single arbitration, and this is a similar proposition in the Kapoia region. You are giving no rights away under this Contract, and even where there is damage, there a remedy is provided. My learned friend who has just sat down referred to the form of arbitration in reference to these rights provided it were in the Supreme Court, because he believed that this Company might be so large and influential that it would not only own the Crown Lands but would largely prejudice in its favour every Government in the future. This is the reason then, so he said, that we should depart from all precedent and go into the Supreme Court as a tribunal to settle every arbitration that arises in relation to a bit of land in the Humber River. We have all the highest regard and respect for the Supreme Court and we know it would be difficult to find a better tribunal or fairer or more impartial men than the Supreme Court, but in this case we are creating a reasonable and fair tribunal for every interest. What is the Court or tribunal provided here in this resolution. One arbitrator is appointed by the Agriculture and Mines Department, or the Minister or someone under him, the party owning the land appoints an Arbitrator and the Company appoints an arbitrator. We do not want the same Arbitrators, for every case that arises there is a different arbitration. As I said before it is practically two against one, because you have the Company coming in here as strangers, one man is appointed by the owner of the property the other by a public official of the Company, and I submit that this appointment from that source is just as likely to be an honest appointment

and an impartial appointment as any arbitrator that can be found even in the Supreme Court. I do not like this way of reflecting upon people that somewhat characterizes the hon. member that just sat down. It seems to imply that everyone is purchasable, that any man can be bought. Because a Company is large it does not mean that it can buy everyone outside its door. The history of the Colony as regards its public departments gives no possible grounds for such a suggestion. Why my hon. friend even proposes a contract of his own here this evening and he lays down four or five principles which he evolves from what we have before us to-night. It is merely an attempt to make people believe that there is something different in what he now proposes, when I think everyone will readily perceive that there is a very great similarity between what he proposes and what actually is before us.

He first refers to the "locking up" of all the water powers in Bay of Islands. But there is no one water power there that can of itself be sufficiently developed. It is true that the figures are estimates from the other side, but they are the only figures that we have. I have done what I could to check the estimate, and I find that it would cost about \$7,000,000 to develop 150,000 horsepower. However, there is sufficient data before us upon which to work. My hon. friend would propose another contract under freer conditions, which is that if there be any surplus power, that it will be sold to the public. That is very likely what is going to happen, even if you never put in that clause, if there is any surplus. That clause was put into the Hamilton River contract, because there will certainly be a very large surplus; but in the case of Bay of Islands, it is an entirely different

proposition, because all the horsepower generated there will probably be required. If they should have more power than is necessary there, they are not going to be like the dog in the manger. It is only reasonable that if there is a surplus there to sell, they will sell it to other people and increase their revenues, so long as the purchasers were not competitors in business.

Then my learned friend pointed out that there was nothing in the contract that provided, in the event of operations not being continued, for the water power's coming back to the people. In other words: if, after carrying on operations for eight, ten or twenty years as the case may be, another discovery is made which will do away with the manufacture of this fertilizer, then the water power does not come back to us. Well, do their millions which are invested in the dams, power houses, machinery, etc., come back to them? Suppose that after ten years, some new discovery is made, what is going to happen? They will sell all that outfit to some other industry. Suppose that Lord Northcliffe's property should cease to be of any value, what is he going to do without the water power? Is he going to sell it? What value is it going to be to him to hug it to his breast, if the paper business does not pay him? He will sell it if he can get any one to sell it to. Then if he cannot get anyone to sell it to, the thing cannot be valuable. It is not worth our getting it back. But if \$10,000,000 is spent on it, it must be worth a great deal, and, being no use to them will come back to us in the form of another industry in another way. My learned friend asked the question why we were not making a provision suggested in his new contract by which these people would be called upon to put a certain capital within a certain

time. But these restrictions throttle an industry and make it harder to borrow a dollar. These people have to go on the market and get money. They say, "We have got certain rights in relation to the creation of a great industry. You have great water powers and we want them. The combination of the two ought to produce a large industry in the country. Then we will go to London and borrow money. But if they are so bound up with restrictions, they will not be able to borrow a dollar. Everyone has had that experience in small enterprises as well as in large ones. We all remember many contracts which have been passed here in this House. I am not the only one that has sometimes taken a rosy view of them. What about Whiteway, Peter Tessier, Shea, R. J. Kent and others? They were optimistic about such contracts in their day; but when the contractors went to the money markets they failed to get money, and the contracts fell through. We must try again; we cannot give the thing up for ever.

Then my learned friend charged me—I hope not intentionally—with making appeals to the sympathy of the people outside. I stated what I thought a reasonable outcome of such an industry in this country. I did not speak of those people who appeared before this House, by petition or otherwise, and who have timber interests in that region, as land grabbers. I said there never was a movement to establish an industry here yet when we were not falling over land grabbers, and we must do what we can to help along the promoters. But I never for a moment referred to these land owners as a class, as "grabbers." It was not with a view of putting the position unfairly before the House that I referred to the people in that way. I never suggested, as my hon. friend says I did, that there were any

persons coming back from Toronto, Boston or Montreal to obtain employment in this industry. When I was asked who were going to come home, I said, some of those who have left the fishery and gone abroad. We can get 1,000 men from Labrador. Everyone that knows the Labrador conditions, knows the conditions of the people there. There are 4,000 people on a coast of a thousand miles. Probably one out of every family will be glad to get work with the new Company. The great thing is that labour will be given to our people. Fancy what it is to be buried down there in Labrador during eight months of the year under semi-Arctic conditions. That is why I suggested that men could be had from Labrador, because they would be only too glad to find something to do. And then there are thousands of our men working in the mines in Nova Scotia, living in shacks. These people would be only too willing to come home, and live. There are two or three thousand people there who would be glad to come back. Then take the men who go away pogie-fishing. You can bring them home, and, better still, you can find employment for thousands of them in Newfoundland, giving them a chance to work the whole year round. These are the places where we can get 5,000 men.

Then my learned friend, speaking about this Company, said that the Company were going out to devour every bit of land, mineral and timber, in that part of the country. What are the facts? If you read the section you will see that in the first place they are limited to a certain class of land for certain purposes. They cannot take a man's property and destroy it forever. The section we have here is a verbatim copy of that in the Harmsworth contract. First, they are given the right to acquire ungranted Crown Lands.

"9.—If at any time or times during the said term the Company shall be desirous of acquiring lands incident to flowage rights or rights of way for telegraphs, telephones, power transmission lines, railways, tramways, roads, or site for mills, works, factories, warehouses, or for wharves, piers or docks, or other shipping facilities in connection with the Company's operations for the purpose aforesaid and within a distance of fifty miles therefrom up to and not exceeding in the whole ten thousand acres, on lands belonging to and in the possession of the Crown, the Governor-in-Council shall, upon the request in writing of the Company, convey such lands to the Company at the price of thirty cents per acre."

That is only what any person can get today, and at the same price. Then if they want any other lands, they have to pay compensation.

The section reads:

"10.—If the Company shall be at any time or times desirous of acquiring lands incident to flowage rights, or rights of way for telegraphs, telephones, power transmission lines, railways, tramways, or roads or sites for mills works, factories, warehouses, or for wharves, piers, docks, or other shipping facilities not belonging to or not in possession of the Crown and in connection with the Company's operations for the purposes aforesaid and within fifty miles therefrom, and shall be unable to agree with the owners or occupiers of such lands as to the purchase money or compensation to be paid therefor, the Company with the consent of the Governor-in-Council may enter and take such lands and the purchase money or other compensation to be paid by the Company to the owners or occupiers of such lands shall be settled by ar-

bitration in manner provided by Section 55 of the Crown Lands Act. And upon payment to the owners or occupiers aforesaid of the amount awarded in such arbitration the said lands shall become and be the absolute indefeasible property of the Company.

This is a final section and applies to large and small claims alike. I do not admit that the construction of dams around the Humber will cause any destruction of property.

MR. MORINE—What do you know about the place anyway. You have but reports.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Pardon me. I went into this matter 3 or 4 years ago when you remember we had this very same question before the legislature in relation to the Deer Lake Company. I went into the matter fully with Mr. Howley, Mr. Bailey also Mr. Balfour and others, who knew that country well. Then as to Grand Lake, I think it will be found that no proposal ever contemplated raising Deer Lake to a level much greater than its ordinary flood level. Then the heights of the lakes must be considered,— the summer height, the spring height and the abnormal height.

I admit the possibility under the Bill, that certain lands may be submerged, but it is the interest of the Company to submerge as little as possible, because they have to pay for every acre they use not granted them in this Bill. They have to pay for it. If we are going to allow any minor interests to stand in the way of a large interest like this, then there is no hope that any industry will ever be started in the country, because we will be unable to make any contract with them. Take the case of the Penn Company.

MR. MORINE.—Suppose their water powers are spoiled by backing up

water, do they get compensation for the loss of value in timber land?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—They get compensation according to this very section.

MR. MORINE.—Not under any section of this Act.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman: I do not hope that as Mr. Morine has taken his views upon this section, I will be able to dissuade him from his contention. He can argue the section and put any interpretation upon it, but none of his interpretations will be agreed to by this House. My learned friend has said we were proceeding in bad faith towards investors outside. I do not think so. We have provided in the Act for every contingency as regards damage. Every possible right is safeguarded. All possible damages can be fully covered by arbitration. It is my opinion that we have grasped this chance just in time. We have been waiting years and years for an opportunity, and up to this year nothing has been or was likely to be done. We all know that this part of our territory has never been made valuable. Attempts have been made, but they have been unsuccessful. Timber companies have tried, but failed to accomplish anything. Here is a company saying it is prepared to spend \$10,000,000 to found an industry. They ask us for 5 years to spend this \$10,000,000. Are we going to be ruined by waiting five years more after all the years and years that have passed with nothing accomplished? The railway was built through there in 1897, and nothing has been done since; but if that country was opened up, development would rapidly take place, as this territory is but a few miles from the sea. Deer Lake is near the Humber River, and as yet no industry ever started there; and I make bold and say that if the contract does not be-

come law, you will probably have to wait another ten or twenty years before you can do anything there. Now, as to the Deer Lake Company, they come before this House and we offered them excellent terms. We gave them power to raise Deer Lake and Grand Lake. We gave them certain conditions as to compensation for damage through dams. This Company accepted these, tried to raise money, and failed. It was only last year that they notified the Government in writing that they abandoned their claim under that Act.

DR. LLOYD.—Can you table that?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Certainly. It is in the form of a letter from Mr. Howley, K. C., their Solicitor.

MR. KENT.—Is there any further correspondence?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I do not think there is. If so, however, I will table it.

As I have said before, Mr. Chairman, it is not without the fullest consideration that this contract has been entered into. My hon. friend on the other side of the House complains that there is no information. All the information as to the disposal of the Government has been given. It is quite true that we have not a full surveyor's report of the whole coast of Labrador, etc., but that would require a very large expenditure of time and money and the employment of scientific men before we could have it to table. They have merely what they know from general knowledge and what can have been obtained from the study of other countries. I think a great mistake is being made in comparing the value of our water powers with that of those in other larger places. The water-power terms of Toronto can be quoted here, but that is no means of estimating ours. The market is different, and the conditions

there vary a great deal from our conditions here. I think that is where the mistake comes in. I think, moreover, that we are getting the very largest consideration that can be obtained under the circumstances. We are getting an expenditure of \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000 within the next five years, and what better proof could be given of the bona fides of the Company.

DR. LLOYD—Has the Government Engineer been called upon to make a report on the estimated water-powers transferred in this agreement?

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman: I think that the question most to be regarded is the subject that the Prime Minister has just spoken about—the absence of information when such an important subject as this is under consideration. The larger the contract, the more necessary it is to have fullest information. We have really before the House no information, and to gauge from what the Prime Minister has just told us we are left to conjecture. This is a most unsatisfactory condition in view of the importance of the subject. The desire of all, and my own desire is, to see this industry established here, and I wish it may be a success, but I am not prepared to sacrifice the interests of the people of the country without being sure of my ground. I want to see where we are going, what privileges we are granting and what concessions, and, lastly, what return the country is going to get. Now, Sir, the time has come to deal with the development of our water-powers. In this case our main water shed is affected, and it is of the utmost importance that a strict survey and report on all the lands under consideration be made and referred to this House. We want good, reliable and absolutely independent reports from an employee of the Government. The answer to this is that

expensive engineers would have to make a lengthy investigation. We ought to have this, no matter what the cost.

I think, Sir, that we, as the trustees of the people, must approach this subject from that point of view, and as has already been pointed out, we ought not to fool with a vast subject of this kind. Let us stop to consider what this means. It does not mean only the granting of the water powers. It does not mean only the granting of the rights to dam up the waters in these areas; but, Sir, we must remember there are depending interests not directly concerned. Take the agricultural districts from which, by this contract, waters may be removed; what is going to be their future? This is a matter which I think should have been enquired into. We know that some of our finest areas depend upon this water supply. Why should this be disturbed. We may ignorantly be doing untold damage by passing anything without ample information before us.

It being now half-past six, the Chairman left the Chair till 8 o'clock.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman. Just before recess I was talking about the necessity of an intelligent appreciation of the effect of what we are doing. I think I pointed out that one of the essential necessities for such intelligent appreciation is that we should have information. I also pointed out that we have not got the information that would enable us to form an intelligent opinion of the contract that is now before the House; and I pointed out that there are other natural resources, the foundation of any future progress or development that this country may make, which may be very materially affected by an unregulated giving away, or abandoning control over, the large water areas or water sheds of the country. I tried to

point out the independence of many natural resources, one upon another, and all more or less dependent upon the water supply and its distribution. For instance, we know that any agricultural future of this country depends upon the proper distribution of its water supply, and any unintelligent interference with that natural distribution of water may do very material injury to these interests. Then there are our forest resources. These may also be affected by any ill-informed or misinformed action in relation to the water supply. I pointed this out as some of the reasons why we should be fully informed, and not why we should refuse a proper application for the development of our water powers. The water powers in every other country are being made more and more subject to regulations. They are being kept more and more under control of the State; and in some cases where they have been parted with, the State is buying them back at great cost. I think, Sir, that in dealing with our water powers we ought to proceed with care; we ought have full information; and we ought not to stand at the expense that will be necessary to inform the Government and the Legislature upon all these essential features in relation to these important natural resources of the country.

Now, Sir, I have already, in my place in this House, referred to the method of legislation which we are proceeding with in this case. I mean proceeding by way of contract. I think it is a mistake for this House, or for the Government to proceed by Legislative contracts in the way in which we are doing now and in the way in which we have been doing in the past. Legislation of this kind is most objectionable it seems to me. We should follow the example of oth-

er countries and put on the Statute book a temporary law regulating the conditions under which these rights should be granted. Such a law should contain essential conditions and terms upon which leases should be granted, though I should leave a certain latitude to the government in dealing with the contract. We have come to the time when we need some legislation of this nature. Some of the proposals in the contract before us have been somewhat amended, which amendments have certainly made a great improvement on certain points. Striking out the East coast for instance. That was a very objectionable feature of the contract. There was no reason why it should be included in the contract. It was in no way related to the establishment of the fertilizer works of the company. The Government have not made enough amendments to meet the terms upon which this contract should be made. It contained much that is not essential to the establishment of this industry. There is much in it that could be eliminated and still not hinder the promoters of this industry in their undertaking. One matter that has been discussed is the question of preserving the rights of the public, and we ought to enact legislation that would protect the public rights. Any person owning property within the influence of these concessions, will find it very hard to deal independently of so powerful a company possessing the rights given it by this contract. That is a very objectionable feature in the contract. I think that before we finally adopt these resolutions, we ought to introduce some measure that would safeguard the public against any such condition as will make us so dependent on this or any other corporation. It is our duty to protect the rights of the people. I notice in the

agreement that was made with the Deer Lake Company, that the rights given there are not the same as under the present act. Section 2 of that contract provides: "The rights to use the general waters granted to the Company by this section are not exclusive rights, but are to be limited to the use of the said waters for the purpose of furnishing power for the operations of the Company at and in connection with the lumber, pulp and paper mills and manufactories which the company purposes to erect on the Humber River below Deer Lake aforesaid; and provided further that the rights hereby granted shall not be taken or construed to prejudice, obstruct or in any way affect any public rights—now or heretofore used, enjoyed or exercised, or which may hereafter be created or granted by the Legislature and, upon or in relation to the said waters or any of them."

I think that this company should be given all the rights that are necessary for the establishment of this industry; but it is the Government's duty to see that the demands of the company are based upon a true consideration of the positions. Take the water powers in that area; our information does not tell us the capacity of these water powers. We have very little information on the matter. If the company require 100,000 horse-power, but find afterwards that they are capable of developing 100,000 horse-power more than is necessary, they ought not be allowed to tie up that possible water power. The Premier said that this might not happen, but the conditions may exist where it would pay them to do it. The distribution of this power ought to be regulated. The company should have no reasonable objection to be under the obligation to develop these water

powers, if they can be developed further than is necessary for their requirements. I am referring now to the water powers in Newfoundland. If you will look at the map of Newfoundland you will find that the area covered by the drainage area of the Humber is very extensive. In Labrador we are dealing with a far greater power. Governor McGregor referred to this as being one of the greatest water powers in the continent of America.

To my mind it is very difficult to see why this Labrador proposition is introduced into the present bill at all. I have been hoping that the Premier would have given some explanation of the reason for bringing this Labrador proposition into the bill. It is not associated in any way with the Humber River proposition. Then, in connection with these works, as has been pointed out it is quite possible that these concessions are so valuable that within a few years it would pay the contractor to hold these water powers and the rights attached to them, without proceeding further with the works which are contemplated at present. There is no provision for the continuous operation of the business.

Now regarding the matter of taxation, we ought not make this a perpetual exemption. A period of years might be fixed when this right of exemption from taxation could come up for review before the Legislature, which would have the right to extend the exemption if necessary. That right might be safely left in the hands of future legislators. The exemption of stocks, dividends and debentures ought not remain in its original form. This section might be greatly modified. It must be remembered that this company is not limited to the particular industry, that it is now asking

extend their operations, and can if they please enter into the general business of the colony, competing with the mercantile firms on Water Street, while our merchants and others who carry on business will be obliged to pay taxes upon their products, this company will be taxed nothing. I do not think that this is fair to the people of the country.

Regarding the other concessions which are made by this contract, the right of expropriation of property is too extensive. I do not mean to say that the contract gives the right to take this area, but I mean it gives the right to select lands within this area, which will really give the company a general control. Compulsory arbitration is objectionable; the right of compensation is too limited. Take the fishermen of Bay of Islands; their property may be taken for the purpose of this Company; the fisherman has to appoint an arbitrator and he naturally appoints some one whom he knows; a respectable man, but without the knowledge of training to be a match for the skilled arbitrators of the Company and the Government, that is a position that no man ought to be placed in.

The same thing applies to Section (15) which says "If the company in or by reason of the exercise of any of the rights hereby granted submerge, destroy, damage or injuriously affect any private rights, interests, lands or property and shall be unable to agree with the owner thereof as to compensation to be paid therefor, the Company with the consent of the Governor in Council may proceed with the exercise of the said rights by these presents granted to the said Company, and the compensation to be paid by the Company to the owner for or in respect to such rights, interests, lands or property shall be

settled by arbitration in the manner herein before provided." The right to a remedy given there is much broader than the right given in the section where land is taken; I have taken the trouble to look into the question of compensation as covered by Section 15 and I find that some lands or rights that are injuriously effected are not covered in Section 15 that are covered in Section 15.

I think the Company ought to be obliged to put up some security to cover its obligations under this section. The Deer Lake Company was obliged to put up \$250,000 for the very purpose I am now talking about, and this proposition is larger than the Deer Lake operations.

There ought to be some protection of these waters against discharge of deleterious chemicals or other matter. These waters are being used by the people for domestic purposes.

As I said in the beginning, I am sincerely desirous of seeing these things fully established. I ask the members of the Government and the other members to take this matter into consideration. These matters to which I have referred, I think, might be considered before we go into any more details of the Act. Section 15 provides as follows:—

15.—If the Company shall be at any time or times desirous of acquiring lands incident to flowage rights, or rights of way for telegraphs, telephones, power transmission lines, railways, tramways, or roads or sites for mill works, factories, warehouses, or for wharves, piers, docks, or other shipping facilities not belonging to or not in possession of the Crown and in connection with the Company's operations for the purposes aforesaid and within fifty miles therefrom, and shall be unable to agree with the owners or occupiers of such lands as to the purchase money or compensation to

be paid therefor, the Company with the consent of the Governor in Council may enter and take such lands and the purchase money or other compensation to be paid by the Company to the owners or occupiers of such lands shall be settled by arbitration in manner provided by Section 55 of the Crown Lands Act. And upon payment to the owners or occupiers aforesaid of the amount awarded in such arbitration, the said lands shall become and be the absolute indefeasible property of the Company.

Where any private rights are submerged, destroyed, damaged or injuriously affected, in one case the submerging may only be temporary. One section is intended for that, and the next is a different case altogether than the others. If the Prime Minister would look at these Acts and the remarks under them, he would see what I am trying to convey to him.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman: There is nothing at all to connect the last phrase with what is the main intention of the Act. I think in connection with this, as I said on the opening day, I think the Companies involved ought to be subject to and under the control of the Legislature. Now, under this clause this Company can eliminate any competitors that arise in the area of its influence. We need not even wait for this Company to commence operations. Immediately the resolutions become law, every one who has rights down there, anyone who owns land or mills down there, will find his property become absolutely worthless. From similar cases in other parts of the world we can draw our own conclusions as to how this will affect the contingency of any similar industry arising there in future. They will have to sell out to the Company and take whatever the Company will graciously give them. They are subject to the rights

of this Company. It is only a matter of time when they will fall in the Company's hands. Everyone knows I am not stretching a point when I say this. It is only what eventually must happen, if this section, as it now stands, becomes law. You have only to look through the statutes of Ottawa and you will find flagrant examples of this very thing where the Legislature indirectly invalidates the private rights of people. Now this is not a question of what the Premier thinks or what I think or what people on this side of the House think, or what people on the other, it is wholly and solely a question of what the people themselves think who have interests there. Are they taking the benevolent view of the Premier, I wonder? We see petition after petition coming in asking that they might come forward and be heard, (Some are even supporters of the Government,) praying that their property be saved from confiscation. The Albert Reed Co. and many others have all given notice, but these are nothing to the number of people whose rights have not yet been brought to the notice of this Legislature. We are not told of the money invested with timber rights and water powers or other matters which cannot conveniently be brought up by their owners at this present juncture. Adjourn this House for a month, and give notice that those people will be heard and you will see the force of my remarks. Now the Premier talks about the water powers there. He said that he thought it would all be required by this Company. Well then, why cannot provisions be made that if they do not develop these water powers it shall be sold to the people, not at the price they name but at a figure fixed by the Tribunal we have before referred to. A Commission of some sort, or the Supreme Court or anything you like, so long as the

price put is a reasonable price. I think this is a wise suggestion and one which would commend itself to and Legislature. I am not an expert on the subject of water powers and I do not think the Premier is either, but I do not see why he is so ready to accept the statement of a promoter. It seems to me that this water can be utilised several times at different points of the river. The prevention of the Company having a monopoly is not only wisdom, so it seems to me, but ordinary precaution. We ought not to deprive ourselves of everything, and what they do not actually use ought to revert to us again. My argument that a provision should be made against lapse of contract or what is to happen when contracts have lapsed (for we must admit the fertilizing industry might die out) was answered by the Premier, who said they would sell back to the country. Then of course we would have to buy at the Company's figures, which probably would not be small, and we would have to sell to various small industries because the Company could not see how to develop one. We have nothing here to prevent the Company from keeping their lands as long as they like. The Colony would be tacitly forced to buy it back after a long time. It is no answer to say that they have a right to sell it; they are getting it for nothing. You are told they are going to give something for it in the way of development, but if they do not develop I think we ought to have the right to take back, that is done everywhere. The Premier says you are wrong when you say you are getting nothing, he argues that our people are employed and the country has developed, but if this does not happen can we get our land back? It is only ordinary precaution as I have said. Supposing in the course of years this Company should fail utterly, are we

going to leave the water powers for ever in the hands and control of these people? I think the lack of provision for a contingency that might well arise is utter madness. A provision such as this would not alter the financial prospects of the Company. Again the Premier refers to the Harmsworth Company; but the premier is only too prone to set his own bad examples up as precedents for his future conduct. He was Minister of Justice, I remember, at the time, and he has taken a great deal of what I would consider blame as greatly to his credit. Anyway what are the facts that distinguish these two cases. Firstly, the Harmsworth's came here with their own capital and we knew it; we knew, too, that they were going to make paper for their own use, not to be sold. They had already acquired most of their property there, and this is very different to the speculative proposal placed before us now. This present company depends upon a responsive sale of its manufacture. The Harmsworths were supplying their own needs. That it turned out fortunately was not due to any statement on our part. I trust that we will be able to discuss each resolution in turn when the matter comes before us later on.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Chairman, we are told somewhere that "language is given to men to enable them to disguise their thoughts," and as I listened to the hon. members' criticism on the other side of the House I found that I could come to no other conclusion than that they enjoyed to the full the advantages of this privilege. It is inconceivable to me how they can fail to appreciate the benefits of the agreement now before the House, and I am inclined to suspect that many of the arguments that have been brought before this House this evening are merely perfunctory. My

view of the agreement is that its one distinguishing feature is its reasonableness. This impresses itself to me as its salient characteristic. It is a matter of far reaching consequences to the water powers involved and while this aspect lends itself to criticism, it appears to me to be most reasonably set forth. Some two years back the Government made an agreement in connection with our railways, and as part payment for the expenditure connected therewith, they agreed to grant to the Reid Newfoundland Company certain lands and water powers, and I think we would have been acting dishonestly if we had intended subsequently to debar them from their utilization of this grant to utilize them for ourselves in another manner. This I may say will not affect individual rights concerned. Apart from these concessions they also ask for about five square miles of marble or limestone, and ten thousand acres of land which the company will select for themselves and certain minor privileges. This is not too much to expect for the very considerable and large benefits the Colony will reap from the capital, which must be expended in order that the Company may be inaugurated. We have been told that private rights may be adversely effected by the expropriation clause in the agreement. Now as a matter of fact I am aware that a great deal of the private interests affected by this Company are being dealt with by Contract, and I have had letters from several parties who have had dealings with the Company in this way, and they expressed themselves highly satisfied with the terms given. I think there is only one outstanding claim, and that will be arranged for within a day or two. We are also told that it is undesirable to have the Reids appear as Dir-

ectors of the Products Company. This strikes me to be very unreasonable and quite adverse to our own interests. The Reids can go into the money markets of the world and obtain the capital necessary for this, as no other person in Newfoundland can, and the very fact of having men of their financial standing is an advantage as an advertisement of Newfoundland in the money markets. It is a common place matter to hear the Reids being vilified for things they have failed to do. I am not here as a defender for the Reids, I am under no compliment to them, and I may say without fear of contradiction, I am not even on speaking terms with them, but I have for some years had an opportunity of witnessing the labours they have undertaken in carrying out their contract. We never hear them complain of any loss, although we know they have suffered severely on many occasions. They have lost trains and steamers by fire, accidents, floods and many other ways, but that continuity of enterprise that has so distinguished them ever since they have been here, has never been abated for a single day. I have been familiar with their business for many years, and I never had occasion to express myself otherwise. I remember distinctly when I was doing business on the West Coast I was annoyed by certain actions committed by the Reid Bros., but upon reflection I realized that their actions were not only justified,—but, had they been otherwise they would have sacrificed the rights of others to a most unfair extent, and today I am ready to admit that they always have acted in the most impartial manner for all concerned.

We were told during the discussion of this matter that the Government should provide data to check the calculations and other

statements that were furnished by the Products Corporation, but we know that the surveys and data that have already been acquired and which are still incomplete have cost \$100,000, and it follows that to make the required surveys and check those data would entail a large expenditure by the Government, and nothing could have been derived from such surveys that would have been commensurate with the colossal expenditure that would have been undertaken by the Colony. We were also told that it was unwise to give this Company the control of the Muskrat Falls on the Labrador. The Muskrat Falls, I am prepared to admit, are a very valuable water power. More particularly would it be valuable if it were situate in a Province of the Dominion, but situate as it is on the Labrador where the electrical energy has to be carried more than three hundred miles, this energy can only be utilised in the manufacture of some material such as that which is to be manufactured by this Corporation, and I think this fertiliser is the only product to the manufacture of which the energy of these Falls could be turned. I am prepared to contend that it will be absolutely impracticable to undertake any large logging or pulp operations on Labrador for a variety of reasons. Climatic conditions and the difficulties of life together with a hundred and one other difficulties would make it impossible. Labrador timber will possibly be utilised in years to come, but it can only be done by permitting its export. I think anyone practically familiar with the difficulties of logging and pulp operations will admit that it is useless to hope for the utilization of this timber within the Labrador territory itself. This Corporation is going to convey this power to the

Straits of Belle Isle, but it is questionable to me whether the manufacture of the Labrador timber could be profitably undertaken even if that were done, and it can only be utilised where you have a large deposit of lime stone as we have at Bay of Islands, and where it is possible to convey to that section the coal and phosphate rock that will secure a repetition of an industry similar to that which it is proposed to start at Humbermouth. Then, of course, something practicable may result. I cannot but feel that every possible advantage will accrue to this country from the inception of this Corporation. I am sure that every member of this House will remember the opposition offered a few years ago to the Harmsworth charter, and the number of objections then which were said to be likely to result, but I do not think that there is in the country today anyone who will say that the inception of that industry has not benefited materially the whole country, and I am quite convinced that half a dozen years from now it will be as difficult to find anyone opposed to the Products Company in Bay of Islands, or anyone to condemn the act of the Legislature that gives them this charter. My particular district stands to gain immeasurably by the development of this concern, and I am equally satisfied that the country at large will benefit to a most appreciable extent. I can see nothing in the agreement before the House injurious to the country and I see no reason why the privileges and rights that are contained here should not be granted to them.

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.

STAMP DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend 5 Geo. V., Sess. 1, Cap. 10, entitled: 'An Act Respecting Stamp Duties.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

PERMANENT MARINE DISASTER FUND BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the establishment of a Permanent Marine Disasters Fund."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

It will be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill was before the House the other day for the second reading it was suggested that possibly to give the Committee power to deal with certain investments would require some little consideration. It occurs to me that this whole matter will be safe in the hands of the Committee now managing the funds, and those that will take their

place later on. All these persons are working without any pay. It is really a labour of love for them, and I think that the whole matter will be safe in their hands. As a matter of fact nearly the whole of the fund of last spring, \$300,000, that was received from the subscriptions of the whole world has been liberally expended up to the present time, and they have been able to provide more than usual for each case. The only section now is that one in which it is provided that any cases where money is now granted by the Committee, if the beneficiaries marry or become otherwise independent of any claim on the fund the Committee will have power to transfer such sum of money to the Permanent Disaster Fund. I think it will be safe to leave it to the Committee to say when and how that amount should have been dispensed. It is not compulsory; it has not to go to any fund; it is only that if a certain state of facts comes about they will have the discretion to apply it to the Permanent Disaster Fund. The Committee, of course, will decide whether it is better to keep that amount in case any further allocation should arise out of the same disaster. We are leaving that in their hands. As I say it is not compulsory. It will be found by looking at the section that we are leaving it to the discretion of that Committee. I think it is a very good thing to establish a Permanent fund, such as this, I have no doubt that it is one that will be a source for people of means to make bequests, and that it will increase to a very large sum in a short while. I find there are plenty of precedents in England in operation similar to this. For instance, going back to the Crimean War, there were very large funds established, and there are large sums still being expended. I think the Balaclava fund was one. Then there was the fund in relation to the "Eury-

dice" which turned over on the English coast. There were many of such funds, in which there were big amounts expended, and there has been legislative authority to pass them over to other funds of a similar nature. It is not my intention to put the bill through now, and I would ask the committee to consider the matter and we will decide it to-morrow or at the next sitting. It was originally intended to find a place in the bill for this committee to have franking privileges so that their correspondence may go free. That is a reasonable concession, and I propose to move an amendment in relation to it at a later stage.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman: When the matter to which the Premier referred was before us the other day, I had not had the bill very long, and I thought that funds subscribed for a general object should be devoted to that object alone. As the bill now stands we are leaving that matter in the hands of the Committee. It is not compulsory to the Committee that they should transfer the funds in their hands, but we are leaving to their discretion everything in relation to the distribution of these funds, and leaving it to them to say what shall be done with any surplus. The principle embodied in this section is a principle that is embodied in the equitable doctrine of *cy-pres*. It is a doctrine applied by the Courts in the disposal of charitable trusts, where the particular object for which the trust was created either fails or becomes exhausted, or for any other reason passes out of existence. In any case, such as that, the Court will give directions for the application of the trust fund in the hands of charitable trustees or apply the equitable doctrine of *cy-pres*. The doctrine which permits them to apply the fund to nearest available charitable purposes to that trust for which the original

bequest was intended. In the present case the original object was the maintenance by these trustees with the funds in their possession of those who suffered in the Marine Disaster of 1914, and when it becomes unnecessary to use these funds or any of them any further, they are given power to transfer them to the Permanent Fund. I state this to make clear the meaning that I had for the remarks which I made on the second reading of the Bill.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I wish to say that as far as the Committee is concerned I am very pleased that a measure of this kind has been introduced. I have no objection to the Bill. I have nothing but good to say of it, and for my part I am very glad that a fund is at last to be established, of which the result may be that in the future when we meet with a disaster such as we have had in the past, those who suffer will find some practical consolation from the fund which will be in the hands of the Committee. The F.P.U. during the last twelve months has established what we call a Disaster Fund, which is only applicable to Union members. It is a fund to which the members contribute, and from it members who are injured, lose limbs, or become sick so that they are laid up for five or six months, will get from the fund a certain amount of money. It also helps the members to buy artificial limbs. We grant a certain monthly or half-yearly allowance according to the number of the family. There was a case last year where ten men were lost on the *Exploite*, and their families were helped out of the Fund in connection with the disaster. We generally get contributions about Christmas. As far as we are concerned we have nothing but good to say of this bill and we have no objection to it whatever. I am very pleased to know

that it is the intention of the Government to appoint the present Marine Disasters Committee that has been sitting on the 'Southern Cross' and 'Newfoundland' Fund in the past year. I perfectly agree with that suggestion. I am sure that the endeavours of the Government in this direction will result in very great benefit.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman: Might I suggest that there ought to find place in this bill some provision whereby the Committee is to receive information from the Magistrates or other officers in the various places. Probably it was the intention to place that matter in the hands of the Committee, but if not, I would suggest that the Magistrates, Poor Relief Officers, Customs Officers and others be instructed that in case of accident they are to send information, detailed information, to the Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I see no objection to the proposal made by Mr. Jennings, and I suggest to the Committee that it would be a very great improvement to put it in the bill, that in case of accident occurring, that it shall be the duty of the Magistrate to notify the Committee of the details of the accident and of the number of families that are affected by it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I would like to say that I think the suggestion of Mr. Jennings is one that, although it has been acted upon in the past year in the Sealing Disaster, still should find a place in a bill providing for the permanent Marine Disaster Funds. One of the difficulties that the Committee was faced with was the getting of detailed information, and it would be considerably safer to have this information before devoting the fund. The Hon. John Alexander Robinson, Secretary of the Marine Disasters Fund, did noble work in this connec-

tion. Everything possible to be done he did. I may say it was no small undertaking for the gentlemen of last year's committee, and they deserve the thanks of the whole country for their work. As the Prime Minister said, it was to them a labor of love, and I think the selection of these three men,—Hon. John Harris as Chairman, Hon. J. A. Robinson, Secretary and Hon. Robt. Watson as Treasurer,—was the very best that could be made for work of this kind. The best feature of the fund in combination with other funds was that there was no overlapping. The fund had one object and that was carried out, and while it might have been beneficial to have kept the fund open longer than it was, nevertheless the results were very satisfactory; and at no time were claims paid without the committee's being quite sure of the necessity. I feel sir, that the adoption of this measure will relieve the case as far as voluntary subscriptions may be necessary. I know last year many of the leading people intimated that if a permanent fund were established they would give large subscriptions, and I have no doubt that this would be the case if this were adopted. You all remember the "Regulus" "Little Jap" and the other marine disasters of the past, and the effective way relief was given in all cases. Nothing could have been more effective than the manner in which this committee did their work, and I think this House appreciates the work done on behalf of this object.

MR. CLIFT—I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I endorse everything that has been said by the Colonial Secretary in reference to the work of those who had to do with the distribution of the funds of the Marine Disasters Fund, and I would also say that three more suitable men

could not be found in the city for this work. I know the great work done by the Secretary, Hon. J. A. Robinson, and I think that the thanks of the whole community will go out to him and the two gentlemen associated with him in his labor of love. I am pleased to know that some steps are being taken by the introduction of this bill, to establish a Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, but I can't help reiterating some portions of my remarks on the bill which was before the House some few years ago providing for payment of \$100 to each of the fishermen who have lost their lives. At that time I had a feeling that this amount ought to be raised by some special means from the industry it was connected with. I had a feeling, sir, that it was not fair to take \$100 from the current revenue to pay the fishermen who lose their lives, and not provide a similar sum for those lost in pursuing other occupations of life. I felt that the industry itself should be charged with the payment of this amount by the imposition of a small tax on such things for instance as the shipping, for which the whole colony would be contributing. This tax would provide a fund from which such amounts as these would be payable. However, that measure passed into law, and is now upon the statute books, and I see no reason now to reconsider the matter. Now, however, that we have been asked to provide for a permanent Disaster Fund, I have been led to feel again that same idea, and that there should be some tax on the fishing industry which would contribute to this fund rather than that we should make payments directly from our current revenue. Perhaps a sufficient sum may be raised by benevolent donations and by subscriptions of various kinds to let

this question of taxation stand over for the present.

I have not quite made up my mind as to the right of this House to transfer the surplus of the Marine Disaster Fund to the benefit of this fund,—the Permanent one. The amount was not subscribed only in this country. About half of it came from outside for the purpose of relieving the distress occasioned by the disaster of that year. The sympathy of the whole world was aroused, and practically demonstrated if the gentlemen who allocated the fund and who were the moving factors in its collection would let the Premier have it as their opinion that any surplus over and above that required for the Marine Disaster Fund should go to the permanent fund, and it is likely that they would do this then we might be authorized to include it in the permanent bill. I am not quite sure, sir, as to this being correct without that opinion being given. The fund was given for a particular class of people, and one would think that they should receive the whole amount. If this fund is so well off, why not have it made to provide for the time until the youngest beneficiary is 17 or 18. The money was subscribed for that purpose. In the event of the death of any one of these it might be alright to do this, but otherwise I cannot feel that it is right. However, with these few opinions I am prepared to support the bill.

MR. HIGGINS—Just a word or two about the question raised by my friend Mr. Clift. I think as a matter of fact when the original fund was opened the intention was to have a permanent fund. If I mistake not, it was at a public meeting that this was decided. I think it will also be found that a resolution to that effect was made at that meeting and I think also that when the fund was started it

was contributed to with that intention; namely that the surplus be transferred to a permanent fund. The remarks of the leader of the Opposition in my opinion practically answer the aspect taken by Mr. Clift as to the right to appropriate this money. That is that it was subscribed for a certain purpose, and this being accomplished the amount left was to be transferred to a fund for doing similar work. I think that in this way the remarks of the leader of the Opposition explain to the member for Twillingate the position as it is, and I think he will agree with me that there can be no diversity of opinion in this matter.

MR. CLIFT—Just one word in reply, Mr. Chairman; I was one of a very few at a subsequent meeting of the committee who objected to the principle of establishing a Permanent Fund out of subscriptions already raised. I questioned the practice of doing this as the subscriptions had been given to a certain fund, and I do so still. However, I have no desire to delay the House further upon this point.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. I have thought over the matter and have agreed with what Mr. Clift has said. In my humble opinion however, the best scheme would be to have a system of compulsory insurance adopted. This matter has been considered by the Union very favourably, and I am hoping that the day will come when every man engaged in this hazardous work will for \$8 or 10 insure his life for \$1000. If this can be brought about the need for a fund like this would be very small indeed.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I think, Sir, that the answers to Mr. Clift's questions are those given by

Mr. Higgins. The money was collected, allocated and the remainder left on hand was to be transferred to a permanent fund which had been advocated by many of the donors. I think that the dependants having received each his or her portion, the only thing that can be done is to turn the rest over to this fund.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman. I think it is very necessary, as the Colonial Secretary has said that no idea should go abroad that any one has been at work to divert this fund from the purposes for which it was given. The point is this, that when the committee found themselves allocating this money and had finished it, they found they had a balance on hand. They had money and no place to dispose of it. This fund supplies a disposal for this, and if placed here, it will serve a similar object to that which it was collected for, and given for by the donors. I think that it would be very wrong to have it said that any suggestion of diverting this money from its right channel was at any time contemplated by the legislature.

MR. CLIFT—I was referring only to the surplus money. We know almost the whole fund has been allocated to the dependents of that relief. The only question in my mind was the allocation of the surplus. Ought we allocate that surplus elsewhere when we see widows and children for whom it was collected living with a small pittance. My idea was that as this money was subscribed to this fund it ought to be devoted in its entirety to this fund, and I was questioning the idea of turning it, even as a surplus to the permanent fund.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It will be remembered that on the 2nd reading of this bill, I had placed in the hands of members a copy of the Marine Disasters Fund. It will

be found there that there was a balance of \$60,000 on hand after the rest was allocated. The report said "This balance will probably be used to keep the survivors in case of illness or disease due to their weak condition," or words to that effect, but they cannot say that this \$60,000 will be consumed. If it is not what can they do with it? This bill enables them to transfer it to the Permanent Fund and in that way the money would be doing similar work to that for which it was given. Extracts may be quoted to show that the donors had anticipated and agreed to some such move as this. This is but one instance:

"The Committee is authorized by Mayor Ellis to say that when in New York, Boston, and Montreal, in connection with the Relief Fund, the hope was generally expressed that a sufficient sum would be raised to enable the committee in charge to devote some portion of it to a Permanent Fund for the Relief of the families of the Newfoundland sailors and Fishermen who from time to time are lost at sea."

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.

PATRIOTIC ASSOCIATION BILL.

Pursuant to order, and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Newfoundland Patriotic Association" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until

to-morrow, Tuesday, May 11th, at three of the clock in the afternoon. The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 11th.

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

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker: I beg to table the answer to a question asked by the honorable member the Leader of the Opposition on May 6th in relation to agricultural expenditure.

PETITIONS.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker. In accordance with the notice I gave yesterday, I beg to present the following petitions: One by the American Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Company, by its Solicitors, Messrs. Howley and Fox; another by the International Timber Company also by its Solicitors Howley and Fox; another from the St. George's Lumber Company by its solicitors Howley and Fox and another from the Labrador Pulp and Lumber Company, by the same Solicitors.

I may say Mr. Speaker that in presenting these petitions I should like to mention to members that personally I have no interest one way or the other in the matter. I do not represent these Companies in any way. I was given these petitions by the representatives of the Companies and I just bring them before the House for the consideration of members in connection with the Bill which is before the House, and if the prayer of these petitions is agreed to I will consider the agreements that may be adduced here. The petition of the American-Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company is as follows:

To the Honourable House of Assembly
in Legislative session convened.

The petition of The American Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co. of

Grand Rapids, in the State of Michigan in the United States of America.

HUMBLY SHEWETH

1. That your petitioners are the holders of timber areas aggregating 400 square miles and situate in and upon Deer Lake and the Humber River.
2. That your petitioners have expended in cash in acquiring said properties sums of money in excess of \$250,000.00.
3. That the agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and The Newfoundland Products Corporation Ltd. now before your Honourable House seeking ratification will if ratified seriously interfere in respect of the said properties and prevent and delay the development of same and the establishment of industries in connection therewith and greatly diminish the value of the said properties of your said petitioners.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your Honourable House will be pleased to grant unto your petitioners a hearing with respect to the said rights and interests and the interference therewith by the said agreement before taking any action with regard to the ratification or otherwise of the said agreement.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray etc. etc.

American-Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co., by their Solicitors.

(Sgd) HOWLEY & FOX.

St. John's, May, 19th, A.D. 1915.

The petition of the International Lumber Company sets out that the petitioners own certain lands, mills and timber lands and other properties situate south of Hall's Bay and containing 270 square miles; that they have expended in cash in the purchase and development of the said properties a sum in excess of \$50,000.00. The rest of the petition is the same as the other.

The petition of the St. George's Lum-

ber Co. is that they are the holders of lands, property and timber lands situate inland from St. George's Bay on the West Coast of this Island; that they have expended in and about the acquirement, development and operation of the said properties a sum exceeding \$200,000.00. The rest of the petition is the same as the former one.

The petition of the Labrador Pulp and Lumber Company, of Montreal, in the Province of Quebec is: "That your petitioners have recently acquired large areas of timber lands situate at Sandwich Bay and upon the Kenimon and Kenalebe Rivers, Labrador, comprising 2000 square miles and 381 square miles respectively.

"That your petitioners have paid for the said properties in cash \$400,000.00 and \$100,000.00 respectively."

The rest of the petition is the same as the others.

Now Mr. Speaker, the interests, as you will notice, represented by these Companies are very large and the expenditures that have been made are considerable. They ask to be heard before the Bar of this House to place before the members how, and to what extent and the nature of the prejudice which they allege they will suffer by the ratification of the Contract. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion of public matters can only take place between the members; but it is a well known principle that when private interests are concerned there is a practice, which is old as Parliament itself, that they may be heard by themselves or by their Counsel with such witnesses if necessary at the Bar of the House.

I find that this practice has been acted upon very considerably at home and though I am not personally aware of any precedent which has happened in this country yet the precedents which have governed us here in the past are the same as have governed them at home. Of course in May's

Parliamentary Practice we find may precedents. The second reading is the stage at which these objections are usually heard to private Bills, or public Bills which may materially effect private rights.

Now we all remember the precedent which affected this country when our Delegates were at the Bar of the House of Lords in 1891, and there are other cases which are referred to in "May" where counsel were heard. I think Mr. Speaker that these petitioners have interests which may be affected by this Bill as they submit here, and I would ask that a day be fixed upon which they may present their case as to how this Contract affects their rights and interests. I think, Sir, it would be well if they were heard while the Resolutions were in Committee. The time to hear them is before going into Committee some day on the motion to go into Committee. The reason I say I think that is the best time is because the House will have adopted the Contract and the Resolutions by the time it comes to the second reading and I think it is only fair that the petitioners should be heard before it is adopted and ratified by the Legislature. I beg to move:—

"That the prayer of the petitioners be acceded to and that a day be fixed upon which the said companies will be heard by their Counsel before the Bar of the House respecting the subject matter of the petitions."

MR. LLOYD—I beg to Second the motion. (The motion was carried.)

QUESTIONS.

MR. HICKMAN gave notice of question.

MR. WINSOR gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement shewing the names of the Mail Couriers for Pogo District for the Winter of 1915, the

names of the routes, and the amount paid each Courier per trip.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to table the information.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether the contractors for the Coastal Mail Service or the Government pay for the use of private wharves for landing freight and passengers. If the contractors do not pay, under what clause of the respective contracts are they exempt therefrom and the Government obliged to pay for same.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That is in course of preparation and we shall have it this afternoon or tomorrow.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Right Hon. The Premier, in the absence of Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay upon the table of the House: (1) A statement showing the amount of money allocated to Mr. Thos. G. Ford, of Middle Amherst Cove, for putting out a fire that occurred on Bonavista Neck last summer; (2) A copy of returns if such are sent in.

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

MR. COAKER asked the Right Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House all correspondence and any other information in reference to the Mobile Water Power.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have asked to have that prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing what amount was lost by the Colony by the failure of Messrs. T. Smyth & Co. to pay their Customs Bonds, and why the Bondsmen were not called upon to pay.

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

MR. COAKER.—Asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to

lay upon the table of the House a statement showing what it cost to operate the Smyth Warehouse Building; what insurance is paid; what amounts have been paid for repairs to the said building and what the receipts for the last twelve months amount to.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is also being prepared.

MR. COAKER—Asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement giving the names of the crew of the dredge "Priestman" the wages paid each per month, the number of days the dredge was in operation during the year 1913-14, the total cost during 1913-14 for (a) wages, (b) food supplies, (c) coal, (d) insurance.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—That has been tabled.

MR. COAKER—Asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing whose tender was accepted for the Bay of Islands Mail Service; and what amount to be paid per week for the said service.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the honourable member I beg to say that the government has accepted the tender of the "Euphrates" Steamship Co. The S. S. "Port Saunders" is performing the service for \$150.00 a week, one trip a week.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—With reference to a request made yesterday for the letter from Mr. Howley I beg to table that.

STAMP DUTIES ACT.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 5, George V., Sess. 1., Cap. 10, entitled "An Act respecting Stamp Duties" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

PROHIBITION RESOLUTIONS.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors.

PERMANENT DISASTERS FUND BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the establishment of a Permanent Marine Disasters Fund."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, when the Committee last sat on the Bill I intimated that there was an additional section I desired to add in relation to the Permanent Committee sending their letters free and I propose to add the following:

"Letters and mailable matter addressed to or sent by the Committee or Secretary thereof shall be exempt from postage."

It was also proposed by the hon. member for Twillingate Mr. Jennings that on the happening of an accident notification should be sent by the Magistrate near where the accident happened to the Committee in order that the Committee should know of the accident at the earliest opportunity; together with the particulars surrounding it. I propose to add a section carrying out that suggestion.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman: Referring to the language of section 4, I presume this means by public subscription. If so, it struck me some limited words might be put in, such as "for charitable purposes". I presume this refers to money for charitable purposes. I think the language is a little too broad, and, might occasion some

trouble in the future. Of course, this would include educational Grants. I may be hypercritical perhaps but I thought that these words being added might save considerable trouble in the future.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The subsequent sub-sections interpreted this, as you will see when we read them. No alteration is 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 Bill with some amendments.

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

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 5, George V. Session 1, Cap. 19, entitled "An Act respecting Municipal Affairs" and for other purposes in connection with the St. John's Municipal Council was read a second time.

RT. HON. SIR EDWARD MORRIS.—It is just a year ago that an Act was passed suspending the Municipal Government of the City of St. John's and providing for the creation of a Board in its place. That was the result of an extensive citizen's movement and based upon a petition signed by three thousand of the city voters presented to the Legislature. When the change was made a solemn pledge was given to the voters in the Municipality through the Legislature that at the end of the year, if no new Legislation was proposed in the meantime or confirmed, we could return to the Status Quo, and have the usual Municipal Election the coming June, and that would now take place if no further Legislation is enacted. In the absence of any similar mandate from the civic voters we would not be jus-

tified in altering the decision arrived at a year ago. As a result of that Legislation, a Board was appointed and has been at work studying civic problems since then, as well as carrying out the ordinary municipal services. By the Report made by the Board at the end of the year and tabled in the Legislature and also the Report tabled here the other day by the Colonial Secretary, it will be found that considerable reforms have been effected in many of the Civic Services and also that the Board contemplates many more. They will find however, when they get down to actual decisions, that the most of the questions outlined and indicated in the Report and which they contemplate dealing with by amendments to the law, may be dealt with and accomplished without any amendment of existing Legislation or any new laws.

The really five important civic services in which citizens are interested are:—

- (1) Water supply which is vital not alone for cooking purposes, and ordinary household use, but also for sanitary service, fire protection and the purposes of trade.
- (2) Sanitary system in all its branches.
- (3) Health of the City.
- (4) Efficiency in the fire department, so as to keep down insurance rates.
- (5) The collection and expenditure of the taxes.

There are numerous other services, but all others such as parks, lighting sidewalks, laying out and repair of streets, etc., whilst most important are not essential compared with those enumerated before. During the year the Board has had a water expert visit the colony and is already carrying out suggestions contained in

his report. An advance has also been made dealing with the night service, not alone by the reduction of the number of carts, but also considerable reduction in the cost. The dust nuisance by sprinkling, oiling and other methods, as well as the prompt collection of city taxes and the handing over to the various Road Inspectors and Sanitary Inspectors the control and the employment of their own men, are also reforms valuable to the citizens and making for efficient service.

On the whole the Board has done good work, and may be expected to perform still further services in suggesting reforms to the Legislature for future Legislation. The present Bill does not seek to anticipate the contemplated reform, but as all are agreed that the Municipal Election should be held in December the present bill aims at so amending the law that the election instead of being held the coming June will be held in December, the present Board being continued in office until the elected Board take up their duties, and in that way the Board will have an opportunity of still further pursuing their work. It is only fair to the Board to say that this continuation in office is not being done at their request. Previous to going out of office the Board will make a full report on all the matters which they have been considering, and at the next session of the Legislature their recommendations, in so far as they may be acceptable to citizens and the Legislature, will become Law, and I have no doubt will be carried out loyally by the newly elected Council, who will be only too glad to have behind them the moral support of the present Board as well as the Legislature. Further, we may reasonably assume that the newly elected Council will embrace many of the gentlemen who have been serving on

the present board during the past year, but in any case it is reasonable to assume that any elected Board will not go back on any of the reforms inaugurated by the present one or fail to put into effect any reforms which will be contained in the Legislation arising out of the recommendation of the present Board.

Should the present Board report in favour of a change in the present mode of civic Government as regards its constitution, substituting any other form, such as government by commission, or any change as to the election of the councillors, or any alteration in the franchise, that can safely be left to come into operation the following election if adopted by the Legislature. From what I can understand, no change is likely to be recommended in the present form of city government as regards its constitution, and as no citizen now votes at an election who does not pay city taxes directly, no matter how poor he may be, there will be no curtailment of the present franchise, the only change probably being to enfranchise women who pay taxes as property holders.

Too much praise cannot be given to the way in which the present Board have considered these problems. The Board has been affected considerably in its work by the war, as nearly all its members have had pressed upon them other work such as the Patriotic Association, and matters arising out of their own immediate calling. It is only right and fair therefore that they should be given a chance to finish their work and I have no doubt it may be anticipated that they will make still further reforms between now and the end of the year. The election then will be fixed for December so as the Council in future years will take office at the beginning of the Council's financial year which begins on January last and not be

taking up the work of the old Council and carrying out the old Council's estimates. The present Bill provides for this. It also deals with the construction of houses with the sewerage system, and also two or three minor matters. On the whole I think we may say that we are making steady progress in Municipal affairs. The income of the City to-day from all its sources of Revenue amounts to \$245,000 against \$100,000 twenty-five years ago. Of the taxation of \$236,000 it would be fair to exclude \$70,000 which is the sum now obtained from those who have water and sewerage services from the city, and which cannot be regarded as a tax as they get value for value, just as much as when they purchase milk or vegetables. What we want now are good city Councillors, men qualified, who know their business, who have studied civic problems, and are acquainted with civic life. In making a selection citizens will have regard to those qualifications. We want to divorce politics entirely, from civic government. In the past I am afraid the connection has not been conducive to success. Councillors will have to regard themselves as trustees for the city, and collect and expend the civic taxes in such a way that they will get dollar for dollar.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, when this matter was before the house last year it will be remembered that I pointed out that I did not think that this body would do the work in the time that was given to it to do it. The one objection that I raised at the time was the fact that we were giving to this body too much work to do in the time. The administration of the affairs of the city and the working out of a charter for the future government of this city appears to me to be too much work to undertake within so short a time, and this bill is, therefore, a ne-

cessary consequence of what we did last year, and of the work then undertaken. That work ought to be completed. I think that the members of the Civic Commission have done very fine work in regard to the administration of the affairs of the city since they have taken control, but I find in the report which has been tabled that they have not completed their labours by the working out of a future charter for the city, and the present bill is a bill only to fill in the time, to provide the machinery for continuing them between now and the time when they have completed the charter of the city. The Prime Minister has said that it appears that they will have such a bill ready for the Legislature at its next session. In my opinion I think it would be useless to extend their time for six months; I think you ought to let the Commissioners finish their work, if they are going to do any work at all. If they go out of power when the time expires under the present act they would go out in December when their work may be unfinished and then a new body would come in that would work for a few months under the old charter and then come in under the new charter of which they did not know the provisions and with which they may not have any sympathy, which may provide for the doing of something which would give the board larger powers of greater scope than the old Act. Having gone so far and seeing that the work is incomplete I think it would be better if we were to wait until we got a permanent charter which these gentlemen are working upon, and after the charter has been accepted by this House you will immediately give directions for an election to be held as soon as the charter is enacted by this House. I do not think any good will come from an extension of six months; on the contrary, what good has come from the work of the Commissioners

will be largely offset. I notice from the report of the Commissioners that their work has covered a considerable amount of ground. They have given great consideration to all kinds of matters and especially to the new charter, but naturally they have not had time to work out the charter in detail and to prepare it to such an extent as to be ready for this House. Until they do so I think we ought not to extend the time by six months but for twelve.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in respect to the remarks of the honourable leader of the Opposition that the object of putting the election down for December was for two reasons. As the Premier has pointed out in his remarks the Council closes its accounts at the end of December, and it is considered undesirable that an election should take place in June, and that the incoming Council should find the estimates for the current year already made and be committed to those estimates. The Commissioners thought that it would be much better if the new Council going in were to have the opportunity of opening new accounts and making the estimates according to its own ideas, that it would not be committed to anything done by its predecessors. In the second place, last year when this Commission was appointed by this House it was done for one year and on the petition of a very large number of citizens in St. John's, and to extend the time for another six months is considered by the Government sufficiently long for the reason that they have no authority from the citizens, no request from them, to go any further than one year, and coupling that with the fact that it is undesirable to hold an election in December they consider that they ought not disenfranchise the people of St. John's for a longer period than they had asked for. I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the

work of the Commission will not be completed at that time, but I think that it will be so well advanced that the incoming Council would be able to continue the work without any serious possibility of its being in any way injured. When the Commissioners took office last year it was considered that they would have hard work to carry out the task in the time, and I think the citizens of St. John's are under a great debt of gratitude to these gentlemen, who are all successful busy men, who have devoted a large amount of their valuable time for the past year in the interest of the city. They took up the work and have done it gratuitously; they have had to give a considerable time (more particularly Mr. Gosling the Chairman, who has been most devoted to this work, and who has given invaluable service in improving the condition of affairs), and I think that they have succeeded. They have brought in improvements that as the summer goes on will be realized and appreciated by the people, and if they have done nothing else they have raised the interest of the citizens themselves in their own city. In regard to the water service, which, after all, is the most important civic service. They have in the past year brought down here an expert Water Engineer who went over the whole system and not only has the water coming to the City received his attention, not only the water mains which convey the water, but the whole distribution of the water all over the town, and he has made a most interesting report which I would advise everyone who has not done so to read, so that they may get an idea of what is going on in regard to the water system here. The enormous waste of water coming into the city was discovered by Mr. Longley and I know of one instance on Water Street where he discovered an enormous leak that was undiscovered before. I say if they

have done nothing else the fact that they have got an idea of the water conditions in such a satisfactory manner is sufficient to justify their work. The improvements that will follow the extension of the water service will be realized by everyone as tending to make the city more clean, more healthy and more desirable, and I think that the one Municipal reform that is most necessary is that in connection with the water. We are fortunate in having a supply of water very near to the city and that water supply in the past has not been taken full advantage of. Taking the improvements that are now being made there can be no question but that the improvements in the condition of affairs in the city will be very remarkable, and when the work now undertaken in regard to the extension and distribution of the water is completed you will see these improvements in the very near future. The first and natural consequence of an increased water supply will be the improved sewerage system. During the last few months numerous leakages and wastages have been discovered and these have by now been cut in half. If we have better water service the fire insurance rates will go down. In the past fire insurance rates in this town have been very large which has been brought about altogether by the fact that in many cases where fire occurred we have had an insufficient supply of water to couple with the conflagration, and if the water supply increases these fire insurance taxes will naturally be lower, and the reduction will be a saving of somewhere between one and five hundred per cent. upon the outlay of this water extension. I am very strongly in favour of this bill, and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it would be in the interest of the city if the Commissioners could see their way clear to continue in office for an additional period, but for the

reasons I have stated the fact that we did not want to keep the people any longer from their right to hold an election and because of the objection to holding an election in December, we have thought it would be well if they were allowed to continue their work up to the end of the year and carry out as much as possible in that time.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have no opposition to offer to the bill, but I am not in sympathy with it and do not support it except for the purpose of seeing the work really finished. I do not agree with the principle of Commission government on the nomination of the Governor or in Council. I say this without any desire to express any adverse opinion on what the Commissioners have done. I am not in sympathy with them any more than I was twelve months ago, but at the same time I recognize that they have done good work during that time. It is no more right than it would be for the Czar of Russia to replace constitutional Government by autocracy. The mere fact that he has done good work would be no reason why we should adopt autocracy. The reason that the Commission has done good work is no reason why we should sympathize with any autocratic form of Government, but while I object to the form of Government I wish to say that the Commission has done good work. They have had the courage of their convictions; they have shown an example which I hope will be followed by the elective Council at the proper time. If there is any evil in connection with an Elective Council it is that like most members of parliament they have not the courage to stand up against opposition, and I hope that when the Elective Council are again a factor that they will have the courage to carry out what they regard as right, and not look at civic affairs from the point of view of getting votes. In the past this evil has brought the whole

system of Municipal Government into contempt. It was the contempt for Elective Councils in the past that has rendered Commission Government a possibility in St. John's, and I say that the courage they have shown will I hope be continued by Councils of the new era. This Commission has done good work. They started out by bringing down an expert in water service and they have obtained from him the full benefit of his expert knowledge in the distribution of the water supply. They have thus increased the supply of water for domestic purposes and for fire prevention. In other directions the Commission has shown excellent system. They have given very close attention to the details of the Department and I have no doubt that in the fulness of time when we have had an opportunity of fully testing their work we will see the full benefit of the work that they have done. In making this statement I think that there is a mistake in connection with the present bill. That mistake is contained in the first section. I do not know whether they have been consulted in regard to the matter, but I can hardly believe that the Commissioners themselves have recommended the termination of their work in December next, by the passing of this bill. I hope that I have not correctly understood the Colonial Secretary. Am I right in understanding the Colonial Secretary that it was their desire to terminate the labours in December.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I may say that the position is this: The responsibility has rested upon the Government to say whether it would be better for them to go out or to continue in office. They have not asked for a continuation of office but the Government has undertaken the responsibility of asking for them for a continuation of five months.

DR. LLOYD.—One thing I understood

from the Premier and from the Colonial Secretary, if I interpreted them correctly was that the council should not go out of existence for a further six months. Well, this is merely a matter of expediency.

The only arguments we have had are these:

(1) The Present commission has not finished its work in full.

(2) The fiscal year of the city ends in December.

(3) It is desirable to have the election of officers so as to have these installed to start the new year.

Now let us examine the points:—

(1) The work of the Commission will not be finished. That brings up two positions, firstly,

As a civil administration they should get out of existence, but in view of the past work done, the work of devising a charter for the city should be left in their hands, or secondly,

They should continue administration, and in the time at their disposal, devote themselves to the matter of incorporating the city.

Now Sir, I am not particular what action the Government may take. They can either let it go out on June 30th with power to continue its study of Municipal affairs and devote its attention to drafting a measure for incorporation, or the second, alternative, and this the Government has elected to take, viz: To let the commission continue administration and devote the balance of its time to drafting the measure. But if that alternative is adopted, surely it should be complete. While it is very desirable that the new council should come in under the new system, it is not everything, and we might arrange that the Commission should terminate at the end of the fiscal year.

Under no conditions ought the new council to be called upon to begin work January first.

Now what does this mean? That on December 31st this commission passes out of existence. It can no longer approach us as a commission. Already the position set out by the leader of the opposition that they will not have finished their work, and though not finished will have no power to go on with it, has come about, and so this work is going over to a new body of men who may know nothing and may have no sympathy with the plans of the others, and who may not have studied the things and who may not be in a position to take over the work and will not have Legislation drafted for the next year. As far as this Bill provides now, no authority is given for this commission to approach the legislature. No means for approaching this legislature is to be left to those preparing this charter. What is the reason? Is it merely that the Government thinks that it is an impossible thing to wait 6 months more after waiting already 12 months.

Under this Bill the existence of the present commission continues for the 18 months. This is not at their own request.

The least that can be done is to keep this commission in power until it has completed its work, and the completing of the work may need the keeping of them in power till June 30, the middle of the fiscal year.

Now this would violate two things.

- (1) It would extend the disfranchisement for a further six months.
- (2) The new council would commence work in the middle of the fiscal year.

Now this second violation could be got over by making the time of the new council to extend $3\frac{1}{2}$ or $4\frac{1}{2}$ years. Everything could be done in this council as is usually done, the only difference being that the first year would end after 6 months work.

I say first of all that if we elect the new Council under the old act and

under the old franchise, it will as a council have no sympathy whatever with the projected incorporation.

Surely it is reasonable to expect that the new council should come in under the new incorporation, and that at all events is my position.

Let section 1 be so altered that the commission remain in power until June 30 next year, and in the meantime finish their work. The corporation being in the interim made out the new council could come in at the end of the year under the new act. Have them elected under the new franchise.

Now Sir, that is my opinion, and in closing I would again say that I have no sympathy with the keeping of this commission in control under the power of the Governor in Council. I have nevertheless to give my appreciation to the members of that commission for what has been done.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman: This matter is one in which the members of the House, more particularly the city ones are greatly interested. I think I am correct when I say that there is no difference of opinion about it. While the member for Trinity has said things opposing this bill, yet he admitted that the Commission form of Government was doing better work than the ordinary form of government. But the honourable member himself knows that the present commission is a temporary commission appointed more or less to be representative. When the present conditions came about the Government approached the commission and asked them if they wished to remain in power for another year. They naturally did not wish to outlive the time appointed for them, and had they asked for a further 12 months adverse criticism would certainly have resulted. Finding the commissioners naturally opposed to doing this, the Government thought it advisable to take power to reappoint

it, and this is why I think the Colonial Secretary named 6 months as a suitable length of time for the commission to finish their work. It must be remembered, and I think everyone appreciates the fact, that the past year has been a very unfortunate year for the commission to do its work. When one year was set we must remember we were not calculating for the happenings of last year. That I think in a large degree explains their delay in getting down to their work. However this extension of time ought to enable them to finish their work, and like Dr. Lloyd, I hope that the charter or measure will be ready to be passed by this legislature at its next sitting, and that as a result of this the new council will be able to begin work with this new charter. It is of great importance that this be done, as to have a new council assume the control without it would mean a loss of at least half its value. I think it is only fair and right for us to say how much we appreciate the work of the Board in the administration work it has done so faithfully, and to express the confidence we have in them as a result, for the larger work which they are about to do.

MR. MORRIS.—Of course Mr. Chairman it is understood that most measures that come before this House are of importance, and some are of greater importance than others. Some matters are of universal interest to the Colony, whilst others are purely local and of special interest only to the Honourable Members entrusted with them. This measure is a purely municipal one, and whilst of importance and interest to us all as citizens, it is the principal concern of the Honourable Members representing St. John's.

Last year some three or four thousand citizens petitioned this Legislature to suspend the operation of the Municipal Act and to place Civic management under the control of a Board of

Commissioners. I beg to say, here now, that the personnel of the Board could not be more representative and more qualified in every way to discharge the duties entailed upon it. I speak now Sir with an intimate experience of over twenty years of Civic Government, and with the special opportunities I have had of knowing, I am of opinion this Board has performed its onerous, and in some cases uncongenial work, during the time it has been in office in a most methodical, business-like and acceptable manner, and without fear or favour.

The fact that the Board is not in a position to submit a charter at this present Session, is not to be wondered at, and arises from no fault of the Board. The individual members of the Board, who are all busy business-men, have devoted considerable portions of their valuable time to this matter of preparing a charter for the City, and especially the Chairman Mr. Gosling, who has been in communication with the various municipalities and Civic Boards both in Canada and the United States and has obtained copies of their charters, Bye-laws and regulations which have been submitted to the Commission, who are diligently, from all the data at its command, compiling a new civic charter, which it is believed will be both equitable and acceptable to the rate-payers of St. John's. It was found to be impossible to have such a Charter ready for presentation at this Session of the Legislature, and hence the necessity of this House to decide whether the Board will be continued in office for another year, to enable it to perform the work gratuitously taken up by the members, and so faithfully and well carried out by them up to the present time.

Whether the Commission should stay or not, is a matter for this House to decide, but I wish to observe, and I am in a position to say that neither the Chairman nor any member of the

Commission has made any representation to the Government, or to this House, with a view to be continued in office. The Commissioners are not asking this House to grant them an additional term, but if this House should decide to extend the term the Commissioners are prepared to accept office for another year, thus enabling them to successfully carry out such civic reform as they had confidently expected to perform when they took upon themselves the duties of civic Government.

For my part Mr. Chairman, I give my hearty support to the Bill now before the Chair, and would have had much pleasure in supporting even a longer extension of time than that asked.

MR. KENNEDY (St. John's).— Mr. Speaker, last year a large petition from the citizens of this town was presented to this Legislature, and acting on this a commission was appointed by the Government. This Commission has done excellent work, but there is more yet to be done before its work is finished and so this extension of time. This extension of time is the Government's proposal, and I was talking to some Commissioners the other day, and learned from them that personally they wanted to get out of it but they had to do their duty.

Their work has been an excellent success. Sewerage has been installed in many places all over the city, a means for dealing with night soil has been arranged. Now in place of the old unhealthy odours of some of our back streets, one is impressed with a nice wholesome atmosphere.

Even that is something to comment on. They have also, as has been stated, improved the water system. They had an expert come down here, and the saying that was accomplished in the system more than warranted the expense of getting that expert down. Now, I don't propose to delay the House, as the ground has all been cov-

ered by other speakers, but I thought it only fair to add my meed of praise to the men who have been conducting the city's affairs. It is my hope that when this Bill is brought before us in Committee, we will try and get them to remain for another year to continue the work which they have been doing.

MR. COAKER.— Mr. Speaker: The last speaker has said that the present Commissioners are a busy lot of men, and that some of them would like to get out. Well, that is exactly what I said last year when you brought in the Bill appointing the Commission. I contended that these men were too busy to attend to the affairs of the city; that if you were going to appoint one appoint it to prepare a charter which might be submitted to the House; but that you should not expect men to prepare a charter during twelve months and run the city affairs. The hon. member for St. John's West has borne out the statements that I then made. Now, I am opposed to Commissioners being appointed by the Government to run the city. I objected to this last year on the same grounds; and I think that the time has come for the Government to tell the Commissioners to get out when their year is up in June. With regard to the work of the Commissioners, I myself have seen a good deal of improvements in the town. I believe they got good value for the money expended, and I hope, as Dr. Lloyd has pointed out, that their work will be an incentive to the next men to follow in the footsteps laid down by the present Commissioners. Of course, this is not a matter which concerns us very much as Outport men; it is a matter which concerns the city representatives; and all we have got to do is to express our opinions with regard to the bill before the house. I do believe what I have just said, that I did not agree with you last year, because I did not believe in the Com-

mission. I knew these men were too busy, and would not be able to run the affairs of the city and also prepare a charter; because if you are going to get a charter which will be suitable, it will mean that a good deal of time will have to be devoted to the preparation of it; it is not going to be done in 24 hours. There is another thing which is very serious. If the present Commissioners are to get out in December, then the election that will appoint their successors will, of course, have to take place under the old form of government. Now, that is a serious objection, I should think. If you are going to have a new charter, then have one by all means, but if in the meantime a Council is elected under the old form it will mean that you will have a pretty good tangle. Certainly, the present system might go on until next June. You might give them another twelve months. They won't be able to finish their work by the end of the year, because there will be no House of Assembly in session to pass any charter which they may prepare. If you have got to pass the charter here, and then have a new Council, it is only right and proper that the new Council should be elected under the new charter, and therefore you will have to let the present Commissioners continue in office until next June. At the same time, I think that the sooner you terminate the work of the Commission appointed by the Government to manage the municipal affairs of St. John's, the better it will be for all concerned.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker: It appeared to me that the appointment of a Commission to run the city and at the same time to prepare a charter was not likely to work out well. Preparing a charter is, in the main, a theoretical question—as to what portion of it should be representative, as to whether it would be representative of wards, or some from wards and some

from the city, and questions of that kind,—they do not require any practical experience in Councils to settle. It has nothing to do with practical work. It is a question which statesmen have to decide with the aid of the experience of other cities and our own experience abroad to settle. It is largely a legal question as to whether you should collect taxes from the landlord or from the property itself or from the tenants. These are not questions to decide which it is necessary to have any experience in connection with the administration of the Council, because they are theoretical questions to some extent, and to a large extent we would be bound, in deciding them, by the experience of other parts of the world. So it appeared to me from the start that the attempt to appoint a commission which would carry on the work of the city and at the same time prepare a charter would fail, and it has failed. I took occasion the other day to speak to the Premier of my own personal feeling about the matter, having regard to the unsettled condition of affairs in relation to the city government. I said that my personal opinion was that this Council should be authorized to exist for another year, so that we should have another session of the House in which to consider proper legislation. Then, after that legislation was adopted, a new election could be held and a new Council, upon a new basis, come in. Personally, that appears to me to be the wise course. Now, what have we here before us at the present time? We have a proposition that an election may be held before the end of December; until that election is held and the new men come in, this Council shall hold on. That provides that the Council shall come in elected under the old charter. If you have a new charter, and it provides for a different kind of Council, all that election trouble and expense is gone to for nothing. Now, for illustration merely:

In many cities abroad they have tried to combine the ward system and the city system, by means of the election of aldermen from the wards and comptrollers from the city; the comptrollers being a sort of Executive Council, which decide upon the work to be done, and the aldermen a consulting body in connection with the recommendation made by the comptrollers. In other words, they have tried to work out a sort of system of executive government with a consulting council from the various wards. Well, that has worked out very well in some cities. So far as we here are concerned, it has been contended that the best council we ever had was the first council, when we had ward men. Then, after a while, as the personnel seemed to decline, we changed that system for the other system of men elected by the whole city. Then we had another drop, because it is quite evident that men of means, men of affairs, are not going to submit themselves to the election of a whole city for the small class of work which they are called upon to do in that respect. You are bound to have a decline in personnel. Finally, we got to the position where this body now in control had to be called into office. We have a class of men in the present council—men of affairs—who will not put themselves up for election for the present time, if you go back to the old system. It is quite apparent, therefore, that the old system will not do, and that we must have something in place of it. Well, why in the name of all that is good should we revert to the old system and then have to change it six or twelve months afterwards. That seems to me to be simply nonsense. What I would urge very strongly for consideration would be this. Change your bill, saying that an election shall take place before the first week in December; give this body power for another year, giving power to

the Governor in Council to terminate it by proclamation before the end of the year if legislation is enacted in the meantime; then appoint a commission of two or three legal men to consult with the present Council or with anybody else for the purpose of the drafting of a proper measure to bring into the House next session; prepare your bill; pass it; then hold your election on the new basis; then publish your proclamation terminating the present Council. Now, the present Council, excellent men as they are, cannot form a new charter. They are not lawyers; and this is an exceedingly difficult professional work; but there is no doubt whatever that the experience of the present Council will be exceedingly valuable in assisting the right kind of Commission. While not making any invidious distinction, I could point to my friend Dr. Lloyd as a very suitable man for a Commission of that sort. After our experience of his excellent work in connection with the Hospital Commission, I feel that we could have no better representative. If the Government would appoint a Commission of three two from the other side and Dr. Lloyd, and take care that the other men were of his calibre, those men, consulting with the Council could bring down a bill to this House that would be worth our while passing and would, I am sure, operate to the great advantage of the city. I think that it would be a disaster to allow the splendid work of the present Council to be lost by reviving the old condition of affairs, because if the matter is left standing for any considerable while it won't be dealt with at all; and now that you have got everybody thinking about the matter, why not adopt the suggestion that I have made? Personally, I have had some experience while I have been out of the colony, and my own feeling is very strongly in favor of the scheme which I have described. I think it would work very

well here. There are a number of chances which the ward alderman, who represents a small portion of the city, has of keeping in touch with things and of knowing what should be done; and while he only thinks of his ward, and is likely to take a ward view in connection with matters that come before him, yet if he is under the control of an Executive Council, which is elected by the City and which will consider the affairs of the city from the city standpoint, you are likely to get as good satisfaction as you can get from any form of civic government. That is the kind of system which I would like to see the Commission consider, and perhaps introduce here. Now, the only thing that can happen, if this Bill goes through, will be that we will go back to the old system and continue dragging along upon the old lines, until by and by it will fall through its own weakness and then the whole thing will have to be taken up and done over again.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—What system have they got in Halifax.

MR. MORINE.—Comptroller.

MINISTER, PUBLIC WORKS.—I think that city is very beautiful.

MR. MORINE.—They adopted the system I am suggesting some years ago. The city of which I saw most was Toronto. I think Toronto, by general admission, is the best governed city in Canada. It is governed upon that system—comptrollers elected by the whole city and aldermen by the wards. That system is working very well there, and I think it ought work very well down here. But in any case I don't think we ought to pass this Bill, which will land us in the fog.

On motion the Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

PACKING CO. RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of the confirmation of the contract with the Newfoundland-American Packing Company, Incorporated.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker: In moving that the House go into Committee to consider this Bill I may say that I do not propose to ask the Committee to go into the matter now, as it was only today that the resolutions were tabled, and under these circumstances I would not expect that the House would be prepared to consider the resolutions section by section. It will be found on perusal that the resolutions confirm an agreement made by the Government in relation to the establishing of cold storage of fresh fish in Newfoundland. The Company is an American one, known as The American-Newfoundland Packing Company, Incorporated. I hope to have the Articles of Incorporation to lay before the Committee in a short time. A gentleman, known to some of the members of this House—Mr. E. St. John Howley—who has lived in New York for a number of years, has been interesting himself in this matter for a considerable time. He has had numerous interviews with the Government in relation to it, and last autumn he brought down three or four Americans who are interested in dehydration works and are interested with him in this Company, and they have made this agreement with the Government in relation to the establishment of works here. It will be remembered that on two or three occasions we

have had Cold Storage agreements before this House. Unfortunately, up to the present, nothing of a practical nature has come out of these agreements. In 1904 or 1905, I think, an agreement was made with a gentleman from Montreal named Wright. It was a rather elaborate agreement, and at one time it was thought that something of a practical nature would result, but it fell through. Then, two or three years ago the Legislature confirmed an agreement with Trefethen & Lord, who came here strongly recommended and who satisfied enquiries that were made amongst financial people. They came from the State of Maine. One of them had been Mayor of the city of Bangor for a number of years. They had been in the fish business for a long while, and everything looked promising; but unfortunately nothing came of it. It would serve no purpose to go into an account of why it failed. One of the partners became ill, and I am sorry to say he has never completely recovered; and other difficulties arose which made it impossible for the contractors to go on. Now, we have this agreement. I can only hope that something may come of it. When these gentlemen were here last autumn they met the Government, and from what then transpired as regards their affairs we were satisfied that we would be justified in entering into this agreement. Now, so much has been said on so many occasions in relation to the value of cold storage, that it is, I think, entirely unnecessary for me to add anything on this occasion. The one thing that we need today in Newfoundland is a system of cold storage on a good, sound commercial basis, so that our fishermen all over the country may be able to procure bait—squid, herring and caplin—if it can be properly kept frozen, at times of the year when they are unable to

procure it in the ordinary and natural way out of the water. We are all aware of the loss sustained by the fishermen year after year for want of bait. There is no one here, I suppose who does not come right up against that sort of thing in various parts of the country. A couple of years ago I was down on the Labrador. At that time there was fish right in on the rocks, and no bait. Then I came up through the Straits, and everywhere we went it was the same cry. It was the same with the bankers, and the same with the shore fishermen. They all wanted bait. The merchants and people who deal with other aspects of the fishery have never felt justified in making any very large expenditure in relation to this matter. This year, however, with a small subsidy grant from the Government, a Company has been established in Fortune Bay—in Harbour Breton. They are going into the business of cold storage for bait on a very extensive scale. Now, in its application to fresh fish that would have a very important bearing on the price of fish in Newfoundland. It is not hoped, and it is not wanted, that this measure, or any measure like this, can ever take the place of the salt curing of our fish. We have large markets in Brazil, in the Mediterranean, and in other places for salt fish today, and our fishermen get a very good price for the fish sent to these markets; but if we could dispose of 100,000 or 200,000 qtls. or any appreciable quantity, fresh, one can understand the effect which that would have on the price to be obtained for the salt article. Not alone would our fishermen get a good price for the fresh article, but it would lessen the quantity of salt fish going into consumption. If our fish could not alone be salt cured, as now, but could be put up in a boneless state and in a fresh state, it is not difficult to un-

derstand what it would mean. We have right here at our doors a great nation, the United States, with a hundred millions of people, who are prepared to take every pound of cod in the country, provided you can put it in fresh. Of course, the great difficulty is that they want it absolutely fresh, and not alone fresh but well preserved—kept in a temperature that will not affect or interfere with the flavour of the fish or that will destroy the fibre of the fish. In other words, they want it put in the markets just as it is taken off the hook. However, it is not, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, necessary for me to go into details in connection with this matter, because I feel that every member of the House is as well acquainted as I am, and some of them more so, with this subject.

I will just discuss very briefly the main features of the agreement that the House is considering. The principal features of the contract are as follows—

1.—The Company agrees to erect at its own expense in the Island of Newfoundland within three years from the first day of January, 1915, three Cold Storage plants for fresh fish products, each of which shall have a capacity of not less than five hundred thousand pounds at any one time. One of said plants shall be erected completed and put in operation during each year of the said term of three years. The Company agrees to maintain the said Cold Storage plants in continuous operation, unless sufficient fresh fish be not available for such operation, or, unless further excused by order of His Excellency the Governor-in-Council, from the date of their completion until the 31st day of December 1929. It shall be optional with the Company to substitute one floating Cold Storage plant of the capacity aforesaid for one of the said

three Cold Storage plants to be erected in Newfoundland under this paragraph.

5.—In addition to the said three plants, the Company agrees to erect and complete at its own expense within three years from the first day of January next, not less than three smoke-houses and three fish packing factories for fish and fish products, and also two glue factories, and two fertilizer plants. One smoke house and one fish packing factory shall be completed and put in operation during each year of the said term, and one glue factory within two years from the first day of January next. The Company agrees to maintain the said smoke house, fish packing factories, glue factories and fertilizer plants in continuous operation during each year of such operation of fifty per cent. of their full capacity, and during each subsequent year of the said term of fifteen years from the first day of January next of seventy-five per cent. of their full capacity. Provided that the guarantee set forth in paragraph 3 does not apply to the work contemplated by this Section.

7.—The Company agrees to employ Newfoundland labour, if available, in the conduct of and in connection with the different industries which shall be established in Newfoundland under this Agreement, with the exception of such skilled labour as shall not be obtainable in Newfoundland.

8.—The Government agrees to grant to the Company free of charge out of any ungranted Crown Lands which may be at its disposal:

- (1) Sites for the said Cold Storage plants, factories and other buildings which are proposed to be erected under this Agreement.
- (2) Subject to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, one or more

Licenses of Timber Areas of sufficient size where unlicensed lands can be found to supply timber for boxes, barrels and other requirements of the said industries which are proposed to be established under the Agreement, said Licenses to revert to the Crown should the Company cease to operate.

- (5) Sufficient water power for operating and lighting the plants and other works erected under this Agreement, where such water power shall be at the disposal of the Government, to revert to the Crown should the Company cease to operate.
- (4) The right to take eels in rivers, lakes, bays and other places subject to such regulations as may be made by the Governor-in-Council from time to time.

9.—The following articles when imported by the Company for use in connection with its works and business contemplated by this Agreement, but not for sale, shall be admitted into the Colony free of duty, for the term of fifteen years that is to say:

- (1) All plant, machinery, implements, apparatus, and material necessary for the original installation of the said Cold Storage plants, smoke houses, and factories and for the extension of same within the said term of fifteen years, but not in substitution for old.
- (2) Ammonia and other chemicals for refrigerating purposes.
- (3) Vegetable oils for use in canning fish.
- (4) Tin metal for cans and solder.
- (5) Gasoline engines for plants and fishing boats.
- (6) Printed and lithographed labels.
- (7) Mineral and lubricating oils for machinery.
- (8) Packing boxes and cartons

branded with Company's trade mark and packing paper.

11.—Nothing whatever in this Agreement shall be taken to permit, nor shall it be lawful for, at any time during the continuance of this Agreement or afterwards, the Company to export any salt-fish or any fishes to be used for the purposes of salt in any place whatsoever beyond the jurisdiction of this Colony.

Some of these people are engaged in dehydration in the United States. It is a sort of drying process by which vegetables and fruits may be preserved in U.S.A. Any one knows that that would be a very great advantage to Newfoundland. The Company is also going in for making preserves. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the House into Committee to consider the resolution.

MR. LLOYD—Is there any correspondence.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No there is none. Mr. Howley came down here and personally made the agreements.

MR. KENT.—The Contract is not signed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is a mistake in printing.

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.

PRODUCTS CO. RESOLUTIONS

MR. KENT—It is not I presume, the intention of the Committee of the Whole on the Newfoundland Products Corporation Resolutions to go over these resolutions this afternoon.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. KENT—As there are petitions to be presented it would be well if they were presented before the resolutions were entered upon.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have no objection whatever. But it was in order to accommodate the House that it was brought up.

DR. LLOYD—It is no use fixing the day for hearing the petitions unless we can go into Committee immediately after. I am not in a position to give any vote on the Newfoundland Products Corporation bill until I hear more on the subject.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I took up several points with the contractors, and in the three points that have been mentioned, I have been successful in getting what may be regarded as useful concessions. First as regards the referring of claims to the Supreme Court, they fell in with my suggestion. The other matter was as regards where the works are to be on the Labrador, and the Company is satisfied to fix that they shall be on some part of the coast between Forteau and Battle Hr. Then, as regards the other matter, that is provided for in the Crow's Lands Act.

When we go into Committee we shall deal with the matter more fully.

On motion the discussion on the Products Corporation Resolutions was deferred until Thursday next after Council for certain Corporations claiming that their rights by the agreement are infringed, shall have been heard at the Bar of the House.

QUESTION.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of all moneys spent at Change Islands, Fogo District, for snow shovelling for the years 1914 and 1915. If no returns the amount and

name of party to whom money was sent.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The answer to that question will be given as soon as possible.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 13th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 13th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the residents of Elliot's Cove for a sum of money for a wharf. It is largely signed and I trust the Government will accede to the request.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Moreton's Harbour on the subject of prohibition. I ask that it be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. STONE gave notice of question.

MR. WINSON—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Wesleyville on the subject of prohibition.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker I beg to table the Report of the Public Schools under Methodist Boards for the year ending December 31st, 1914.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from T. Rideout and others of New Bay Cove on the subject of prohibition.

It was ordered that these several petitions be received and referred to the various Departments to which they related.

QUESTIONS.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a list or returns of all monies and goods given out of temporary relief in Bay de Verde District during 1914-15.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table the information.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House the cost of transferring coal and machinery from Bay de Verde to the Fog Alarm at Baccalleu during the year 1913-14; also, to state what became of the coal left on Bay de Verde wharf in the Fall of 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That information is being prepared.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any person is paid a salary for looking after the Government wharf at Bay de Verde; if so, to give the name of the person holding the appointment and the salary per annum paid to him. Also, a statement of cost of Sydney coal landed at Bay de Verde in 1912-1913-1914 for Baccalleu, and who supplied the coal.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House returns of all monies sent from his Department to Bay de Verde District during 1914-15.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if there is any money allocated for a Ferry at Low Point, Bay de Verde District; if so, what is the amount and who received it.

MINISTER MAR. AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I might say the answer to question number 3 is being prepared; number 4 I have very much pleasure in tabling. As to number 5 I may say my Department has no connection with ferries, and the

question will have to be addressed to the Department of Public Works.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns from all Relieving Officers in Bonavista District from October 1914, to date, with copies of all bills in connection therewith; also, vouchers for same.

PERMANENT DISASTERS FUND BILL.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—That information is being prepared, and I shall have it to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: "An Act Respecting the Establishment of a Permanent Marine Disasters Fund" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, 'An Act to amend the Act 5 George V., Session 1, Cap. 10, entitled: 'An Act respecting Municipal Affairs and for other purposes in connection with the St. John's Municipal Council'.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I should like to make a few observations relative to this subject, which was discussed here yesterday. I think some little confusion exists as to the effect of this measure in relation to our present Commission. I know something about the municipal affairs of this town, and, since the appointment of this Commission, I have kept in touch with them, and may

say that I have a fairly good idea of their plans and measures in connection with the municipality. I think we may safely assume, (and I have no doubt myself), that no departure from the constitution of the Council at present as an elective board is likely to be recommended. The Board is not likely seriously to entertain that proposition at all, although I am aware that something was on foot a year ago to the effect that we were going to revert to civic government by Commission as you have in some of the towns in the United States. That would in many respects be going back to a worse condition of affairs than our system of unopposed representatives. We had Government by Commission in 1838 and it was a dismal failure. The St. John's Municipal Act was introduced in 1888 by Sir James Winter, then Attorney General. This continued up to the year 1902 and I think on the whole the Municipal Council did good work for the Municipality, always having regard to the fact that their means were very limited. When the Municipal Council was created in 1888 it was created by a system of wards, which continued for some time and then was put an end to by an Act of Parliament. Then we had a Commission for two or three years and this turned out to be such a dismal failure that in 1902 it was abolished, during which year this present Act with some slight amendments was brought into operation. Since 1902 we have been proceeding along the lines laid down by that Act. Now if you have read the report, as no doubt many members have, which was tabled here some days ago by the Chairman of the Commission, you will observe that it is here suggested that a great deal of the present Act should be reformed, amended or entirely deleted. Although I do not desire to anticipate the work of the present

Board, I think I may be so bold as to say that when they get down to business thoroughly to amend this Municipal Act they will find that there is very little they can do to improve it. Originally drafted by Sir James Winter, it is the growth of years, amendments taking place year after year. In 1902 it was amended and redrafted entirely by Sir James Winter who was specially paid for this work. It is now, I may venture to say, as good an act as it is possible to have. Structurally, perhaps, there is room for improvement. But this is a mere question of recommendations from the Board themselves, and would very little affect the city itself. It would in this form be more convenient for reference and other similar purposes. An Act that will have to be used every day such as this, might very advantageously be codified, each matter being treated under its own head. This is a matter that requires very little consideration at our hands and can be very easily arranged.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding in connection with the question of the constitution of the Council, in relation to the ratepayers. Originally, when the Council was created the franchise of the voters who elected that Council was confined entirely to ratepayers who paid something like \$2.75. That was the qualification necessary for a resident of the city. But things have changed since then, and it must be remembered that those who paid water or sewerage rates had no greater claims than those, who, from other sources paid the rest of the revenue. Last year the Income was \$240,000 with \$60,000 or \$70,000 collected from water and sewerage. Now as a matter of fact the rate payers do not pay sufficient to defray the cost of maintaining the system which they enjoy. If you are interested you can easily ascertain

from the Council the cost of the water supply up to date. It is I believe, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$800,000. That means some eighty or ninety thousand dollars a year for maintenance alone and the Council only gets sixty or seventy. In other words they are getting this service at the cost of people who do not get it. Indirectly, of course, other people pay. It is not the rate payer who gets a bill every half year that maintains this town. He gets his quid pro quo. Why should he get his water service or his sewerage free any more than he should get his milk or bread or beef? And this is only a small item in the Council's income of \$240,000. So what I wish to point out is this that the Council is not likely to reduce the present franchise. In other words every man who now votes in the Municipality is contributing to the taxation, whether he be a bachelor or a married man, whether he lives in a hotel or maintains a home of his own. Every man in St. John's is a rate payer directly or indirectly. From coal alone they get \$60,000; they get something like \$12,000 from the Government in relation to the fire department. They get \$8,000 for lighting the city, from eight to ten thousand for roads and bridges, and three thousand for clearing the streets of snow, etc., in winter time, and four thousand for Crown rents. Besides the taxes on fire and life insurance companies and the taxes from the Reid Newfoundland Company for street car service, and taxes on amusements and various other items amounting to about \$240,000 in all. So that I think as regards the question of the franchise it is not likely the Commission will alter that.

As regards the ward system. We had that as I have already pointed out from 1838 up to the year 1892 and today you find most people and the

present board divided as to the advantages of that system. Some think that if you had a ward system, the smaller the ward the more likely you would be to get men to stand for that ward, while other men admit they would prefer to stand for the whole city. So that this system of wards lends itself to a great deal of argument on either side. I am however, not prepared to vote against the ward system if it comes before the House as a practical system. It might or might not be advantageous. It would depend largely upon the class of man voting and the class of man likely to be elected.

The point, however, attempted to be made here in this House last Tuesday by the opponents of this Act was that by the passage of this present measure the value likely to flow from the work of the Commission might be curtailed or affected. I do not admit that most of the matter the Board reports on can seriously be affected by statute. If you will read the report tabled here you will find that nine-tenths of it deals with matters that can not be affected by legislation at all. A great deal has been said about a charter, but I think the only thing we want is to get half a dozen good men who will honestly carry out the public services you have. Nine-tenths of this report deals with matters in no way connected with the Legislature. Every reform they have made since the assumption of their tenure of office has been made without any reference to the Legislature. What they have done in the past they can very easily do in the future. There is much room for improvement on matters that are purely questions of administration. Is there anything more thoroughly disgusting than the way ashes and garbage are collected in this town? Is there anything worse you can imagine? From

the hours of nine or ten at night until twelve in the morning the receptacles for ashes and garbage are overfilled with every conceivable sort of commodity, garbage, papers, nuisance, tins, cuttings from tailors' shops, cuttings from tinmiths' shops. Then about eleven at night a large body of men come up and begin seriously cleaning up the streets. There is no need of legislation to remedy this shocking state of affairs. A covered receptacle to receive this garbage would remove much that was disgusting from the sight of people who have to pass along these roads. I had for many years my office on Henry Street opposite the Star of the Sea Hall and I never went through that street in the morning on my way to that office at ten o'clock in the day but I saw men cleaning up the filth that had accumulated in the streets there the night before. I mention this not to put any blame on past Councils or the present Board of Commissioners. In fact I have gone through this town with Mr. Goeling and pointed out this very objectionable condition of things and given ideas of my own for their amelioration. Other reforms can be effected in the same way. In this report you will notice many interesting things the Board propose taking up, chiefly regulations of various kinds. The intention of the Council is to draft an entirely new document utilizing such sections of the old one as are applicable. There is no objection to the Council reforming the present Act and arranging and codifying it. But when they get down to work they will find it very difficult to find a single improvement not covered by this Act. A member of the Board not long ago pointed out to me the condition of things at Hoylestown. He informed me that he could do great things when the new charter came into force. I pointed out to him that ev-

ery bit of that land was in the municipality, just as much as Cochrane Street or LeMarchant Road. A new charter is not necessary to remedy that. The Council recommend that certain boundaries of the City should be speedily extended. Well, as far as I can see there is no objection to that. That can go on whether there is a Council or a Board. The only difference between the Council and an ordinary corporation lies in the limitation of cash the Council may spend; but that may be somewhat of an advantage to the Council, because they get their loans through the Government's credit. It would indeed be most desirable to give the Council a large and sufficient scope to carry out their proposals as it is decidedly a disadvantage from every point of view to have every little point brought up here to this House. I think the Council ought to be granted whatever may be necessary in the way of rights and privileges for the performance of the duties incumbent upon it.

I understand that they intend to recommend the Legislature to give the franchise to every person over twenty-one residing within the Municipality and paying taxes. Under that everyone will have a vote whether he lives in a house of his own or who is taxed for water and sewerage, or in any other way. Then they propose to place additional responsibility upon the heads of the various departments; more responsibility on the Engineer and Secretary and on the other officers. There could be no objection to that. Then they go on to point out the various heads under which this matter has been taken up. First—city boundaries. Secondly incorporation for certain purposes, and so on. Then they propose to vest in the city all the public works of the city, its roads, bridges, and other public works. At the present time the

Council has complete control of these but it appears that there might be some doubt as to their actual ownership. Their term of office is to be brought into accordance with the Fiscal year. Election to be at large or by wards, as decided; but as to the question which was raised here for discussion, namely, the change from elective Councils, although it is within their power to recommend that, still, I know enough of the matter to say that there will be no recommendation by this Board to go back to government by commission. Then it is proposed to give more general powers to the Council to pass bye-laws in relation to proceedings of the Council, city cleaning, official buildings and so forth; then they deal with the water supply. As a matter of fact there is a great deal of all this dealt with in the present bill. Then there are provisions for street lighting, and regarding the question of taxes. Then there are two or three pages dealing with officials; the duties of the Secretary and Treasurer; the duties of the City Engineer in relation to water and sewerage; duties of the Auditor and Medical Health Officer; of the Sanitary Supervisors, of Impounders and other officers; Regulations in regard to the dog tax and so forth.

Now my point is that a year ago the present Board was created and they were given a year to enquire into the present city government and various services in connection therewith. They have been in power nearly a year, having been appointed in June, and it is now proposed that a further term of six months should be given them so that they may continue to make inquiry into these various questions and how they can be improved and reformed. The only argument in favour of their appointment at the time was the fact that petitions for that pur-

pose had been signed by citizens to the number of three thousand, petitions asking for a Municipal reform. They were justified as citizens in making a movement to bring about reform in their city and in asking for the appointment of those who would make some enquiries. A year has passed and if the present Legislation is not enacted at the end of June, we will have to hold an election without having done anything. It is proposed now to give them another six months, until December, to hold an election then, and in the election to use the old form of Government. When the Board is going out in December they can make a report and make certain recommendations towards Legislation; but the Board elected in December will be elected under the old charter. Whatever is in their report, whatever recommends itself to the members of this House will be put into law at the next session, and there can be no doubt but that the Board elected in December will carry out the new law. I believe that the Board elected in December will be favourable to the reform in Municipal government recommended by the present Commissioners. As I said before I know a little about this Municipality, I do not mean that I am the only one. There are members on both sides that know just as much as I do; but I do not think that I can be contradicted when I say that the old Councils have done very good work considering that they have been limited in their means. I think we will be safe in assuming that if they are elected in December any reasonable recommendation that will be left behind by the present Commissioners will be carried out by them. They will have to carry it out because the report will come before this House and any proposal which they make in

regard to taxation or Municipal Government which appeals to this House will be put into Law. Some may say that the present Board may suggest a commission. They may give their recommendation to this form of Government, and then we will have a Board elected in December that will go out when the House meets, but I do not think that this House is going back to the old form of appointing a Board. Every member of this House has supported a bill which is now before the Upper Chamber to give every man in Newfoundland the right to appoint his own Board, and I do not think that we are going back to the days of '98 when elective councils were done away with by the Government of that day, when we had government by commission under Messrs. Burchell and Bradshaw. It turned out a dismal failure. There is no check on the Commissioners, as you have in the case of an elective board, because you have not the check of the ballot box. I would be the last in the world to be a party to any measure that would lessen the value that will come from the present form of government. Of course this present Board has done very good work. I know the work they have done because I have been in touch with them ever since they were appointed, and as one of the representatives of the city I have to be in continual touch with the Council in regard to matters arising almost daily. Under the present bill they will be given six months more to complete their report and when that report is tabled next year so much of it as recommends itself to this House will be put into law, and I am quite sure that elective councils will be the only form of government that will receive the support of this House, and I am equally sure that the incoming Board elected in

December, will continue to carry out the reforms left behind.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I beg to move an amendment to Section 1 in relation to dates. I do not think that there is any necessity for me to cover any more ground than I did yesterday, as I said then I think it desirable to keep the present Commission in power until we meet again and consider the recommendations and deal with their report; and consider the charter that they will recommend. That charter will be brought into being at the next session of this House and it should be the charter under which the first Council should be elected. There is nothing to my mind in the laboured argument of the Prime Minister that will affect the principle which I have laid down. There is nothing to justify holding an election until the new Act has been brought into force. There is no reason why we should not keep the present Commission in power, until we put the charter proposed in their report to the test. There has been no argument brought forward by the members on either side which will change that principle. Last year I spoke against this form of Government. This afternoon the remarks of the Premier have been that faint praise that damns. It damns the report before it is brought in; it damns the charter before we see it. We are practically told that no one can bring in any charter more acceptable to this House than the Act that is already on the Statute Book. If that is so then it was a most extraordinary proceeding to appoint a commission twelve months ago. I have no desire to labour the matter. I have already expressed my opinion, and I do not desire to prolong the debate by going over the ground again. It is clear enough, however, that the gentlemen in charge of this Commission do think that a new

charter is desirable; whether they are right or not is a matter which we should be able to know later on. This Commission was brought in being to recommend any reforms that they might think necessary, and I think it would be a great mistake to elect a Board under the old law before we have considered the work which has been done. They were appointed to consider a new incorporation charter. Their other work was merely incidental and that means reform. The Premier let the cat out of the bag that their work has been absolutely futile.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I made no such statement.

MR. LLOYD—Now let me finish. I repeat Sir, that the whole of the time of this Committee this afternoon was occupied listening to the Premier making clear to everyone that he considered that the work of the Commission was futile so far as drafting a new charter is concerned. I challenge anyone to deny that that was the impression left on the mind. The position is that the Commission was given certain work to do. That meant work with the drafting of a new charter, and we are asked this afternoon before that charter is brought into being that a Council should be elected under the old regime and should be allowed to come into power. There is no reason for it. The only alleged reason is that the fiscal year will begin on January first. Now even if that advantage is granted it would only affect future boards. The difficulty would only apply during the first six months of the year 1916, because after that the Council would be able to make their estimates as on December 31st so that in future other Councils can begin the fiscal year in January. It is proposed to attain that end by putting into power men that have not the slightest sympathy with the work that has been done by the Com-

mission, and the Premier himself has clearly enough shown no sympathy with the idea of a new charter. The new Council would be of exactly the same frame of mind as those who were turned out by the present Board. Having given the Commission work to do we should allow them to do it, and no new state of affairs should be brought into being before the new Council is elected. No election should be held under the old regulations until we meet again and the new bill is put in, and in order to give effect to that I move that in section 1 subsection 1, third line, the words 'December, 1915,' be stricken out and there be substituted the words, 'June, 1916,' and on the fifth line the word 'January' be stricken out and the word 'July' substituted. The effect of this would be to allow the House to deal with the proposed bill next year and provide for an election to be held under the new regime.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to make any lengthy remarks upon the questions now before the Chair, I do not think that this is a matter that should be regarded in a party light and I do not intend to deal with it in that way. Last year we were engaged considering petitions from a large number of citizens of St. John's asking that the control of the Municipality of the city be handed over to a Board of Commissioners for a period of twelve months. Certain recommendations were made by a Committee of citizens on civic reform, and this Board was appointed for the purpose of giving them time to consider these suggestions. That Board has given good attention to the work but has not, as far as I have been able to ascertain, been able to finish the work which they undertook. I think the citizens of St. John's owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Gosling and his colleagues for the manner in which

they have performed their duties. They have not had time to finish their work for the reasons stated in the report, and the present bill is to give them sufficient time to finish their work. If we were looking for a slogan of battle on this question I would suggest, 'Let Gosling finish his work,' and I think in view of what has been done by the present Board if these gentlemen could be induced to continue in office for another twelve months it would be a great advantage to the city. I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the Prime Minister, and I know there is no one in the city who knows more, and is more capable of forming an opinion upon Municipal affairs than he, and so I listened with a great deal of attention to what he had to say in reference to the question, and I concurred in the main with everything that he said; but I disagree with him so far as one point is concerned and that is the extending of the term of office up to December next. I would suggest an extension of another six months to give them until June, 1916. I understand that some of the members of the Board are desirous of getting relief from these duties. Anyone who looks at the work done by them must know that they have gone to work about the performance of these duties in a most businesslike way. There is not a man on that Board who is not a busy man, and they have been prepared to give considerable time in the interest of the city and it will be very bad if we do not give them sufficient time to finish the work which they undertook. I agree with the proposal made by the learned member for Trinity.

I can't see, Sir, any good reason why their term in office should not be extended for twelve months instead of six months. I do not mean to say that the members of the board are

seeking that office, but if we could induce them to remain I think it would be a great advantage to the city.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would make it quite clear that no member of the Board has asked for an extension of time. They have not asked this; on the contrary some have intimated that they do not want to stop longer. The legislature must be prepared to endeavour to keep them here. This bill was brought in for this very reason. We hold it is not desirable to let them go. We are asking them to continue for six months in office and then go out and study, and with their 18 months' experience formulate the charter required. We must see this thing through now we have started. A great deal of the work will require no legislation, and can be accomplished in the six months. The fixing of the six months does not mean that the present is an undesirable state.

What I said at the beginning of the session was this: That no charter could be a very great improvement on the present Act. I did not suggest that the present system is incapable of improvement. But the present Act is founded on an experience of thirty years.

DR. LLOYD—The Rt. Hon. member is fully persuaded in his mind that any changes will be but of slight importance.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Great reforms and great good may be accomplished which will not need legislation. The present act has worked for twenty years without the necessity of a change. Most of the reforms needed are in administration.

DR. LLOYD—The reforms are mainly administrative, and with regard to the new charter, I undoubtedly agree with what the Premier said. It is quite clear the Board does not agree.

What has been the reason they have done nothing but that they have been up against it. The reason for their not having completed the charter they say is 'no time to consider it.' That shows the natural differences between themselves. Otherwise they would want to be put in charge again to finish their work.

MR. CLAPP—Just one or two words Mr. Chairman, on this subject. The main point is whether the adoption of this is going to prejudice the city itself or not. These men have done noble work in sacrificing their time. They have also done it gratuitously. Now this House is asked for more time for them to consider the measure to be put before this House. Is the House or this city going to be any worse off in the hands of these people for a few months more who for 12 months past have done their work so thoroughly? They must have the interests of the city at heart. I quite agree with my hon. friend, Dr. Lloyd, that there is nothing they hope to gain by it. Why not allow them to finish their work. The bill will be brought in, and anything objectionable can then be removed. The city will know best the men to place in office. I think Dr. Lloyd's remarks in the main are good. This bill does not affect out harbours. I therefore think that the out harbour members will be convinced they will be doing their duty to let the present Commission rest. I agree with Dr. Lloyd and support his amendment.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Chairman. I would suggest allowing these men to stay in power, and paying them. They are doing the work for nothing but the pleasure of doing it now, and will get credit only on what is the result of their labours. I do not see why it should be necessary to have these men work for nothing like this. We have a Board of Works responsible for pub-

lic works of this sort, and I think that department ought to compensate them for their work. Everyone will admit the value of the work done, and no one can pass through the city without appreciating it. The city however, is in a very poor state, and I would lay the stigma upon the Board of Public Works.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I did not intend joining in this debate Mr. Chairman, but I think I must defend this attack on the Board of Works, made in the remarks of my honourable friend. I might inform my hon. friend that this department is at present much overworked.

MR. DWYER—Overworked!

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Yes, there is more than enough work for the officials there. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that it is hardly fair to blame that Board for the present state. However, the Chairman of that Board is prepared to take all that may be coming to him on account of that department, and to answer same. In reference to the bill, there seems to be some difference of opinion as to whether the time should be extended or not.

I have no doubt but that the incoming Board will be as good as this present Board. The present has certainly done great work, and they deserve compensation, but the one point I would like to refer to is as regards the extension of the boundaries of the city. There have been lately a great many large residences built just outside and within a few rods of the city, and just far enough away to escape taxation. They enjoy all the advantages of the city on account of their proximity and yet are exempt from any taxation. I think a great deal of revenue might be derived from residents on such property if the boundaries would be extended all around the city, but especially in the north-

erly direction. I think that the matter ought to be taken into consideration.

Another matter I think ought to be considered in the present system of dealing with rubbish. Everywhere we see evidences of lack of energy on the part of the employees of this department, and I think a thorough reconstruction of this branch would mean a saving of thousands of dollars to the city. The Council ought to pursue the men in charge of that department and see that the work is correctly done. There is no earthly good reason why there should be so much dust in this place, but we have it, and as a result we swallow it and ruin our clothes with it, and have filthy houses. What we want now is responsible men to take charge of this work. We want good, strong, determined men who will see this thing through. It is my hope that the men will be found to make a great improvement in the management of this town.

The amendment proposed by Dr. Lloyd was put and lost.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Chairman, there is a small amendment which I propose to put in there (section 11.) In stead of 'Outside of this colony,' I propose to put in 'Not being a resident of the city.'

I had a letter today from the Chairman of the Commission Mr. Gosling, in relation to another small amendment that I think will be agreeable to the House. The section that the Chairman refers to was passed in 1910, and is as follows,—'In any contract hereafter made for letting for habitation a house or part thereof within the municipal limits of St. John's, of the yearly rent value not exceeding fifty dollars, there shall be implied a condition that the house or portion thereof is at the commencement of the holding in all respects reasonably fit

for human habitation, and that the house or part thereof shall during the holding be kept by the owner or lessee in all respects reasonably fit for human habitation.' Well, there you will notice the rent is fixed at \$50. In the one case which they took under it the rent was \$60. I now propose an amendment by striking out the words 'fifty dollars' and substituting therefor the words 'one hundred dollars.'

DR. LLOYD—I would suggest that instead of doing it in that form we should repeal the whole section and adopt it again, leaving these words out.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Well, then, the section will read in this way: 'In any contract hereafter made for letting for habitation a house or part thereof within the municipal limits of St. John's, there shall be implied' etc., without saying how much the rent is—making no limitation.

MR. MORINE—In the case of a man hiring a house for \$200, why not imply the condition that it be sanitary and fit for human habitation?

MR. COAKER—There are lots of houses at \$100 which have not got it. It looks to me like getting after the smaller houses.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

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

PACKING CO. RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions confirming an Agreement be-

tween the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland American Packing Co.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

DR. LLOYD—Has this Company undertaken any work so far?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The only thing I know is that they have for a considerable while been negotiating with Mr. Clouston of this city. He has been doing something in the business of dealing with boneless fish, and as far as he has gone I think he has been successful. He is acting for them, and I think they have an option on his property in the east end.

DR. LLOYD—You have no information?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. MORINE—Do you know anything about their capital?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No.

DR. LLOYD—As a matter of fact I heard that some contract had been entered into.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I don't think any contract has been finalized. I think they have been in correspondence with Mr. Clouston. Beyond that, I don't know that anything has been done. I don't know what their capital is, or whether they have made any contract, but I am making enquiries. I have no information that I could absolutely state to the House. If I had, of course, I can appreciate that it would be of value in connection with putting this measure through.

When I was in New York in January I met some of these people, but I have nothing definite. In the meantime, as I say, I am making enquiries and when we pass the second reading I will have their incorporation pa-

pers. Personally I know nothing whatever about any contract.

DR. LLOYD—What is the actual course in reference to these contracts?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We pass the contract section by section.

DR. LLOYD—Are we dealing with the contract now or the resolutions?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—With the resolutions.

DR. LLOYD—I would suggest that we begin with the contract.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I wish to make a few remarks on the Bill. I may say that, in the main, I am one of many on this side of the House who realize the importance of Cold Storage and who trust that this project will be successful. The remarks that I shall address to the Committee on the matter will not be to the end that this contract be rejected. They will be merely referring to the meaning of the contract and on the point whether or not it should be amended. The main point in the contract is that the Government will undertake to give a guarantee to assist the earnings of the Company, should the ordinary earnings fall, so as to enable the Company to pay a dividend of 5 per cent. Now, this is not a new feature of such contracts. So far as I remember, there has never been a contract brought into this House that this clause has not elicited considerable debate. I wish to point out, in the course of my remarks, that the results of previous debates have not been taken advantage of in formulating the resolutions in this particular case. It is proposed in the first place that the term of the guarantee shall extend fifteen years, and there is an implication throughout the whole contract that the agreement shall only

last for fifteen years. I say, there is an implication, because, although it is not expressly stated, that is the suggestion, I would suggest that a resolution be passed making it clear that the agreement is to terminate at the end of fifteen years. Now, in reference to this guarantee, I wish to draw attention to the wording of that, and to make the matter clear I would go back into the history of such agreements and point out that in one of the earlier agreements the guarantee is that the earnings shall be brought up in such a way, shall be added to in such a way that the Company shall be enabled to declare five per cent. on the cash invested in a particular form of the industry, in connection with the cold storage of fresh fish. An objection was raised to that if the company met losses and were unable to declare any dividend, that this would entail on the government first of all making good all the losses, and then a sufficient addition to that to enable them to declare a dividend of five per cent. The first amendment which was made on one of the earlier contracts was to cut out the loss liability. That was done by stating that the guarantee should not exceed a certain sum. You have the same principle here. There is an assumption here that the guarantee is not to exceed 5 per cent. of that \$500,000, in all the guarantee shall not exceed \$25,000. Well, now, that is an adoption of the principle which was agreed upon in one of the earlier measures and the object of it was to cut out the loss and to guarantee no more than five per cent. on the cash invested in that particular form of the industry. In the Trefethan & Lord contract there was another provision made. By the way, I don't know whether the Premier has the contract?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—
I will get it for you.

DR. LLOYD—If I remember rightly, the principle adopted was this: That the guarantee should not exceed five per cent. of whatever the capital might be that was invested, and that the total amount of such guarantee to all parties should be limited to a capital which should not exceed \$500,000. Now, let me give an example that I wish to take. Here we are contemplating an investment of \$500,000. Suppose, however, that you take the case of one factory or two factories, and assume, for the first year, that the capital invested in the cold storage plant is \$250,000. We should still be liable under this agreement to the extent of \$25,000, although that is ten per cent. on the cash actually expended. That is, we should be liable in that case, if they met a loss of 5 per cent. to make good that loss and also to continue paying a dividend until they were able to do so, because the only limitation proposed is this limitation of \$25,000. Now, if the cash investment in the cold storage plant for the first year happened to be \$125,000, and not \$500,000, and they met a very severe loss, we should be still bound to pay them \$25,000 if that were necessary.

There is also another point that I want to draw the attention of the committee to. If this contract is of any value to these people then ten years guarantee is ample, and I think that it would be reasonable to limit the time to ten years which, for a guarantee is a pretty long time. I would like to draw your attention to section 4; I would suggest a verbal change there, in relation to the employment of labour. It appears to me that, entering into this contract, we have nothing but faith to rely on. Then again in section 3; the very fact that there is no reference to Crown Lands in that

act, suggests that it is not meant to be included, and in section 9 there is the same objection. We are bringing this company which gets so much of its raw material duty free to come into competition with other factories which cannot sell their products at such a low price, and the fishermen will suffer. I draw the attention of the government to that fact, that they may give it some consideration. I am glad to see that the Government has seen the necessity of putting in such a clause as in section 13. Now, Sir, the main objections to the resolution is the questions of guarantee. We are asked to legislate on almost everything. To my mind the whole thing is rather incongruous, and it is the most important question of the contract. However, with many amendments I think that this bill may be made a reasonable one. I wish to repeat that a period of ten years is long enough for the guarantee.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few observations at this stage of the committee. I am not one of those on this side of the House who support this measure. All down through the years we have been considering contracts such as this, and nothing has ever come out of them. A short time ago, I had it laid down to me by a gentleman of experience in these matters, who said that it was a safe principle to go by, that any company looking for a guarantee was not safe. I have no faith in the man who would come into the country and carry on a matter of this kind, trying to induce people to make investments by starting out and asking for a guarantee. You agree to give these people a 15 years guarantee, and at the end of that time the business drops. Any one who looks at this matter from a commercial standpoint, would not be attracted by it. If there is a commercial future before this, they do not want a petty guarantee for such a

small concern as this. A great objection is that you are making the way for imposing tremendous customs duties in the future. You are making all sort of agreements and petty regulations of one kind and another. It is irritating to think that we are giving so much and getting so little in return. I know that this is only a small matter, but it is the principle at the bottom of it that I object to. These contractors seem to get whatever they ask. My opposition in this matter is based upon principle.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks in reply to what my hon. friend has just said. In the general principle that he laid down, I entirely concur, but in dealing with conditions in this country we have to do unusual things. This is the only country in the world where there is no cold storage plant. They have it all over the United States and Canada. We have no means of sending codfish or herring out of this country, not because we haven't got the commodities, but because we cannot sell them. I do not know any other way of inducing people to come here and take an interest in the matter, than by giving them these concessions. When I was in Liverpool I saw different birds in cold storage, which were ten and twelve years old. I saw salmon ten years old in New York. This is an attempt to bring a company to start cold storage. Looking at the matter from the worst standpoint: suppose that we had to pay the whole \$25,000; it might be worse. As a matter of fact, this contract is based on the act which was introduced by the Government of 1898, of which my hon. friend was a member. It was passed in 1898 and nothing came of it. I am not saying that in any sense of complaint, but it shows that even as far back as 1898, Governments were looking around for some way of inducing people to come

here and start cold storage. The Government of Sir Robert Bond entered into an elaborate contract, but nothing came of it. Now we have the proposition from these people in New York, who are prepared to come here and establish a cold storage plant. Then my learned friend said that any contract looking for a guarantee was no good. Take for example the case of the contract for building the Canadian railway which is being completed by the Canadian Government, and also the Rope Walk to which a subsidy was given here many years ago, of \$50,000. The materials came in duty free. Now the Rope Walk has expanded and is paying 10% and receives no subsidy. That is the effect of helping that institution. The late Moses Monroe came before the Legislature at that time and asked for the terms. The reason why we have not cold storage here is because we are not enterprising enough. That is the answer to the point made by my learned friend. He referred to the tying up of customs duties. It is only for 15 years. Now nearly all the items here are on the free list already. I think if you look you will find that that is so.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, just a word or two. The fact that we passed an Act in 1898 giving a guarantee is rather an argument against this. Our experience from 1898 down to the present time shows there is no advantage in doing it; and the fact that we have tried this method for seventeen years is now an argument against continuing it. Whatever may have been my opinions in 1898 I have now come to the conclusion that it is not a good principle.

Again there is the question as to whether the price we would get for our fish from cold storage in competition with other fish would be sufficient to pay for the cost of cold storing it. Now the Premier spoke about the fish sold in Canadian and Ameri-

can cities. Now that fish is caught in the waters immediately adjoining these coasts and the difference between the price of their fish and the price of our fish is not sufficient to pay us to put our fish in cold storage and take it there. The hon. member spoke of mutton. It is quite true that Australian mutton is put in cold storage and brought to England sold there in competition with native mutton at a price quite sufficient to make it profitable; but it does not follow that it would pay us to put our fish in cold storage and take it up to the United States and sell it in competition with the fish there. However, it may be taken for granted that if this market is offered and there is reasonable expectation of profitable business in this direction some of our business men will be found only too ready to engage in it. Of course it must be remembered that nearly all foods deteriorate in cold storage and will not command anything like the price of the fresh article sold in the same market. We all know for instance that the poultry coming here from the United States no matter how well preserved in cold storage, is very different from the fresh article. I do not think, Sir, that we should give this guarantee.

HON. MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS

—Mr. Speaker, just a word on this subject. I do not altogether agree with the honourable gentlemen on the other side of the house when he intimates that this proposition needs too much encouragement, and if there was anything in it it would not need so much encouragement. Now look at it first from the fisherman's standpoint. Where are we in cold storage as far as bait is concerned? We all know how much the fishermen all over the Island often suffer in the months of July, August and September for lack of bait; how much time

they lose trying to get bait, and we all know what it would mean to the revenue if these fishermen were well supplied with bait during these months. We all know that heretofore cold storage of bait has not been a success from a business standpoint. There are two reasons for that. The first couple of years that cold storage was tried at Petty Harbour the owners of that plant put down a certain amount of squid. Now the first two years the fishermen did not take kindly to this frozen squid, and they could not be blamed because bait was plentiful and all they had to do was to put overboard a bigger and get all they wanted. In those years fish was low in price, and there was abundance of squid all around the island and the promoters of this enterprise received very little encouragement. But it is when the fresh squid cannot be got that the fishermen need the cold storage bait. Now within the last two months an enterprising merchant of Grand Bank imported a cargo of squid from Providence and sold them to the fishermen at five or six cents a pound, and one gentleman told me that it had been estimated that the purchasers of that bait caught on it about fifty thousand dollars worth of fish. Now if that can be done with one cargo what would be the earnings of the fishermen if we could supply bait to all our fishermen during the months of July, August and September. I have seen fishermen, day after day get up at one o'clock in the morning leave home and go five miles to the fishing grounds and come back in the evening without a fish owing to the want of bait. Now to leave the bait question and come to the question of codfish. Owing to the price codfish is today there is no necessity of putting it in cold storage. There is no necessity when it is worth eight dollars quintal to

put it into cold storage. Now several governments have dealt with this cold storage proposition. I think Mr. Morine said the first Act was introduced in this House in 1898. Well when you take up that Act and come to analyse that Act and see what help you would get from it in putting up cold storage plants around the island you will find it a pretty hard proposition. But this Act is a different proposition. We want them to put up plants worth about five thousand dollars. They can be filled with squid. It is a bait that is easy to keep, and can be used all the year. If you put up caplin you can only use it for bait during the caplin school. Squid as I said can be used at any time and will keep well for eight or ten months. Now I think a proposition like the one we have before us to-day should receive every encouragement. If you can furnish squid to 120 bankers next spring and they go on the grounds in March and April and they can catch four or five hundred quintals of fish each it will more than offset the five per cent. guarantee under this Contract. I think this bait question is one of the most serious problems that can come before the House.

Take the Coast of Nova Scotia for instance. There are over 150 bankers from Lunenburg and the surrounding countries going to the bank fishery this spring. Where do they get the bait. Each and every one had bait secured last January and February out of cold storage. In February I was in Halifax and was talking to a gentleman who had something like ten or fifteen vessels going to the Grand Banks and he told me they were baited with herring that had been brought from Green Bay and put in cold storage. I do not see why we should not be able to accomplish something like this here on a small scale, and if these people are coming here they certainly

are not coming for the 5% we are to pay them. On the other hand I am sure they are not going to come without they receive this encouragement. I think Mr. Chairman, that this House ought to pass the Bill and give it all the support and encouragement possible. I know the question of bait supply around this Island is a heavy question to solve and if we can in any way improve the situation I think we will be doing as much for Newfoundland as has been done for a long time, and when a proposition like this comes before the House I feel we cannot treat it too liberally.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on this Bill. I have listened very attentively to the speeches from the legal gentlemen on the other side whose business it is to criticise the Bill, and any Bill that comes up here; and quite rightly so, because if they did not do that the Government might bring up some bills that would have to be criticised by its own members. I agree with the last speaker, the Hon. Mr. Cashin in quite a number of his remarks. There is a great loss to this country every year because we have not enough bait to keep our fishermen going. This is well known to every man interested in our fisheries. The hon. member Mr. Morine did not think there was salmon exported from British Columbia. Well if he will look up the Canadian statistics he will find there are thousands of pounds exported annually from British Columbia to the United States in cold storage and right down to Montreal and Toronto. Not only is salmon exported all along that part from the Fraser River and other rivers in British Columbia; but last year some was exported to Great Britain via New York. This venture was not repeated owing to the conditions then prevailing, but it is believed when the war ceases a great trade

can be developed with Great Britain.

He also stated that he thought no good would come from this cold storage business. Well, that is only his opinion, and it is one privilege given to us all that each can have his own opinion. Well that is not my opinion, although mine may not be worth any more than his. The hon. member for Ferryland pointed out one great benefit, and that would be the supplying of bait. Herring are imported into the United States in cold storage from British Columbia and sold in Boston and New York at three cents a pound. They can be shipped from Vancouver across Canada in refrigerator cars and sold in Gloucester to the fishermen for three cents a pound. They come down here to Bay of Islands and bring up our herring and sell them for five cents a pound. Now the reason of this is he does not want to sell our Newfoundland herring for bait. They would rather sell them in the market in their frozen state.

It was also stated by Mr. Cashin that a cargo of squid was imported into Grand Bank and sold for five or six cents a pound there. Cargoes were also imported into Lunenburg from Providence; and there were cargoes of squid sold at St. Jacques and Rose Blanche this year. This I think ought to show this House the benefit of cold storage as far as bait is concerned. When I was at Rose Blanche Mr. Harvey had a cold storage plant there and I was delighted to see the fishermen coming in with ten to twenty five quintals of fish per boat. I myself saw the men coming up to the cold storage plant and buying bait for five cents a pound I said to one of them, 'This must be a great convenience to you,' and he said it certainly was, and that the boats came from all directions to get this bait.

Now nearly anybody who is a fisherman will agree with me there is one

thing that all governments have neglected and that is this question of bait supply. There is one thing I do not agree with in this Bill. Instead of having three cold storage plants on land the Company should be forced to have two on land and one floating cold storage plant. I hope if this Company ever comes here the Government will insist that they build and equip a cold storage steamer capable of carrying so many thousand pounds of bait, and go around our coast and the Labrador coast and sell to the fishermen; because on the Labrador coast we annually lose thousands of quintals of fish through lack of bait.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

EXPORT OF TIMBER BILL.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law respecting the Export of Timber.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, May 13th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 13th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a petition from Middle

Brook, Gambo, in the District of Bonavista. This petition which is largely signed asks that the sum of two hundred dollars be allocated for the purpose of making a road down there. The petitioners state that the absence of this road causes considerable inconvenience as the people of that place have to utilize private land in order to get to the water-front. I sincerely hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant the prayer of this petition; and beg leave to refer it to the department to which it relates.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Morine gave notice of question.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary: (1) if any appointment has been made to fill the vacancy at Government House caused by the death of Mr. Ellis, the late gardener there; (2) if any salary has been paid on this account since the death of Mr. Ellis; if so, what amount and to whom paid.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of all monies paid to Messrs. Kennedy Bros and Messrs. Sprait Bros. for work done in or around the General Hospital for the years 1912-1913 and 1914.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

This is being prepared. I expect it will be up some time this afternoon.

MR. STONE asked the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Justice, to lay upon the table of the House a copy of all correspondence, if any, relating to the case of the Crown vs. Frank Murphy, of Placentia, and others in 1914, with reference to breach of the Game Laws, the amount of the fines imposed, and if the said fines were paid.

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

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the

house the total cost to the Government of the Daily Telegraph Message from Halifax, with details of this expenditure and of the amounts paid by all parties in this country for using this message in newspapers and otherwise.

MR STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary for a statement of Parcel Post arrangements covering frequency of service and the reason why we are not served by the cross-country train.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I shall have the former question ready to-morrow. The latter part I beg to table now.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 5, George V., Session, 1, Cap. 10, entitled "An Act respecting Municipal Affairs, and for other purposes in connection with the St. John's Municipal Council" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message, requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

PETITIONS RE PRODUCTS BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave of the House, Mr. Howley K.C. appeared at the Bar and presented arguments on behalf of his clients respecting alleged possible injury to their interests arising out of the contract entered into between the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited. The Companies represented by Mr. Howley, K.C. were as follows: The Labrador Pulp and Lumber Company, Ltd., The American and Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Company, The International Timber Company, The St. George's Lumber Company, Ltd.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman: I do not propose to ask the committee to discuss the matter of supply this afternoon; but I would like to explain the several votes. I think that each member will find on his desk a copy of the Supplementary Supply for the current fiscal year, amounting to \$167,629.97 in all.

For the Premier's Office we require \$1,500 for incidentals, the appropriation being inadequate to meet the claims for cablegrams, telegrams, and other services, there being a large increase as hon. members will easily understand, because of the war.

For the Colonial Secretary's Department we require \$8,224.44, which I shall describe in detail. We ask \$2,200 on account of the Census, and vital statistics, of this \$2,000 is to pay the cost of binding and printing the additional volumes of the census. In past decades the census returns consisted of two volumes, but this time there will be four, two of which have already been issued and the third will be ready in about two months' time. The information obtained through the last census is about double what has been obtained from any previous census, and the cost of printing is increased accordingly. For the Vital Statistics Office we require \$200 to pay special bonuses to registering offices who forward their returns promptly. This was previously paid by the Tuberculosis Commission, and since that body has ceased work the Department of Vital Statistics has assumed liability for the bonuses. For consolidation of laws we require \$3,521.41, representing a payment of \$500 each to the seven members of the Commission, and a small sum for incidentals. For the Sealing Commission we require \$2,500. to pay the fees of each

of the judges, \$500 apiece, and \$260 to the Secretary and Stenographer, while the balance represents payments of witnesses and other incidentals.

For the contingencies of the Colonial Secretary's Office we require \$1,000, mainly for telegraphing, owing to the increased volume of work in this connection arising from the war and also for stationery and sundry expenses.

For the Marine and Fisheries Department we require \$200, \$100 for an increase to the stenographer and \$100 for an increase to the lighthouse mechanic, both voted last year, but omitted in the Estimates; and for the contingencies of the Marine and Fisheries Department \$3,400 are required. A Minute of Council provided \$2,374.43 of this sum, but as \$990 of lighthouse contingencies have been charged to the Marine and Fisheries vote, we ask for the extra \$1,025.48.

The Public Works Department requires \$2,750 for fuel, \$2,500 being for the post offices and telegraph offices in the outports, and \$250 for the departmental buildings in the outports. The amounts voted last year were inadequate, many new offices have been opened, each of which required an amount of coal. In Grand Falls, Bay Roberts and Hr. Grace Buildings, the quantities of coal required for these buildings cannot yet be determined until after the winter's experience. This vote is to cover coal supplied, but not provided for. The vote of \$1,000 last year was not sufficient.

For Insurance and Keepers we require for the Harbour Grace public buildings \$375. Mr. Thomas Tobin, caretaker, salary \$150. Requisites, \$40; Francis Martin, fireman, salary \$135; Paul Higgins, to attend to repairs, winding and upkeep of clock in public buildings, and also all clocks in public offices and buildings in Hr. Grace, \$50 salary. These men were

appointed by the Government in July of the financial year.

For the Grand Falls public building \$400. H. Whitmarsh, caretaker, appointed in November, began work in May, 1914, salary to caretaker \$360. Requisites, \$40.

For that at Bay Roberts, \$440. G. Snow, caretaker, salary \$400, and requisites, \$40.

For the Museum in St. John's, \$120. Increase in Fireman's salary from \$420 to \$540.

Then again, for repairs to public buildings, we need for the completion of the Grand Falls building \$2,500; for that at Bay Roberts, \$2,950; for the Grand Bank Court House \$1,600; for the Analyst's office in the Court House at St. John's, \$300; for the gardener's salary at Government House \$520, and for Mercer's Cove Postal Telegraph Office, \$650, making a total of \$8,580. There is also a sum of \$2,200 required to cover repairs done to the plumbing and heating plants in various public buildings. For the Government Engineer's Office we require \$1,150, in connection with the Branch Railway Trust Account, for salaries, travelling and living expenses, etc., for April, May and June.

For the Head of Administration of Justice we require \$20 to increase the salary of Edward Collins, Jailer at Placentia, raised by Minute of Council; for police annuities, we require \$187.50 as pension to Constable Petter, of Twillingate, who has been retired owing to ill health; for registration of Jurors we ask \$300, the vote not being sufficient, and the account always over-expended; for constabulary uniforms we need \$700, as a delayed shipment of clothing last year placed this amount in the current fiscal year, whereas if it had arrived in due time the payment would have been made out of the vote for last year, which stood in credit nearly \$600, and which

became a dropped balance; for Constabulary salaries under the cable service vote we ask \$3,500, to pay for the work, board, and lodging of special constables guarding the cable stations in the Colony because of the war. We also ask \$400 for constabulary conveyance, to cover the expenses of necessary transfers of the men, the vote of \$1,000 taken to cover the same not being sufficient this year because of the frequent movements of men owing to the war. For the Fire Department we ask \$300 towards additional aid, representing grants to reserve men of the South Side and City Stations, as there have been heavier requirements than usual this year in connection with the reserve men.

The Finance Department requires \$750 for Supreme Court contingencies and \$1,500 for magistrates' contingencies, but these figures represent a reduction of \$250 on the former and \$500 on the latter as compared with the special votes last year. Under the Public Works Department the police station at St. John's, \$300 for supplies and maintenance for the Penitentiary in the same way, and \$1,750 for the maintenance of German prisoners in outport jails, it having been necessary to transfer a number of these men to the outports so as to make room in the Penitentiary for ordinary requirements. This makes a total under this service of \$2,150, practically all occasioned by caring for German prisoners during the war.

Under the head of Legislation we require \$12,175. Of this amount \$915 is for the Legislative Council, the principal item being \$240 for material, making and fitting of a new carpet in the Council Chamber to replace the one that had done duty there for more than twenty years. The carpet, I might say, was sold at Bastow's Auction Market by direction of the President of the Upper House, and the amount

received was turned over to the Treasury. The chief other items of the amount are \$100 each to the Western Star, Bay Roberts Guardian and Bell Island Miner for publishing the debates of the Upper House, and the balance is represented by sundry accounts. For the House of Assembly we require \$11,500 in round figures. Of this, \$630 is represented by allowances to the outport members and officials for travelling expenses, etc., during the war session; also amounts for printing and publishing debates, Hansards, journals, and Acts, etc., and some accounts for 1913 being included with those of 1914 because the publication of the volumes was delayed owing to the election the previous Fall. For General Legislation we require \$383 for binding the Acts of the session and \$200 for books supplied to the Library. We also need \$250 more for fuel and light in the Colonial Building, arising from the increased use of coal and light there. Fires and lights are now needed in the offices, and during the whole fall and winter the Regimental headquarters was located here, while there is in addition, the heating required during the session of the Legislature.

Under Education we ask \$200, the additional payment of \$100 each to the Anglican and Methodist assistant inspectors, raised under Minute of Council last year, and as the Education Act has not been amended to provide the money, Supplemental Supply has to be taken for it.

Under Public Charities we ask, for the relief of able-bodied poor, \$20,000, it being necessary in view of the distress in various directions caused by the unusual circumstances to which the war gave rise, to make provision for assistance during the past winter to some extent in this direction. Hon. members on the other side of the House will remember that they were anxious that the Government should

move in this matter, and this outlay has thus been occasioned.

For the Lunatic Asylum we require \$4,287.50. Of this sum, \$3,000 is due to increased prices of new contracts caused by war conditions. In other words, the contractors, as soon as the war broke out and increased duties were put on, there was an advance in the cost of supplies, represented to the Government that it would be unfair to hold them to their original figures under the circumstances, and this contention was admitted. We also need \$1,000 for fuel and light, the amount voted last year being too small, the actual outlay being \$6,000. \$287.50 is needed for salaries, two temporary watchmen being appointed to replace two permanent ones at present incapacitated by chronic illness, and whose retirement is being considered by the Government.

For the General Hospital we require \$17,860. \$8,000 of this is for fuel and light, due to a short vote last year, \$8,450 is for maintenance, due to short vote, and also to the claims of contractors as already mentioned, and \$1,410 for salaries. The amount of \$1,200 for the acting House Surgeon, Dr. Knight, was left out of last year's estimates by a typographical error. The wages of three firemen are increased from \$420 to \$540, to put them on a par with other Union firemen, and this makes \$180; and the male helper in the kitchen is advanced from \$150 to \$180.

For the Poor Asylum we require \$1,440. \$1,030 for maintenance because of contractors' claims as already mentioned; \$300 more for fuel and light; and \$110 for salaries, the chief male attendant being increased from \$350 to \$400, and the assistant from \$270 to \$320.

For the Lazaretto we ask \$230 for maintenance, because of war pensions as aforesaid.

Under Head 8, for Lighthouses, we ask \$9,450. \$450 of this to cover outstanding bills for advertising notices to mariners and for stationery and other supplies for the Lighthouse Department; and \$9,000 for Lighthouse maintenance, the vote being short as several new lighthouses have been put in operation. The expenditure for maintenance last year was slightly over \$65,000, and the estimate was \$52,000, or \$13,000 less for this year with twenty new lights and fog alarms to maintain.

Under Head 10, Marine and Fisheries, we ask for \$21,740. Of this sum, \$9,000 is represented by repairs, dockage, and supplies for the Fiona. She needs practically a new deck, her boiler and engine rooms require large repairs, and she will have to dock for an overhaul, while her first supplies for the spring will also represent a goodly sum. For similar work for the dredge we ask \$3,000. In order to carry out fully the lobster propagation enterprise, we need \$3,700 more; the increase to boatman's salary omitted in estimates, is an item of \$40; and the Game and Fisheries Board ask for \$6,000 in order that they may be able to meet their requirements. It will be readily appreciated that owing to the war, which automatically disposed of the tourist traffic, there was a decided fall in the revenue from fishing and game licenses, while the protection service had to be maintained just the same.

Under head 11, we require \$7,000 for Customs to cover general refund. The demands under this head, especially with regard to kerosene and gasoline, could not be more accurately estimated and are growing all the time.

Under Head 14 we require for general contingencies \$32,000. The account to date has been overdrawn \$26,000, and we need \$1,000 to cover pensions up to June 30th that have

been paid to officials, who, through ill-health, were put upon the pension list since the last session and whose pensions could not, of course, be provided for them. Under the Act by which the Bell Island Transportation Company was granted a concession for a landing way at that place, we have to pay a subsidy of \$500, and as the Colony also undertook to make up to the shareholders the interest upon their amount, we need \$2,000 for this purpose also, while we estimate that we will require another \$2,500 to cover the vote for sundries up to the end of the fiscal year also.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to say in connection with Supplementary supply what I said the last time Supplementary Supply was asked for. I do not think it is sufficient when asking for Supplementary Supply to come down with a general statement. Each item ought to be dealt with more fully than it is in this account. This statement ought to be a statement in detail from the Minister in charge of each particular Department which is responsible for the expenditure that has been made to anticipate the fresh vote now asked for. For instance, take the Marine and Fisheries Department. Each item in that account ought to be gone into here by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, showing why it is necessary, what expenditure has been incurred, what progress has been made in the works, if it has been made for works, and what needs other than works have made it necessary to come here and ask for supply. In the same way the Minister of Public Works ought to come into the House with his accounts down to date which occasion the extra vote and explain why each vote required this overdraft. The same thing is true of the Colonial Secretary's Office, the Prime Minister's Office and the

Department of Finance and Customs. I think it is due to members of the House that this ought to be done; it is due to us when we are asked to vote these moneys that we should know why we are doing it. Such a general statement as has been given I do not think sufficient. We are no wiser now than when we started as to why these increased votes are asked for and each vote as I have said ought to be explained to the House by the responsible Minister, who is responsible to the House for the vote that is asked. The Minister of Finance has, I think, done his duty in dealing with it in the broad way in which he has done; but it should be followed, before the votes go further, by a statement by each Department, giving details and particulars as to why such vote is required by that Department. I think we ought to have from each Department a statement such as I ask.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I beg to say that it is the intention to give all information possible. We could not anticipate last year two-thirds of the amount that we are asking for this evening.

Take the Marine and Fisheries Department for instance. When we came down with the Estimates last year it was not known that we would have to repair the *Fiona*. Yet we found during the winter that Lloyds' Surveyor and Captain English practically condemned her; and before that ship was allowed to leave port certain repairs had to be made. When she was surveyed and an estimate made it was found that nine thousand dollars was necessary for the work. We could not foresee that last year, and consequently it had to go into Supplementary Supply. Any information that hon. gentlemen require we shall certainly give. Now take the dockage

and supplies to the dredge. If we can go within two or three hundred dollars of that amount I think we are doing well. Of course we would not have to ask for this at all if the dredge were allowed to spend the money earned by her the past six months and now put to her credit. It is merely a matter of book-keeping. Next is Lobster Propagation. Last year after the House closed the Commission appointed by this House decided on a certain figure to be paid for female lobsters. When the House was in session we could not estimate that expenditure. We simply voted five thousand dollars and we found that has not been sufficient. I think in every other case we can give the Committee a satisfactory explanation. We went as near the actual expenditure last year in our estimates as was possible. I have never known any Government to come into this House and ask for a smaller amount in Supplementary Supply than we are now asking for.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in reply to the Minister that I do not for one moment question the necessity of these votes; but what I have said is well illustrated by the case of the 'Fiona'—that before these votes are finally passed the Minister of the Department responsible for the expenditure should give some explanation as has been given in reference to the case of the 'Fiona.' For instance the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should come in here and explain why it is necessary that the 'Fiona' should be overhauled, what estimate has been made in connection with the work, and why it is that it was not anticipated last year. That is merely an illustration of what I think ought to be done in the case of every vote asked for in Supplementary Supply. Every vote ought to be explained separately and in detail to the

Committee. I do not think there ought to be any trouble about that. I simply make this request in order that it may be considered before we come down to-morrow.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, It is refreshing to hear the Minister of Finance say he has done what the Auditor General told him. I am very pleased to hear that and I hope he will abide by the Audit Act and the instructions of the Auditor General a little more closely in future, and when he comes down next time with his additional estimates I shall be very glad if he will tell us where he is going to get this money that he needs.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: When the Minister of Finance and Customs brought down his original estimates we had quite a little fuss over the procedure and as to the information that should be given to this side of the House. Now we are raising some objection to these supplementary votes, and if he wishes to get them through he ought to give us all the information possible about each item. We want to know how much money has been spent, where it has gone, the balance left and all particulars. Now with reference to the "Fiona" vote, I do not agree with him that this could not have been foreseen. If the Government did not know the Ship's Husband should have known last year and should have made the necessary arrangements. With regard to the \$3,000 for repairs let us know how you are spending it, that you are not fooling it away. Now with regard to the Lobster Propagation we gave you \$5,000 and now you are asking for \$3,700 more, and we should have full information about this. I do not intend to delay the House; but I do not think it would be any delay to let us have the necessary information. We will be satisfied if the Head of each Department comes in here and gives an

explanation of the amounts required by His Department.

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.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Chairman: Before passing that Resolution I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is his intention to make any reply to the objections that were raised this afternoon by Counsel at the Bar of the House. This is the first time to my knowledge as a member of the House—and I have been associated with it for quite a number of years—that we ever had the pleasure and privilege of listening to Counsel at the Bar. This afternoon Mr. Howley, on behalf of the several Companies he represented, pointed out certain objections that his clients had to the measure now before the Committee. He pointed out, for instance, that in the Labrador areas which are dealt with under this Contract his clients, the Labrador Paper and Pulp Company had very large interests and that these interests would be affected very materially by the passing of this Contract, that it would give the Products Company control over the drainage area and the water powers in the Labrador for a

period of five years and during that time the enterprise and investments and properties of the Company he represents would be tied up. Now there must be some argument I take it on behalf of the promoters of the Contract to offset what has been said by Counsel at the Bar, and I should like very much to know what is to be said upon the other side before I make up my mind as to how I shall vote on this particular matter. If what Counsel has said is correct then the interest of the persons whom he represents will be materially affected by this measure. I am not at all clear on this matter and the Prime Minister may be able to enlighten me as to the nature of the holdings of these people.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Ordinary Licenses.

MR. CLIFT—Does the Prime Minister know if this Company has complied with the provisions of the law to make these licenses good.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have no reason to think otherwise.

MR. CLIFT.—I would like to know in a general way what is to be said on the other side against the arguments of Mr. Howley. As I said a few days ago, in approaching this measure I have no desire to offer any factious opposition whatever. My only desire is not to vote for a measure that may affect the interests of others and that may be the means of putting a monopoly in the hands of a Company or may not be in the best interests of the Company. The session is too late now and we have too many other matters to dispose of to sit here merely for the purpose of making Opposition. All I want is to get information on these various matters before I can make up my mind as to how I am going to vote. The American Newfoundland Pulp and Timber Company say they have no water powers. If that is so their timber

must of necessity be of very little value to them and if they have to acquire water powers from the Products Company it may be at an expense which they cannot afford to incur. I would like some information on these matters and also in reference to the matters I asked about when speaking on this subject before. I daresay he will be able to give it to me and if he does it will help me very much. I asked the Prime Minister to bring down the conveyances by which certain water powers were conveyed to the Products Company. I said that I was aware that the Reid Newfoundland Company owned certain lands on the Humber River over which water was running, in other words they held lands under the bed of the River, and that being so they would naturally have some interest in the water running over the land but it would not of necessity give them the water power and when it is stated that these water powers have been conveyed to the Products Company I would like to have some more information as to what has been conveyed to the Company. In addition to knowing what was conveyed I would like to know the consideration for the conveyance. If the Reid Newfoundland Company own the land and claim the water powers why do we come in here and grant them these water powers? If they own it why need we convey it to them. If it has been granted or conveyed to the Products Company by the Reid Newfoundland Company I would like to have some information as to the matter of conveyance and I would like to be informed fully as to the concession from the Government or the Crown to the Reid Newfoundland Company respecting these water powers. I also referred to the matter of reservations along the banks of the River and around all these lakes and ponds over which the Reid Newfoundland Company had rights because they owned

the fee simple of the land. Along these waters and around these lakes and ponds there is reserved a right of way for the public. Now this right of way does not appear to be reserved in this agreement. The Products Company are given certain rights without reserving in any way the Public Rights. It seems to me that is a very important matter. As to the other matters that have been referred to by honourable members on this side of the House I do not propose to deal with them at the present moment. Certain amendments are being made in the original resolutions. The Premier informed us the other day that he had certain concessions from the Products Company. He got them to agree to certain concessions before entering into the agreement. They would naturally think they were entitled to everything set out in the agreement; but they have agreed to certain modifications which are now before us in the form of Additional Resolutions.

Of course that will modify the contract to some extent. It seems to me to be a pity that it has not been found possible to limit the period of freedom from taxation to, say twenty years. I do not altogether like this principle on which freedom from taxation is granted for an unlimited period in the case of duties on imported machinery, because I regard the importation of new machinery as a necessary complement to new industries. If it is advisable to give a concession of free duties on the original installation of these works, it follows if the Company imported new machinery for additional works they would naturally be entitled to free admission. I hope the Premier will explain to me what I desire to know as regards the rights of these parties as far as water-powers are concerned and also as regards what he has to say in reply to my observations of Counsel at the Bar this afternoon.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In relation to one or two points referred to by my hon. friend Mr. Chft, I might say it was entirely an omission of mine that he was not handed a copy of the grant. I may say that beyond this I have no other information. It is simply an ordinary grant of land and whether it conveys water-powers or not I am not prepared at this present juncture to state. I do not mean to say that it does. I know that it is one of the ten mile blocks of land that Junction Brooks runs through. As regards the 1904 Act in relation to the transportation of timber there you are dealing with rights of land, and here we are only concerned with the right of time. In relation to any special reply to what has been said here this afternoon, all I can say has been said over and over again in this House.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman: In reference to this point I would like to know whether any additional consideration will be given to the question of the transportation of logs, and whether it was the intention to approach the Company on Clause 20 of the agreement which puts them in the same position as the public at large.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Since that point is raised I would like to point out that there are no further amendments going to be made there. I have done the best I could do here and do not propose going into this further unless some advantage can be given as a reason.

MR. KENT.—In consideration of Section 20. This is the fundamental clause of the whole matter. I consider that it can considerably affect the whole grant.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman: There is just one matter here I wish to point out. I notice from the first this demised water power is subject to existing grants and this is inferred from the remarks of the Premier just now.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that it may be necessary for this Company to interfere with these water powers. I am not sufficiently informed to speak with any degree of accuracy, but I understand that there is an existing water power held by the Penn Company, which can be seriously interfered with by this. The Penn Company is interested in the water power at Muskrat Falls, which if you refer to Sec. 1, you will find the Company is also interested in. This matter places the scheme in a more undesirable light. The mere compensation for the water power would hardly be sufficient. They should be in a position to ask the value of the water power from the Company and obtain it. Can the Premier give me some explanation of this?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The only answer is this that where any damage is done to any water power the act provides for compensation.

MR. LLOYD.—That was not the point I was referring to.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I know. Such an aspect as that raised by the hon. member has never been considered.

MR. LLOYD.—My point is this: It is desirable that industries other than this should go on as well.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I will take a note of this.

MR. LLOYD.—I think it is of sufficient importance to be considered, and it is extremely unlikely that the Company will object to it.

MR. KENT.—I think that the matters we have heard this afternoon and which the Prime Minister is about to discuss with the Company ought to be attended to and the result made known before the bill is adopted.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This first resolution can be allowed to stand over of course, but I think the second can go on.

DR. LLOYD.—In reference to the points that have come up this afternoon relative to the Labrador water power and more especially the drainage area of the Hamilton River, I would like to state a few ideas which have occurred to me during the progress of these debates. The Premier may resolve them or later information may leave no room for doubt. The question was as to the streams which run into the Lake Melville and I would like to know in speaking about the drainage of the Hamilton River what the eastern termination of that drainage is. Under the contract we may presume that it goes to the sea. Well, then is Lake Melville a part of the sea? Can the Premier explain this point to me?

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of occupying the time of the House in analysing the different opinions that we have heard set forth here this afternoon concerning the advantages and disadvantages of the advent of this Products Company. I am convinced that the coming of this Company will materialize into something that will considerably advance the interests of this Colony in the future. But I would more especially refer to the positions of some of the Companies with regard to the water powers. Now anyone who will take the trouble to consult a map will find out that the Products Company is situate at the south side of the Grand Lake. In connection with the position taken by hon. members in reference to the areas held by private parties I may say that water powers are necessary for the operation of pulp and paper mills, but up to the present time the Penn Newfoundland Company has not shown any intention to utilize its power for such purposes. They simply hold it as a mere speculative proposition. I need not refer to the different objects which the Products Company hope to obtain as the ground has been gone

over so thoroughly by hon. members but I have great faith when this industry will be in full swing the people of the West Coast and of the whole Island must be greatly benefited. I have therefore very much pleasure in supporting this measure.

MR. LLOYD.—Of course Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend Mr. Downey is speaking without any authority. I presume we cannot take his version of these facts as authorized by the Company.

MR. DOWNEY.—I have had no conversation with any member of the Company. I am speaking from my own personal knowledge of the locality.

MR. LLOYD.—Of course the Hon. Member cannot have a knowledge of the mind of the Company, as he does not speak with their express authority. And seeing it placed before us as his own personal observations we cannot accept it as of any value. Even if it were of value that would not affect the position that the Company may change its views afterwards when the deal is completed. If we could get from the Company a confirmation I should be satisfied but until then I fear that I am unable to accept the hon. member's remarks as of any value.

MR. GRIMES.—Is there anything decided as to the question of wages?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes. I may state that I have very fully discussed the question of wages with the Company and they express themselves satisfied that any wages they will pay will be in excess of present wages in the same class.

DR. LLOYD.—I fancy the Prime Minister stated that the wages would be from \$700.00 to \$1000.00 which is over two dollars a day. That means I presume a minimum age of two dollars a day.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.
The Chairman from the Committee

reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Administration of Local Affairs," without amendment.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the law respecting the exportation of timber," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the Report of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board for the year 1914.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, May 14th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 14th, 1915.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Fortune Harbour, who ask that an allocation of fifty dollars be granted for the improving of a landing at Black Duck Cove, Belle Isle. Some money was expended there last year which created considerable im-

provement, but the sum here asked is required to complete it. It is in the district of St. Barbe. I hope this will receive the immediate attention of the Government and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

QUESTIONS.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House copies of all tenders received for repairs on the S. S. 'Fiona.'

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The reply has been tabled.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance, or other Minister representing the Justice Department, to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all amounts paid under the head of Civil and Criminal Prosecutions from July 1, 1914 to date.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—This is being prepared.

MR. MORINE asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House all information in the possession of the Government in relation to the manufacture of fertilizers in the United States and Canada by the methods proposed to be used in this Colony by the Newfoundland Products Company, especially in relation to the capital of companies manufacturing, and the locality and output of manufactories.

GRAND BANK WATER SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to providing a water supply for the town of Grand Bank.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

CONTINGENCIES PRIME MINISTER'S DEPARTMENT.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Chairman: While this matter is before the House I will accede to the request of the leader of the Opposition and give particulars of the various accounts when such is practicable, so that all reasonable information may be supplied. The original vote for the Department was \$1,500. This amount is to cover stationery, dictaphone records and minor office supplies. The telegraph system was not used as much this year as formerly, as more was done by mail. Many of the telegrams that were sent were not paid for in cash, as dealings between this and other departments are simply matters of book-keeping.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S DEPT. CONTINGENCIES.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

With respect to the expenditures of this department, I may say two volumes of the census are now prepared. This was printed at the Royal Gazette office and bound at Dicks and Co. Royal Gazette Office charged \$1,275, and Dicks and Co. \$750. I may point out that expenses are twice what they were, and that therefore the printing and binding will cost more than last time. The third volume will be ready in two months' time, and the fourth in three or four months' time. Thus it will be seen that \$2,000 of this is mostly used up for printing and binding. The two hundred and twenty dollars is special amounts paid the Registering Officers for forwarding returns promptly. The \$3,524.44 for the consolidation of the Laws represents chiefly the amount paid the seven commissioners at \$500 each. The rest is for stationery, etc. The Sealing Commission of Enquiry is \$2,500. This represents \$500 each to the Commis-

sioners, payment of stenographer etc. The rest defrayed expenses of witnesses, etc. I do not know if there is any more explanation than this needed.

MR. COAKER—With regard to that vote for the Sealing Inquiry: Are there any other payments to be made to lawyers representing the fishermen, etc?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Government has received no claim yet

DR. LLOYD—The Government has received no claim for the simple reason that we were asked not to send one in.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I knew nothing of it.

DR. LLOYD—I can speak from first knowledge. It came from those in charge of that particular matter.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I would like to explain the contingencies of the Colonial Secretary's Office. This year they were particularly large, owing to the fact that a large amount of advertising had to be paid for,—proclamations and such like on account of the war. All this increased the expenditure, and also a great deal of telegraph messages. Part of this I think, ought to be charged to the war vote, as it is as a result of that. We decided to do this to some extent, otherwise this vote would necessarily be much larger.

While on my feet I would like to explain the vote for the Government Engineer's Office. As seen there the vote is \$400 for surveys of Branch Railways. This and other expenses ran up \$1,150, which was found to be necessary for that work.

DR. LLOYD—In the Department of Marine and Fisheries account, I noticed in the account given by the Minister of Finance that the Bank balance showed a large overdraft on this year's account. I would like an

explanation as to what we are to expect on next year's account.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—You say on Bank Account. The intention was, Mr. Chairman, to take out the loan bill of last year when it was cashed, which is only a matter of time, to settle this. There is no overdraft on Bank account.

MR. WINSOR—I would call the attention of the Premier once more to the gaoler at Greenspond. I did so last year. This man is now getting \$84. The lowest other one gets \$125. He has an additional way of earning \$20 per year. I notice that other men in his position are getting good salaries, and I hope the Government will look into this matter. This man has lost one arm, and that is why he is there. He cannot go elsewhere and earn more, so I think the Government should do their best to give this man a living wage.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I can speak with some knowledge of the gaoler at Greenspond, to whom Mr. Winsor has referred. It is a pretty hard case. It is not easy at the present time for a man with his two arms and all his faculties to make a living at the fishery at Greenspond or anywhere else. I know this man. He is industrious and hardworking, and does his best to maintain his family, and takes advantage of every opportunity to make an honest dollar. If there are other gaolers, doing the same work, who get a larger salary, I certainly think that this case ought to be looked into.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The hon. member for Bonavista is quite right when he says that he drew attention to this matter at the last session. If my memory serves me right, I ordered that an enquiry be made into the case. However, I shall attend to it to-morrow, and when we meet on Monday I shall be able to say what can be done.

MR. COAKER—I note now that the Premier is going to attend to this matter, and I hope that he will see that this man gets as large an amount as gaolers get anywhere else. I know the man to be an honest, hardworking fellow, and he should not be working for this salary.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker: I beg to endorse all that has been said by the hon. members on this side with respect to the gaoler at Greenspond. I know him to be a hardworking man who is trying to earn an honest livelihood. I am very well acquainted with him, and know that he is always striving to make an honest dollar when he can. I think that the least the Government can do is to put him on a par with other gaolers, and I hope that the Premier will do all in his power to do this.

MR. COAKER—Is anyone able to give any information as to how many German prisoners we have here now?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am not in a position to state the exact number, but I will enquire.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think there are three or four in Placentia; four or five in Bay of Islands; five or six in Harbour Grace; and about fourteen here.

MR. KENT—I would like to know whether anything has been done in the matter of the Reports of Debates of this House. It will be remembered that I brought this matter to the attention of the House some time ago, and the Premier promised that the Internal Economy Commission would take it up. I do not observe any improvement.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say that I immediately told the Supervisor to let me have a report as to what he considered might be done in the matter. He made a report to me, but it has been impossible to do anything up to the present time. I hope before Monday to have a con-

ference between the members on the other side and two or three from this side to see if it is not possible to improve affairs in this respect.

MR. KENT—I would like some information in relation to that large vote—\$16,421—for the House of Assembly.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I can give you the details. I have them here.

MR. KENT—By reference to the statement given by the Minister of Finance I notice that the greater part of the amount is made up in connection with the printing of the debates. Now, I think unless the system is improved that this money is simply thrown away. I notice that the printing of the Journal for 1913, and the publication of the debates in the Hansard cost \$2,770, and for 1914 \$1,939. The difference is over \$800. Now, if I remember the debates of 1913, I don't think they were nearly as bulky and voluminous as those of 1914, and I don't think the Journal was either. Of course, as regards the publication of the debates in the other manner, I don't think that they are of any value whatever. They don't appear until late in the summer, and nobody takes any interest in them. I would like to know what the explanation is of the difference in the cost. Is there any person who can give any information? There does not appear to be any relation between the work done and the amount charged.

MR. COAKER—As regards the expenditure for printing. I think the time has come now when the Government ought put this work up to tender. I have not the slightest doubt but that the Colony loses a large proportion of the amounts paid for printing. There is quite a lot of competition in that line now. Under the present system, one or two firms have a monopoly of the whole thing. If the work were put up to tender I have

not the slightest doubt but that \$25,000 could be saved to the colony in this connection, and that sum is worth making an effort to save. I believe it is only fair to put this work up to tender. I might say that so far as I am concerned I could not tender. We have quite enough to do to look after the work which we have, but there are establishments who would be very glad to tender for the work. From my knowledge of this work, I know that the companies are getting it now are making 50 per cent. clear profit on all work done.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman: Might I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from what vote in his Department the Coast Fishery Wardens are paid? Are they under the Game and Inland Fisheries Board? I do not notice the vote here. I am of the opinion that that service could be dispensed with altogether, as I cannot see of what use it is. I know from my personal knowledge that the Warden in my neighbourhood does not do very much for whatever money he receives. I don't think that the service is of the slightest benefit so far as the preservation of the fisheries is concerned.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to inform the hon. member for Twillingate that the Coast Warden is a different service altogether from the Game and Inland Fisheries Board. The hon. member says that he knows that the gentleman who is Coast Warden in his district does not do very much. I think that a glance at the reports will convince him that this service does good work for the amounts paid.

MR. JENNINGS—I have not got the report.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That is not my fault. These men are, as a matter of fact, not paid enough. They are not paid half enough. You cannot expect a man who

is only getting \$25 or \$30 a year to travel around the coast very often. Five thousand dollars is our whole grant for the Coast Warden service of the Colony. I must disagree with the hon. gentleman on this matter. I think that the service is absolutely necessary. The hon. gentleman will remember speaking to me last year in connection with boats anchoring on the spawning ground down in Friday's Bay, I think, in spite of the fact that there was a rule which stated that boats should not anchor near a spawning ground. Now, these are the things that we are up against. If you make fishery rules to protect the fisheries, you will have to see that they are carried out, and you won't get anybody to do the work for nothing. You must have somebody, and you must pay for the work. As to whether they do all that you expect them to do is another thing. We will suppose they don't, but then according to their reports they are doing something. It was only a few days ago that I received an anonymous letter from Bay of Islands referring to breaches of the Fishery Rules by certain parties. Our Warden was paid off last winter, when the herring fishery was over, and the Warden for this year had not yet been appointed. I wrote the Magistrate and asked him to enquire into the matter. He made an investigation, found that the statements made to me were correct, and had the parties before Court. Now, there is a case where, if there had been a Fishery Warden there, he would have been able to prevent any violation of the rules; and there are other cases of a similar nature right round the colony. But there are a number of those men who don't get enough to encourage them to do all they might. If the hon. member will call at the Department, I will be only too glad to give him a list of these

Wardens, and an explanation of the work which they do.

MR. JENNINGS—I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I was only speaking from what I had heard. I quite agree with the Minister when he says that those men are not paid enough to warrant them in giving the time and attention that they might to this work; but to my mind, as far as the matter has come under my notice, we might just as well have no Fishery Warden service at all as the one which we have. I have often thought that a very much better system would be to get some reliable man in each centre, some man who knew his duty, and pay him for the work which he did. You would then be certain that he would see that the rules were observed, and that he would report on any breaches that might come under his notice.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I can only say that if the hon. member for Twillingate will give me the name of a good man—a man whom he considers will do right and just—in his neighborhood, I shall be only too glad to appoint him.

MR. COAKER—I would like to ask the Minister where he has the vote for Fishery Wardens in the Estimates?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You mean the Game and Inland Fisheries?

MR. COAKER—No, Fishery Wardens.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Under the head of Fishery Protection.

MR. COAKER—I would just like to say, in reference to this Fishery Warden matter, that I agree with Mr. Jennings when he says that this is money thrown away. I have had considerable experience, and I feel like endorsing what he has said. You don't get value for the money which you spend. The men may get around their

jurisdictions a couple of times during the season. I remember being a Fishery Warden once for Gander Bay. I went the round twice, and at the end of the season I told the Government not to appoint Fishery Wardens any more. I considered it a waste of money, and that no good was coming out of it. I am not prepared to make any suggestion which would improve on the present system, but I certainly do not agree with that system. These men do not do anything more than draw their salaries.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: While we are discussing matters referring to the Marine and Fisheries Department, I beg to call the attention of the Minister to a petition that was sent in here last year from the inhabitants of Change Islands. I think it has been an annual affair with the people there for the last five or six years to present to this House a petition asking that the lighthouse be erected at Sable Point. A beginning was made, I think, in 1898. Material was sent there for the construction of the lighthouse, but nothing has been done since, and I suppose the cost of the material has been lost to the Colony.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—No material has been sent since I have been in the Department.

MR. COAKER—No, it was just before you came in.

MR. HALFYARD—Now, I wish to call the attention of the Minister to this matter. Every year a petition has been presented to this Legislature, and it is very annoying to the people to be continually agitating and not to have any attention paid to their request. I trust now that I have called attention to the matter, the Minister will have it looked into. There is also another little matter to which I would like to call attention, and that is a question which I asked on the 11th. The Colonial Secretary

said that he had referred the matter to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but I fail to see what information the Department of Marine and Fisheries can give.

MON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I got the answer to that question from Mr. Goodridge, and tabled it.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not think it is fair that other places should be getting it from the general revenue. There ought to be a hard and fast rule regarding these matters. The grant is so small that we have nothing for the upkeep of the public wharf. Forty dollars is put aside for the Harbor Master at Pogo. How are other Harbour Masters paid? Are they paid from the grants for the districts? If they are satisfied, then it is all right. I am not just finding fault, but I want some information on the matter. Another matter I want to speak about, is what I referred to the other day when the Estimates were being discussed, in connection with an allocation that was made last year. The Hon. Mr. Crosbie was instrumental in sending the money there. As to the reply received, I have the original letter sent to the Deputy Colonial Secretary. (Letter is read.)

I think that you will see that there is a comment there and recommendation also. The Deputy Colonial Secretary did his duty as this letter shows. (Letter is read.)

I will leave that matter as it stands. I do not think that anything of this sort will occur again. It will show that members of the Executive have taken the responsibility of allocating money to districts outside of their own districts.

MR. COAKER—They ought to have a light at Sable Island after waiting so long for one. There is a great necessity for it. The people pass through the main tinkle all the year round, going through the bay. Any man will attend to it for \$200 a year.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, now that this matter is before the Committee, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to a petition that I presented here last year from the inhabitants of Port Rexton. They are in great need of the dredge down there. The people of Trinity want it. I trust that the Government will see to it that the dredge is sent down there.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary if the public wharves are to be used by the coastal boats only or by the public generally. There is also another matter in relation to the letter on the condition of the railway. The letter contains some very grave statements. In connection with this. What was the report of the Government Engineer? The condition of the railway as disclosed in that report is anything but satisfactory. The whole line requires to be overhauled. I am sorry that I did not bring the report this afternoon. The Government Engineer did not report the line as being in a satisfactory condition.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I took the matter up and had several conferences with him with the result that he has instructions to deal with the case and see that the contract is carried out. He has written to the Reid Nfld. Co. and said that prosecution will be entered upon without further notice. He has instructions from the Government to go on and do what was necessary.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance tabled a statement which I have before me. This statement is remarkable for its candour, and I compliment the Minister on it. I will read it because his candour is expressed in words. I may say that it is a statement tabled by the Minister in relation to the Supplementary Supply for Legislation. (Hon. member reads statement.)

The only fault is that he does not follow up those words by deeds. I find that in the estimates for next year his estimates are still short to the extent of this Supplementary Supply, and the Supplementary Supply for the current year has not yet been asked for. I must repeat that this is remarkable for its candour.

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.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered between the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland Products Corporations Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, there is a question on the order paper in relation to this matter asked by the hon. member, Mr. Morine, who was not here when it was called. I wish to say that there is no information.

There was a point raised yesterday by Mr. Lloyd, the member for Trinity in relation to the Kenemou and Kennemish Rivers. Neither of these rivers flow into the Hamilton. Both enter into Lake Melville some miles below where the Hamilton River empties into the sea. Both were visited by Governor MacGregor, and you will find references in his report as to the locus in quo of these rivers; but

to remove any doubt that they will be in any way reserved during the five years—these two rivers around which the property of the Company is marked red—I propose a resolution to this effect:

RESOLVED—The undertaking by the Government that it will not grant to any person during the period of five years referred to in Section 2 of the Agreement any water powers or water privileges within the drainage area of that part of the Hamilton River between Lake Winicapau and the sea shall not apply so as to prevent the Government from granting or otherwise disposing of any water powers or water privileges on the Rivers Kennemish and Kenemou flowing into Lake Melville, and the expression in the Agreement “from the head of Lake Winicapau to the sea” shall mean from the head of Lake Winicapau to a point on said Hamilton River twenty-five miles below the Muskrat Falls.

As to the other point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I have made an amendment to section 20 which I think will be acceptable. It reads as follows:

RESOLVED—That Section 20 of the Agreement shall read as follows:—“Notwithstanding the grant of the water powers herein all persons shall have the right to the temporary use of the said waters for the purpose of passing to and fro in boats, and for fishing, and for the purpose of floating logs and lumber.”

MR. LLOYD—Why temporary?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Because if not temporary any one person might go there and occupy the whole place.

MR. LLOYD—May I ask the Prime Minister if anything has been done outside of granting monetary compensation for injury to water powers of others. They should be able to get from the Company the same amount

of energy they would develop themselves if their power were not taken by this Company.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have not been able to attend to that point, it is still under consideration.

RESOLUTION 2.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I have already expressed my opinion regarding that Resolution. I think the principle of admitting construction material and machinery duty free is all right, and probably for a limited period a Company coming in to establish works of this kind would be entitled to a certain period of exemption in this respect, but I do not think we ought to make this unlimited as regards time. I think we ought leave future legislators to view conditions as they exist when a period would lapse, and not tie their hands so as to render them powerless to put any import tax upon the materials mentioned in this Resolution. I think that a period of twenty years would be ample security for this Company in this respect; and it should be left to the Legislature that may then be in existence as to whether they would extend that time, either in its present form as regards construction material and machinery, or whether it would extend it in some modified form under the conditions which would then exist; for it may be that the conditions which would then exist would warrant removing the exemption altogether. Now I would move the following amendment. After the word “old” the words “shall be admitted into this Colony free of duty” shall be stricken out, and the words “imported into this Colony within twenty years of the enactment hereof, shall be admitted free of Customs duties.”

The amendment being put, was lost.

MR. MORINE—I beg to move the following in amendment.

RESOLVED.—All lands, waters, water powers, buildings, erections, and

all property whatsoever of the Company for use in connection with the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia and other fertilizers, carbide of calcium, cement, and their bye-products, situate at Bay of Islands or within the drainage area of the Humber, or within the drainage area of Corner Brook, or at Labrador shall be exempt from Municipal taxation during twenty years from enactment hereof. Section 6 of the Agreement in the Schedule hereto shall be held to include only such lands, waters, water powers, buildings, erections and property as are for use in connection with the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement or their bye-products.

The effect is to limit the time to twenty years instead of leaving it unlimited as it is at present.

The amendment, being not, was lost.

MR. CLIFT—I beg to propose the following amendment:

RESOLVED—The stock, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages, and other securities of the Company shall be exempt from taxation during twenty years from the enactment hereof.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. LLOYD—I beg to propose the following amendment:

RESOLVED—All phosphate rock, pyrites, electrodes, soda, and bags and packages for the distribution of the Company's products required by the Company for the purpose of the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement, or their bye-products imported into this Colony within twenty years of the enactment hereof shall be free of customs duties.

The amendment, being put, was

lost.

MR. COAKER—I beg to move the following amendment:

RESOLVED—All coal required by the Company for the purposes in the next preceding Resolution mentioned imported into Labrador within twenty years of the enactment hereof shall be free of Customs duties.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. MORINE—That is the Resolution which permits the taking of ten thousand acres of land, and there is a small amendment which I think very necessary. It is to limit the time to a period of twenty years within which they may take it. As it stands at present they may take it within ninety-nine years or nine hundred and ninety-nine years. I do not think there is any reasonable objection from any standpoint to limiting it to twenty years. Then there is a technical alteration that I think the Premier will see is necessary to carry out the meaning. It is this. At the present time the Resolution says they may take such land belonging to or in the possession of the Crown. Now lands under timber leases are in the ownership of and belonging to the Crown, and I think in law would be held to be in the possession of the Crown. This would allow them to go in on lands held under timber licenses. These licenses only give the right to cut timber, the ownership remains in the Crown. Under the clause as it is I submit this would authorize them to go in on lands already under lease or license for the purpose of expropriating them, and of course taking the timber on it. Now, I think these two changes will be assented to by the Government.

Then there is a third one, and it is this. It is not the intention of the Government I presume to allow a clause whereby a party can come in and take at the rate of thirty cents

an acre, land on both sides of a water power, carrying the soil under the water power and preventing anybody else from using it. I take it the intention is to allow them this land up to 10,000 acres for their buildings, telegraphs, telephones, etc., and that the point has not been considered. I am going to move my amendments and ask that they be allowed to stand over, so that the Premier can look into them and see if they are not reasonable concessions on the part of the Company, and very desirable ones on the part of the Government.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have no objection to standing over these or any other amendments. The points raised by my friend are somewhat novel. I would point out to him that there is nothing in the section compelling the Governor in Council to make a grant. All that he has suggested can be reserved or the grant refused. However I shall be glad to take up these sections.

MR. MORINE—With just this qualification that I think it ought not be lawful for the Governor in Council to grant land under a water power for thirty cents an acre.

MR. KENT—There is one matter referred to by the Premier that I cannot agree with, that is that the Government is not bound to issue these grants if asked for them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—What I meant to say was that I thought there was power under the section for the Governor in Council to make any such reservation as to public rights as he may think desirable.

MR. KENT—That is an evasion of the question. I have not looked into the matter, but I think unless reserved here the Government have no right to make reservations, because once this Contract and Resolutions pass the rights of the Government and the Company can only be found

within the four corners of this Agreement, and any limitation the Government wish to introduce with reference to these grants must find a place here.

MR. LLOYD—I would like to emphasize the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and I would like to call the attention of the Premier to Section 9 of the Contract. The Government undertakes clearly to carry this out. In that Resolution it merely states that it shall be lawful, but I would also draw his attention to clause 1 of the Resolution, which makes clear that anything not expressly provided for in the Resolutions and covered by a clause of the Contract shall be taken as having been resolved upon by express terms of the Resolutions.

MR. MORINE—If you have any doubt that under the Resolution the right to reserve is in the Government then add to the Resolution that the Governor in Council in granting any land shall have power to make reservations for public purposes. Then again, it may be that it would be inadvisable in the public interest to grant any particular land applied for, and I think that power ought be given to the Governor in Council to reserve any particular section of land.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say that later on I shall submit an additional Resolution in regard to this section, No. 3.

MR. KENT—In the resolution that I propose to substitute for the first in this bill, it is made clear that the five millions first provided in Section 2 shall be an expenditure entirely different to the five millions provided in section 18 thereof. I beg to propose the following amendment:

RESOLVED— The expenditure by the Company of the sum of five million dollars, provided in Section 18, in and about the business operations of the Company, shall mean an expenditure at Bay Islands and or with-

in the drainage area of the Humber; and or within a radius of ten miles of the mouth of Corner Brook, in and about the construction of dams, buildings, docks and transmission lines for the business and operations of the Company in and about the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement or their by-products; and the failure to begin actual construction work or to expend such money within the times mentioned shall absolutely prevent the Company from taking or holding any rights whatsoever under any Section of the indenture of the Schedule hereto, and the indenture, the demise under Section 1 thereof, and the grant under Section 1 thereof, shall be wholly void ab initio.

The difference in that is to see that the expenditure of the proposed capital is in such cases for the purpose of the construction of the works named under the resolution, etc., the main point being to make it for construction work.

I have understood from the Government that an agreement had been made with the Company that all this should be expended on construction work and nothing else. I would also suggest that the words "and operations" be cut out of this agreement.

MR. MORINE—I notice here that in one case you phrase the same thing in two different ways. May I enquire the reason why there is a distinction in the language. This may give rise to the question in the future that you intended to differentiate between the two cases. It is a proposed resolution which I think will commend itself to everyone, that in lieu of this the words "the construction of dams, buildings, docks and transmission lines for" be added.

MR. KENT—I have already stated that I object to make arbitration compulsory. I think a person whose property is damaged by any Act of the

Company ought to have the same remedy open to him as any other person. Instead of these parties going to Court if they so desire, they have only one course open to them under this bill, and that is arbitration, a proceeding, which entails endless fees, a special tribunal, and many minor difficulties to get the same work done for which the Judges of the Supreme Court are paid by the Colony. Anyway, arbitration ought to be made optional. I think that this would be an improvement.

MR. MORINE—I do not see how you can complete these matters this afternoon, because you are going to prepare amendments expressive of the idea of making optional either Court or Arbitration Tribunal, and we are not quite ready for this.

It will be necessary to have the Judicature Act amended to give the Judges the necessary power to carry out these provisions, before these new duties are imposed upon them. The amendment which I now propose to make dealing with the matter of arbitration is taken from the Deer Lake Pulp Act, with some improving differences, and it deals with the question as to whether or not the arbitrations ought to be obligatory. In cases where the amount involved is from one to fifty dollars there is the means provided of going before a stipendiary magistrate, as well as the option of going before the Supreme Court in the ordinary way. This is the only way that will give a poor man an equal footing. I am desirous however of seeing this stand over for further consideration and amendment.

MR. CURRIE—I would like to express a layman's opinion in this matter which is now occupying the attention of the House. Not only do I consider arbitration a cheaper method for everyone, but I also deem it considerably more satisfactory. The poor man finds the proceed-

ings in the Supreme Court attended with too much expense, and while he has the option of an appeal there, I do not think he would care to run the risk entailed. A man can get his work performed more to his satisfaction in the majority of cases by arbitration.

MR. KENT—My idea is merely to make it optional. The Courts ought to be open to every man. As regards matter of expense, I have had some experience in these matters, and may say I have known arbitrations to be subject of more expense than any case that has been within my experience in the Supreme Court.

MR. COAKER—I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Burin giving voice to these sentiments. I should have thought that every layman in Newfoundland had had sufficient to do with arbitrations. Was the hon. member alive at the time of the telegraph award that was given to Reids? If he was I can scarcely credit the fact that any layman could after the experience we have undergone sanction a further chance of a repetition. When we submitted this matter under the Act of 1898 the Colony was fleeced of a very large sum of money that never ought to have been given. In the face of this we have a man in this House giving voice to the opinion that he would rather trust his case to the consideration of a tribunal other than the Supreme Court. I wonder if the hon. member knows that the man who was appointed by the Government of that time, Mr. Blake, himself said that it ought not to have been more than \$750,000, and that when the matter was decided they gave \$1,580,000. When he expressed his disapproval of this they said they would make it \$2,000,000 which they could themselves have done, and rather than permit this he was forced to sign for

\$1,580,000 rather than see the Colony fleeced for three million. Can we talk of arbitration after this? It is a mere question of common sense. Are we going to lay ourselves open to a repetition of this treatment. In the case of proceedings in the Court everything is mapped out, and a man is not liable to be fleeced because he can appeal and have his case more thoroughly examined if he is sure he is in the right. The judges are independent men, and can state what they please. That is the reason that a rich Company is liable to the same treatment as a poor man. The fact that a Company is rich is immaterial. If this Company decides all its difficulties by arbitration it means that we are merely giving other people's property to Reid. It is Reid over again. We must treat the Reids according to the way in which they have treated us in the past. In the case of the arbitration they would have fleeced us of three million if they had not been fronted with a man like Mr. Blake. I defy any one in this House to contradict what I have just said.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Chairman: The remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Twillingate have no relevancy to the matter under discussion. We are not dealing with Government arbitrations, simply with matters between private parties, and for that reason I do not agree with the suggested change. I do not think the small man should be compelled to take his case into Court as this requires; he would probably be compelled to follow it to a still higher tribunal if the amount involved was large enough, and the additional burden would drive him out of Court. I think that the small man would be better satisfied with the arbitration than have it go to Court.

MR. MORINE—We seem to have been getting away from the subject

we were discussing. What I would suggest to solve the difficulty here would be that all cases involving below a certain sum to be named, should be treated in a summary manner. This would be a cheap way for the poorer man and would in my opinion prove considerably more satisfactory. Of course he could always have the option of arbitration. An arbitration can prove expensive because the arbitrators can demand whatever remuneration they desire for themselves before they will determine their award. Thus a great deal of possible expense may arise. The award cannot be taken up until the arbitrators are paid. And then the Supreme Court will treat the matter in an impartial manner that is rarely to be found in an arbitration. Not only that, but the men who hear the case are men accustomed to deal with similar cases, and have a deep knowledge of the law. In the case of a Company like this they have sufficient money to enable them to have always a particular man to handle their arbitrations. He will be a man of weight, and unless the poorer man is able to pay for a man of equal standing he will have a poor chance. He probably will select a friend who might lose a good case through utter incompetence. The men who represented conflicting rights would be too strong for him to deal with. As a matter of fact arbitrations are fast disappearing. They were originally created to obviate the expenses of the law Courts. It is a practise that tends to become more and more infrequent. The member for Burin may have considered this the cheaper way of getting out of a difficulty. In my experience it is anything but the cheapest. By removing this difficulty you prevent many an injustice that may occur.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered

the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on Wednesday next move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, May 17th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 17th, 1915.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE—I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from the inhabitants of Catalina, Little Catalina and Melrose, asking that dogs be done away with. I ask that this be referred to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Abbott gave Notice of Question.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported a Resolution which was read a first time as follows:

Supplemental Supply.—\$167,620.97.

The said Resolution being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolution was agreed to.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee

of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony, with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Chairman: When we were in Committee on these Resolutions the last day, there were certain amendments suggested by my hon. friends on the other side. One was by Mr. Morine, in relation to arbitration, and one by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, in relation to reserving the right of either party to go to Court. Both of these have been accepted, so that the section will read in this way: "Resolved:—Where in the Agreement provision is made for the holding of arbitrations under Section 55 of the Crown Lands Act, the following procedure is substituted in lieu thereof. There shall be three arbitrators, one appointed by each of the contesting parties and one by the Supreme Court consisting of not less than two Judges. The application to the Supreme Court for the appointment of an arbitrator may be made by either contesting party, upon motion, after four days' notice thereof has been duly served upon the other party."

There was another amendment proposed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the expenditure of \$5,000,000. That is agreed to. No change is made down to the third last line. After "transportation" add "Power houses, railways and plant"; then you strike out the words in that third line "business and operations." Then there is an amendment proposed by Mr. Morine, No. 7, limiting the grant to within twenty years. That is agreed to also.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: If the matter now before the chair only affected me personally, I may be

inclined to silently allow the measure to be discussed. But as I consider the Bill we are asked to ratify as the most important that ever come before our Legislature, I have a duty to perform to the people from the section of the country who sent me here to represent them.

The contract is of the gravest importance for the future weal or woe of this country, and deserves the most serious and careful consideration. In discussing this measure all party feelings should be put aside. While the personnel of the parties who are asking may not be of the first or any vital importance; yet we cannot rid our minds of the fact that the parties who now have control of such vast areas of this country are also the directors of the Company who are seeking such vast concessions, which if granted, will give them control of the greatest and we may say the only asset of any value the Colony has left.

Will it be to the interests of this country to make this mighty corporation still more powerful without any reservations or limitations whatever? We are creating a monopoly, the value and influence of which is so great that it is difficult to find a parallel in the old or new world.

In this enlightened age of the Twentieth Century, among the most advanced nations and colonies, the object is for the State to keep control of its natural resources. We are doing the exact opposite by legislating away everything that is of any value to the future development of the country, and for what? For nothing, except the hope that is held forth it will give employment to some of our people.

Is the return for such vast concessions in any way commensurate with the sacrifice we are asked to make? Are we to mortgage the future of this country for a shadow or an imagination? Simply for the sweat and

labor of our people to further enrich a corporation, which is obsessed with the enormity of the wealth they have already wrung from the taxpayers of this colony, by way of building railways and infamous awards from arbitration courts, as a result of the blunders of past governments.

Are we in making this contract to repeat the mistakes of the past? Are we never to learn from bitter experience that awful consequences may follow from an ill-considered or badly drafted document?

A burnt child dreads the fire, surely we should have the sense, or instincts of children, if not, that of hard-headed politicians, statesmen or business men. We should not be lured to the giving away of the heritage of future generations by the fantastic glittering of the word employment, at this one of the darkest hours in the history of the country. In 1898, seventeen years ago, the condition of the country then was taken as an excuse for making a contract with the Messrs. Reid. Is it too much to say that the deplorable financial condition of the country has been taken advantage of to make a bargain with this Legislature, which surpasses Shylock and his pound of flesh.

We know from experience that no amendment or change can ever be made in this contract after it is once ratified by the House, without the proverbial pound of flesh being enacted to the infinitesimal part of an ounce. Should we then unthinkingly rush headlong into an undertaking and seal forever every possibility this country has in the untold wealth of its water powers, without any reservations whatever?

It may so happen that not in the very distant future our water powers may become so valuable that a rental could be obtained, which would bring an annual revenue to the country of a million dollars. If such should

come to pass, coming generations will curse the men who were so stupid as to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage.

The resolutions as brought down to this House remind one of the great Athenian lawgiver, Solon. It is said of Solon, "that he was obscure and ambiguous in the wording of his laws, on purpose to increase the honour of his courts, for since their difference could not be adjusted by the letter, they would have to bring all their cases to the judges, who thus were in a manner masters of the laws."

The parties who drafted this document must be true disciples of Solon, for it is a most ambiguous document, and even to the ordinary layman of the most limited intelligence it cannot fail to provoke the statement that the men who drafted these resolutions were either knaves or fools. If knaves, it was designedly written with the idea to grab everything, but if it met with any determined opposition, they would pretend to grant some concessions or make modifications that the members of the Legislature might imagine they were giving something back, and yet retain everything that was desired.

If it was foolishly or ignorantly drawn, and if the leaders of the Government had anything to do with it, we are indeed to be pitied to have such men purporting to be lawyers and statesmen at the head of affairs in this poor old contract cursed Colony. The resolutions as amended, and brought down to us by the Government, are in my opinion adding insult to injury. Are we ever to be regarded as a party of men who live only for the present moment and anything which holds out the probability of giving employment for the time being at the expense of to-morrow or the next day is good enough. This is not good enough for me, and it

should not be good enough for any man who has the honour to sit in this Legislature.

We are building not for the day but for all time. It is selfish, unwise, unpatriotic, and is only the actions of weaklings and fools to be enamoured of the prismatic colours of the floating bubble or the beautiful rainbow, which is an evidence of sunshine and shower, for to have the pleasing phenomenon we must have not only the sunshine but the cloud and the rain as well. That which we are asked to witness now only exhibits the rainbow side, but we must as rational beings look for the cloud and the shower which are causing this pleasing presentation of all the good that the passing of this contract will bring us.

We find behind the screen the greedy, grasping hand of a corporation, that is seeking to monopolize the future development of this country and to bind hand and foot as far as they are concerned the future legislators of this Colony. The possibilities of electricity are beyond our imagination, when we consider that it is only twenty-five years since the transmission by wireless was first developed. Its miraculous powers are beyond our comprehension, still it is only in its infancy, and what will come within the realm of its operations during the next twenty-five years may be still more wonderful.

In the Hudson River a highly successful experiment in the propelling of boats by wireless, has become an accomplished fact. A fifty-foot boat is driven up and down the river by a wireless station at a distance of half a mile from the river. The boat is made to travel in any desired direction.

It is only reasonable to suppose from the marvellous accomplishment of recent times that in the not distant future, that all the river boats will derive their propelling power

from some mighty power station many miles away. We have water power enough to give power, heat, and light to the whole Colony.

Supposing at the end of fifty years from the passing of the 1898 contract, when the railway will revert back to this country that our railway could be cheaply and efficiently operated by electric motor power. What an inestimable boon it would be to the people of this country if they possessed these water powers that we are now giving away.

In thirty-three years from now, according to contract, we shall have to take over the railway with all its rolling stock at a fair valuation to be paid the Reid Nfld. Company for the same. Supposing that locomotion by steam at that time will be obsolete, the rolling stock will be practically worthless, and the possession of our water powers would then be worth millions to the country, if for nothing else only to operate our railway. We should not railroad these resolutions through the legislature blindly. The hon. members of the Government should gravely consider what the passing of this contract may mean to themselves, their children, and their children's children.

A Bill was introduced in the Nova Scotia Parliament to incorporate a 12 million dollar company. The Halifax Tramway Company, because they had control of the Fall at Gaspereau River, seventy miles from Halifax, which at the utmost would only develop 10,000 horse power, the engineer would not guarantee any more than 5,000 horsepower. If that water power was worth twelve million dollars at that distance what are our million and a half horse power worth to this country, when 1 h.p. develops 3-4 kilowatt, and we have to pay the Reid Nfld. Co. 15 cents per kilowatt for electric light.

I have endeavoured as briefly as

possible, to give my reasons for placing myself on record as being opposed to this contract, as brought down to this House, and if the Government is determined to put the matter through, all the talk and recommendations from this side of the House will be of no avail. In this matter the Government is acting according to its mad policy of providing for the present only. Their policy is "let the dead bury its dead." Live for the present, let future generations provide for themselves, forgetting that they are piling up liabilities and obstacles that will make it impossible for people to live in this country.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say just a few words in connection with this matter. I have listened for a while to the different speakers on both sides of the House and among them there were some able speeches. I give the opposition members credit for their effort and I believe that every honourable gentleman on that side, spoke in earnest and in the interests of the country. The last speaker brought in about the Railway contract. I must say that from the beginning I was always in favour of it. When the 1898 Contract passed, the hon. member for Bonavista sent me a copy of it. I thought that that was the best thing that ever happened to Newfoundland. The Company lost in the operation of the railway for several years—from \$200,000 to \$240,000 every year, but they carried it through as far as they could. I think that they deserve great credit. Then about the Harmsworth deal. At that time I had the pleasure of sitting on the Opposition side, when I fought in favour of the twenty-two amendments proposed by Mr. Morine. I believe that every man on that side feels that he is doing right in opposing this bill. I believe that they feel in their hearts that this bill will go through. We have heard a great

deal about the injury that it is going to do to other parties. We have here before us protests of the Penn-Newfoundland Company that own land situate on the South side of Grand Lake and the limit, in the vicinity of Hinds Lake; both of these lots of land are not less than five hundred feet above the waters of Grand Lake. We have also before us, protest from the West Coast Pulp & Lumber Company that own lands at Sandy Lake. Sandy Lake is 270 ft. above the sea level, or 255 ft. above Deer Lake. We have also a protest from the Great Northern Development Company owners of one hundred square miles situated at different places around Grand Lake. I may say that Grand Lake itself is 240 ft. above Deer Lake. A glance at the Geological map of Newfoundland will convince one that any operations on Deer Lake and on Junction Brook no matter how great the dam will be, or how long it may be, will in no way interfere with the above mentioned properties. If a dam is required at Grand Lake, the only parties to be interfered with would be The Great Northern Development Company, and a dam of 20 ft. high, right at the railway bridge at the outlet of Junction Brook, would not damage the Great Northern people's land to any extent—not more than \$1,000. Those who know Grand Lake and have travelled it, can certify that in going back from the shore of the lake one hundred yards at the lowest places, they will get a rise of ground of not less than thirty feet. The West Coast Pulp & Lumber Co. have some more limits in Bay St. George, which is more than fifty miles from where the Products Co. will be operating, and as they have no water power on their limits this Company would in no way interfere with them. We then take the Packer, Harrison, O'Connor, Sherwood and Begent limits situated between Bay of Islands and Bay St.

George, all west of Cooke's Brook. These limits held by the above gentlemen mentioned cannot in any way be interfered with by the Products Co., no matter how many dams or mills they may build at Bay of Islands, Deer Lake or Grand Lake; and as I said before, on the Packer, Harrison, O'Connor, Sherwood and Begent Limits, there are no water powers, merely rivers for driving purposes, that is for the driving of logs. St. George's Lake which is situated midway between Bay of Islands and Bay St. George, is only sixty-four ft. above sea level, and the river from St. George's Lake emptying into Bay St. George has no fall on it. The Serpentine Pulp and Lumber Co. has limits containing thirty-five miles at Spruce Brook and the sea-coast south of Bay of Islands, a distance of about fifteen to twenty miles. The timber will be shipped from the sea-coast and cannot in any way be interfered with by the Products Co. They have no water power on their limits that would be of benefit to any body. St. George's Lumber Co., that has limits on Flat Bay Brook, Bay St. George, is not less than sixty miles from Corner Brook, Bay of Islands. They have no water powers on their limits, and no land that would be of any special benefit to the Products Co. The above statements are actual facts and obtained from the best surveys and maps obtainable in this country, and I challenge contradiction from any member of this House. I may add, however, that Deer Lake is fifteen feet above sea-level, and the draining and raising of Deer Lake in summer time of ten feet, would not damage in my opinion, and the opinion of those competent to judge, property held there by different people to any extent. I do not think any gentleman in this House can contradict the figures that I have given. This will be a great benefit to the country. Mr. Halfyard

talked about the electric tramways in Halifax. The people objected to having a company operating them. They wanted to do it themselves. Would the people of Halifax consider that it would be a great benefit if they could run the whole railway themselves? I am pleased to see the Opposition fighting this matter however, as it means that we will have the whole thing thoroughly threshed out and arrive at a satisfactory bill.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, the lands granted to the Reid-Newfoundland Co., carry no more than the natural flow of water over the land. We do not give the rights to water powers themselves. They are really getting a good price for their water powers. A grant of land does not give any such rights. We are really giving the most valuable right that it is possible to acquire.

MR. MORINE—I beg to propose the following amendment to Section 26:—

RESOLVED—It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Council at any time within twenty years from the enactment hereof to grant to the Company any lands belonging to and in possession of the Crown and not under lease or license, which may be required as incident to flowage rights or rights of way, for telegraphs, telephones, power transmission lines, railways, tramways, roads or sites for mills, works, factories, or warehouses, or so much of the seashore or foreshore and of the public waters and land thereunder as may be required for wharves, docks, quays, piers, warehouses and other buildings for the purposes aforesaid or shipping facilities in connection with the Company's operations and within a distance of fifty miles therefrom but the quantity of land so granted shall not exceed in the whole ten thousand acres and shall not include any land under a

stream or river where a water power can be created.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. MORINE—I beg to move an additional clause re water powers which explains itself. The Company is given a lease for 99 years of certain water powers. It may use part of the power and refuse to develop the rest. This section gives the Governor in Council power on the report of the Government Engineer to compel the Company to develop these powers to their full extent. This is from the Ontario Act, and if it is necessary there I submit it is necessary here also. Here we give them practically a perpetual lease over certain water powers without requiring that they shall develop these powers. We should be in a position to say to the Company: "You must develop these powers or give them up. You cannot be a dog-in-the-manger."

RESOLVED—The Company shall develop and utilize the water powers hereby demised by the construction of necessary works and the installation of suitable and necessary plant and machinery for the production of some form of power to the extent which such powers are reasonably capable of physically, and shall use the power so developed in the operation of machinery or some other commercial, mechanical, or industrial purpose, or if the said power so developed or any part thereof shall not be required for such purposes by the Company it shall furnish power to any person, company or corporation requiring the same power up to the amount of power which the said water powers are reasonably capable of developing, or such lesser quantity as shall be actually required or in demand. Upon report being made by the Government Engineer to the Governor-in-Council that the water powers aforesaid have not been developed and utilized to the

full extent of which they are physically capable by the works constructed or the plant and machinery installed by the Company, and that there is a bona fide demand for power in excess of the quantity of power developed and utilized by the said Company which might in whole or in part be supplied from the water powers aforesaid, then the Governor-in-Council may by Order-in-Council require the said Company to develop and render available for use the additional quantity of power so shown to be undeveloped and capable of development or any part thereof, by the construction of the necessary works and the installation of suitable and necessary plant and machinery within a period of time to be named in the said Order, and in default of compliance with the said requirement the Governor-in-Council may order and direct that the lease and grants hereunder or any of them shall be forfeited and cancelled, and the same shall be forfeited and cancelled accordingly.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. LLOYD—I beg to move a Resolution re the renewal of the demise beyond a period of ninety-nine years.

RESOLVED—Notwithstanding anything contained in the indenture appended the Company shall have no right of renewal of this demise when the term expires at the end of 99 years from this period.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. MORINE—I beg to propose the following amendment:

RESOLVED—The expenditure by the Company of the sum of five million dollars, provided in Section 18, in and about the business and operations of the Company, shall mean an expenditure at Bay of Islands and or within the drainage area of the Humber; and or within the drainage area of Corner Brook; and or within a rad-

lus of ten miles of the mouth of Corner Brook, in and about the construction of dams, buildings, docks and transmission lines for the business and operations of the Company in and about the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement, or their by-products; and the failure to begin actual construction work or to expend such money within the times mentioned shall absolutely prevent the Company from taking or holding any rights whatsoever under any Section of the indenture in the schedule hereto, the indenture and the demise under Section 1 thereof, and grant under Section 5 shall be wholly void ab initio.

The word "begin" in the said section shall mean the expenditure in construction of not less than one hundred thousand dollars within two years from the enactment hereof, and not less than five hundred thousand dollars shall be expended in the work of construction each year for two years thereafter.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. MORINE—I beg to propose the following amendment:

RESOLVED—The expenditure by the Company of five million dollars provided in Section 2 of the agreement shall be an expenditure in addition to the expenditure of five million dollars provided in Section 18 thereof, and the first named sum of five million dollars shall be expended in Newfoundland in and about the construction of dams, buildings, docks and transmission lines for the business and operations of the Company in and about the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement, or their by-products; and the expenditure of ten million dollars provided to be made in the construction and operation of the

Company's plant on Labrador shall mean an expenditure for the construction of dams, buildings, docks and transmission lines for the Company in and about the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement, or their by-products.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. MORINE—I beg to propose the following resolution:

RESOLVED—Unless the Company shall by the 1st January, 1917, have a subscribed capital of not less than five million dollars, of which not less than one million has been paid up in cash, and shall prove the same to the satisfaction of the Governor-in-Council, which satisfaction shall be signified by a minute of Council, all rights, privileges and powers granted to or conferred upon the Company hereby shall cease and determine, and any lease and grant hereunder shall become void.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. KENT—I beg to propose the following amendments in connection with Section 4, as regards taxation on stock dividends and securities of the Company.

RESOLVED—All construction material and machinery for the Company's mills, factories and works for the purpose of the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, and other fertilizers, carbide of calcium, cement and their by-products both for original installation and further extension, but not in substitution for old, imported into this Colony within twenty years of the enactment hereof shall be admitted free of customs duties.

RESOLVED—All lands, waters, water powers, buildings, erections, and all property whatsoever of the Company for use in connection with the manufacture of phosphate of ammon-

in, nitrate of ammonia, and other fertilizers, carbide of calcium, cement, or their by-products, situate at Bay of Islands, or within the drainage area of the Humber, or within the drainage area of Corner Brook, or within a radius of ten miles from the mouth of Corner Brook, or at Labrador, shall be exempt from municipal taxation during twenty years from the enactment hereof. Section 6 of the Agreement in the schedule hereto shall be held to include only such lands, waters, water powers, buildings, erections and property as are for use in connection with the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, cement or their by-products, situate as last mentioned.

RESOLVED—The stock, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages and other securities of the Company shall be exempt from taxation, during twenty years from the enactment hereof.

RESOLVED—All phosphate rock, pyrites, electrodes, soda, and bags and packages for distribution of the Company's products required by the Company for the purpose of the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement or their by-products imported into this Colony within twenty years of the enactment hereof shall be free of customs duties.

RESOLVED—All coal required by the Company for the purposes in the next preceding resolution mentioned imported into Labrador within twenty years of the enactment hereof shall be free of customs duties.

These resolutions, being put, were lost.

MR. MORINE—I beg to propose the following amendment:

RESOLVED—Nothing contained herein, or in the schedule of this act, shall take from the public or any

member thereof any right now existing by law or custom to fish, shoot, hunt and trap, or, of navigating streams, rivers and lakes, and to maintain thereon for use in such navigation any kind of vessel or boat.

This amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. KENT—I beg to propose the following amendment:

RESOLVED—The exemption from taxation upon the stocks, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages or other securities shall apply only to such as are bona fide required for the purpose of or relate to or are derived from the works, business, or operations of the Company in relation to the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia and other fertilizers, carbide of calcium, cement and their by-products.

The amendment, being put, was lost.

MR. LLOYD—I beg to ask the Premier a question I asked him some time ago. At that time he said he had no information. That question is in reference to assignments of patents. There is a clause in the Indenture re the assignment of certain patents that they should get confirmation of these patents notwithstanding anything in our patent laws. That is an extraordinary clause, and nobody seems to be able to tell us the object of it. Is the Prime Minister going to move any resolution on this point?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No.

MR. KENT—Is there any assurance that they have any patents?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No.

MR. MORINE—Surely the Premier does not intend to assign patents which belong to one man to others who come without proving any assignment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— I understand they have been assigned. However we are not making any assignment.

MR. MORINE—You confirm to the company letters patent which have been granted to Jesse Critz King. You thereby assume that there has been an assignment. "Such letters patent shall be valid and continue in full force for and during the period of twenty-one years from the date of the original patents, and all the provisions of this clause shall apply for the benefit of the Company." This confirms an assignment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, if the assignment has taken place.

MR. MORINE—You are asking us to confirm an assignment the existence of which we do not know. If the assignment exists why do we not know. This is a scandalous way of proceeding.

There is another point about this that makes it necessary for any man who has any self-respect or respect for our laws to vote against this clause. It is set forth that such letters patent shall be binding notwithstanding anything in our Patent Act. Suppose Jesse Critz King is not the original inventor or discoverer of the process for which he asks a patent which he has assigned to this Company, we are taking away the rights of the real discoverer and assigning them to this Company for twenty-one years. Such legislation is entirely scandalous in the last degree. Even if we suppose that Jesse Critz King had these patents, and suppose further that he assigned them, anybody can come in and challenge his right to have them, and can have them set aside by proving that he was not the original discoverer, or that he stole them from somebody else; but here this Act steps in and says they shall continue in force for twenty-one years notwithstanding anything in the law of the Colony. You are giving away without question rights that may be

long to a dozen different people in this Colony or outside it. It is certainly a most scandalous proceeding.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I must press this matter upon the attention of the Government. I raised this point a fortnight ago, and asked a question. I tried to get outside of the House the object of this, and I was assured the only object of the clause was to continue the patents for twenty-one years in this way: instead of waiting for fourteen years to obtain a renewal for seven years that this House should give that renewal now. Now if that is so I think we ought to have a Resolution limiting it to that; but not giving them something they may have no right to possess. It is a monstrous doctrine, and alien to every land in the world to give patents to a thief. I am not at all certain that it is the intention to give these patents to a thief, but that is the principle upon which we are asked to deal with them. No matter whether the patents are honestly obtained or not we are asked to deal with them and give them to the Company, and to give Jesse Critz King something which he may not have at all. He may not have any right to a patent; that patent may be set aside within the next six months or two or three years under the ordinary law. Now it would be monstrous if we are to set aside all the protection which every law in every country in the world affords that no patent—no monopoly—shall be granted except to the true discoverer under certain definite conditions. I do not think that under any circumstances we should depart from that principle. If the mere object is not to override the patent law but merely to make the term twenty-one years, then I am quite willing to accede to a Resolution setting that forth. But I am not prepared to let the present Resolution go without some protest to justify myself and

this House in dealing with this matter, and I would press upon the Government to find out exactly what the meaning of this clause is and to set before us something clear and definite. I may point out that neither the Premier nor any member of the Government has said one word in defence of this clause. It has been absolutely ignored. Even the object of it has not been mentioned in any speech from the other side.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think I explained to the hon. member before when he raised the point. It is quite true that I did not refer to it in my original remarks, because there did not appear to be any need to refer to that particular clause.

MR. LLOYD—I recollect that the hon. gentleman said he knew nothing about it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The position I took was the position I took this afternoon, that it is simply for the purpose of confirming patents issued by the Governor in Council, namely:

No. 184 dated April 21st, 1914, for manufacturing Phosphoric Acid and Phosphates, and No. 189 dated May 16th, 1914, for a method of making nitrogen compounds, and No. 190 dated May 18th, 1914, for Phosphoric Acid Products, and No. 193 dated July 25th, 1914, for method of producing Nitrogen and Compounds, and No. 196 dated Aug. 22nd 1914, for method of manufacturing ammoniated double super-phosphate, and which patents have been granted to Jesse Critz King and by him assigned.

I think the whole point now resolves itself down to a question of fact, whether they have been assigned or not. I have been informed that they have been regularly assigned. When the agreement was first under consideration a year ago, that matter was under consideration and right up

through the various discussions. Then there were other patents applied for which I was informed was included in the assignment.

MR. LLOYD—I think we are entitled to know whether the Government as a party to this arrangement intends that this patent shall be made valid, although at present it may be invalid.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Certainly not. I go further and say this Resolution does not make valid anything that is invalid.

MR. LLOYD—If that is so we have got to do something. It is not the intention of the Government to make valid something which but for this might be set aside in the Court. I hope now that the Government will reconsider this matter, and not enact something which may give a black eye to the whole project; and the Company should consider from their side whether they are prepared to go into the London market or the New York market and say we have obtained the passage of a law making our patents valid, even though they have been obtained from a thief.

MR. MORINE—This is "the nigger in the wood pile" of the whole contract. I think to give these people a monopoly would be a most improper act. This practically gives this paper company a monopoly for twenty-one years. Surely it is not necessary to the making of fertiliser to hand over to these people a monopoly without any kind of reason or justification. Probably in time to come when we come to understand the meaning of these various sections we will realize and regret that we gave away by act of Parliament rights that we have no right in the world to deal with. Why in the name of Heaven should we rush into this contract without regard to ordinary business ways? Why give these patents until we see each assignment? The Government is sitting

down and does not ask for the assignments. It is not even considering the force of what it is doing here. In fact I do not think that it really understands the meaning, because if what the Premier deals with is all they know, then the object of this section would be perfectly useless, which it manifestly is not.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman: I do not see the object of this section, unless it is to give something that the principal Act does not give. If it gives something that the principal act does not give then it ought to be explained, and the Government ought to be in a position to put that information before the House. If the assignment itself of Jesse Critz King is a faulty title as it goes to the Company, why should we legalise it? If it is a good title then what is the necessity for this section, unless it is concealing something of which we have no explanation. That is the only interpretation that can be put on it. That can be the only interpretation that can be put upon our passing that clause without seeing the assignment and securing the rights of third parties, that there is something concealed. Parties may have equitable rights against the Patentee himself; parties that do not even know up to the present that such a contract is in contemplation; parties who have claims, legal or equitable, against the assignment of the patent, if there is an assignment, and if there is an assignment what object can the Company have in not producing for the Government such assignment. Why not produce the assignment and put it on the table of the House? Let them even say where the assignment is. This clause ought not to go through, and no one with any sense of what is right can let that clause go through without conserving the legal and equitable rights of third parties. If

within these years a person claims that Mr. King had no right whatever to that patent, and we are aware that there are cases where the right to a patent has been contested, and every lawyer in St. John's knows that no year passes by that he has not got to advise upon the question of faulty titles to patents. If this clause goes through we are passing it without knowing what rights we are excluding. We ought to secure these people even if we did confirm the patents. We ought to secure people who have rights against the patent. There is only one object that I can see that this clause can have, and that is that the law as at present it stands in Newfoundland, requires the owners of patents to bring them into operation within two years. I would, if necessary, extend that time for the bringing of these patents into operation, but I cannot for the life of me see what object there is for this clause unless it is to do away with the rights of some third innocent parties. I admit that it would only be fair to extend the right to bring it into operation for five or seven years.

MR. LLOYD—I am quite prepared that there should be some amendment that their rights should not cease if they do not bring their patents into operation in five years say; but I do not think we ought to pass this section unless there is some reason for it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—One of the amendments that has been suggested concerns the conserving and flowage of water where any power would be supplied, and I have submitted that matter, and have had a couple of the resolutions printed, which I will table to-morrow. I suggest that that matter stand over till then.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I propose the following amendment:

"Except as hereinafter provided no male person shall be employed by the Company at a lower rate of pay than twenty cents per hour, provided that this shall not apply to those persons boarded and lodged by the Company while in their employ."

That means that for all purposes except those mentioned, the Company shall pay twenty cents per hour, that is the lowest wage that the Company shall engage anyone to work at. In view of what we have heard from the Premier in presenting this matter to the House—in view of his statements as to the labour of this Company, to the great benefits that would accrue to seven hundred or a thousand men I think that the least that the Company can afford to pay for labour is twenty cents an hour or \$600 a year for any man who works. Unless they can pay this wage I see no good that can come to the labouring people. We are told that there is going to be a great deal of employment for the fishermen. I hope there will be, if the fishermen require it, but I cannot see what good is going to come if they do not pay at least \$2.00 a day. If we cannot get that from this tremendous business, it is no good as far as the Colony's workmen are concerned. There is no fishermen going to leave his home where he is established at the fishery, and go to Bay of Islands for \$1.40 or \$1.60 per day. The only people that I can see it is going to benefit are those men who have not done well at the fishery, and who wish to put in three or four months at that kind of employment. This Company will employ a great number of people at logging. That will be a great benefit to the fishery class. For all other labourers they should be paid not less than twenty cents an hour, and unless a concern of this kind can pay that it is of no value whatever to the work-

ing people of the Island, and I hope that the Government before they pass these resolutions will take the rate of pay into consideration, and arrange with the Company that they shall give this rate of wage. If they do that they will be helping the labourers of the country.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Chairman: The first objection that I have to the proposal made by the hon. member is that at the outside it will mean that the men will get \$1.60 a day, because these men will work only eight hours a day. To put in therefore a wage such as that is a mistake. We must assume that this Company is actuated by the highest motives. If we look at the facts we will find that in 1890 when we made a contract to build the road to Port aux Basques we stipulated on seventy cents a day for labourers, and they got ninety cents, and in the next contract we put a dollar as a minimum wage, and there were very few who were not paid more. Then when we were giving the last contract the rate of wage was \$1.50; that meant that no one could be paid a less figure than what we stipulated, but in those cases we were giving a contract to a man for a public work. In this case we are not doing that, and if the stipulations in this contract are not carried out we get back all the rights that we have given. It is my hope and belief that when these people begin the rate of pay will not be \$1.60, but \$2.00 and \$2.50, because I feel that they will not be able to get the people to work for less, and if they cannot keep up with the rate of wages paid by other companies then the men will not stay with them. The rate of wages is to a very large extent dependent upon the law of supply and demand, and the starting of this company in the Island will increase the price of labour considerably. If you put in a rate of twenty

cents per hour you are telling the company what you think is a good rate of wage—what is a good standard—that I think is a mistake. I think it is a mistake furthermore, because there is no necessity for it. They will not be able to get anyone to work for less than \$2.00 per day, and it might have a very injurious effect upon their obtaining money in the foreign market if you put in all these restrictions and covenants.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: Just one word in reply. I think that twenty cents an hour should be placed in the bill. Every man will work twelve hours a day in the summer, more particularly on the construction work. We have two or three years to go before they spend this \$5,000,000, and if you put in twenty cents an hour as a minimum wage we will look after them after the construction work is over, and if necessary, see they get twenty-five or thirty cents.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In that case I think it would be safe to leave the whole thing to you without any stipulations in the bill.

MR. COAKER—Well let us make the limit \$2.00 a day as a smallest amount. Let them give \$5.00 a day if you like. I do not believe in the Premier's statement. If you do not believe in my suggestion, then let us see that they get at least \$2.00 a day. I do not want to make trouble for the company, but I want to see them give a wage that will let the labouring man live. To-day they can give a man less than \$1.00. When we put in the Reid contract that he was to pay \$1.50, the men got it. If you put in this it will be a boon to the people of Newfoundland, and the people will then say, "Well done Morris."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think we are perfectly safe in leaving this matter as it is. There are a great number of men today in need

of labour, who cannot get supplies for the Labrador or other fisheries. That has been brought about by causes which would serve no purpose by discussion here. There is a great diminution in the supplies for the Labrador fishery. Two years ago they were not able to get a man to go, and it appears to me that it would be a great mistake to put in a clause such as this which may interfere with the coming years. I am prepared to vote for anything that I consider in the interests of the working people of the Island. I have never been influenced in this House or outside of it by any kind of influence other than what I considered right. That is a very broad statement to make. I have never allowed any influence, lay or clerical, to interfere with my opinions in this House. I will vote for anything that I consider right, as regards the people of this country, in relation to a contract or any other matter that is before the House, — temperance matters, or any other matters. I have only one interest, and that is to have placed on the Statute Book the best possible contract in the interest of the country, and in the interest of the people. But this amendment will be no improvement in any way.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman: I have to disagree with the argument put forward by the Premier. There is no argument against putting in twenty cents an hour as a minimum wage. If there is no necessity for it, it can do no harm. If you make a minimum wage then any increase will be governed by the law of supply and demand. If you go into the argument you will see how absurd it is. There are conditions which will make labour worth \$2.50 a day, but if you make it \$2.50 by statute that will be the best they can get. If you put in this minimum wage then the wages

cannot be cut down. If you do not put in this minimum wage then the labour market will be governed by the foreign labour that can be brought in. There is no restriction upon their bringing in foreign labour. Nothing can be clearer than that labour will increase in price according as the market gets short, but it is also clear that if foreign labour is imported the price of labour will go down.

Mr. Chairman, the point is this. The Premier was arguing that the demand at Bay of Islands would cause the price to be about \$2.00, and I say that it will depend upon supply. If we are to develop our natural resources, we are glad to have them, and must keep them, and must run no chance of losing them. The proposal is that none would fetch less than 20 cents. There is a great danger from the foreign element; this would stop it, and I support this as a measure for that purpose.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman: While I believe the members who have opposed this are sincere, nevertheless I do not think that this legislature should need discuss this question of a private company. It is a private company. I agree with the Premier in what he said about the 20 cents. I believe that when started they will get that. I do not agree with Mr. Morine, I think that if this war continues there will be very few foreign labourers come to this country. There will be lots of employment elsewhere. The more people a place has the better. If we had more here today we would not have as many taxes to pay. Lots are going to the United States, and that is growing fast.

MR. COAKER—My friend Mr. Moulton regrets that more people are not here. Let us get down to business. It is my belief that when this Company

is started, immigration will set in at once.

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.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL.

Second reading of bill, "An act to amend the law respecting the Exportation of Timber."

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker: I ask that this bill be withdrawn. The reason for doing so is this: that it is desirable to have an export duty on timber, and in the bill as brought in there was no verbiage to make this possible. As a result of this change the bill will be brought in by means of resolutions.

On motion of Hon. Minister Finance and Customs the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the Law Respecting the Exportation of Timber" was withdrawn.

MESSAGES FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled: "An Act to amend 5 George V., Sess. 1, Cap. 10, entitled: 'An Act respecting Stamp Duties,'" 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 Customs Act, 1898" with an amendment, in which they

requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the Council's amendment was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PACKING COMPANY RESOLUTIONS

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider "certain Resolutions confirming an Agreement between the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland-American Packing Company, Incorporated."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Chairman: When these resolutions were before the House some one or two changes were made. We have had the whole thing reprinted, and I think the points have been made quite clear.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman:

When this matter was before the House we had two very excellent speeches on them, one from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the other from the Minister of Finance. These brought the attention of the House to the matter brought up here by us last year, namely, the bait question. There should be bait depots erected. This bill provides that there shall be three places for storing fish. Bait is only mentioned in the last clause; and there but to prohibit its export. I presume there will be arrangements made to have bait depots established. There are great results awaiting the opening of such depots.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

I think that the Company when they are once started, would do this in their own interests.

MR. COAKER—That is not enough.

We want to be sure of it. What return is the Colony going to get for this expenditure of \$25,000 per year? What benefit is this going to be? If by doing this we also provide fresh bait depots to supply to bankers and shore fishermen, we would be doing some good. Now you take \$25,000 which you are going to invest. Suppose you raise a loan for that amount. You can invest it in a better way than this. Suppose you invest this in 200 bait depots. You can do this, and still have some \$200 left to operate them, and get them started. If each of these get 100 qts. of fish, we would have 20,000 quintals, and this at \$7 per qt. would mean \$140,000 revenue. Thus the establishment of these depots would mean an addition to the revenue of \$140,000. Therefore if we spend this money on bait depots we would have an addition to the revenue of this \$140,000. Now you are going to spend \$25,000; on what? On securing \$5,000 or \$4,000 revenue on the Cape Shore. I certainly cannot agree to such a proposal as this. Let us first get the fish, and then get cold storage for it. I do hope the Government will down such a proposition. There is another thing I object to in this Contract, and that is that it is confined to this one Company. If you are going to make it in opposition as it is to the outports, then make it general in its application; give every other company the same option. Why give this Company any special favour? Why not let any company, a local company, erect stations at the same rates? Many would accept the proposition. What I would recommend is to pass a bill guaranteeing every company carrying on such a business a dividend of 5 per cent. for 15 years.

I believe, Sir, that the question of a bait supply for our fisheries is a question just as important as the

Newfoundland Products Bill. You would have had lots of residents in Newfoundland today if you had started that. There is lots of fish; lots of it, but not bait. Supply bait and I am sure of a return to the revenue of at least 25 per cent. I believe if you invested \$12,000,000 on this now, you would get a return of \$3,000,000 per year. There is lots of fish. Every fisherman spends at least a month or two doing nothing in the search for it. This country has had a Government now for over sixty years, and not one yet has helped the fisherman to get one quintal of fish. No one Government out of all that have had power. All they did with the fishermen was to tax them. I hope the Government will look into this matter and see what they are doing before passing this contract.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman: The hon. member opposite has only to look up the past history on bait depots to see the objections there are to them. The Messrs. Job Bros. & Co. some 12 years ago erected plants for this purpose, and kept them running the whole season. It may be interesting for the hon. member to know that there was not \$100 worth of bait sold there for the whole year, and naturally the business was closed up. The whole explanation was that the fishermen had lots of bait that year, and gathered it for themselves. If any industry like this is to be carried on, the fishermen should patronize it. It is only with their continued patronage that the venture could succeed at all.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: As the time is getting late now, I will postpone my remarks until the next session of this House. Then I hope I will be able to show the hon. member that the Government is ready to en-

ertain the offer of any company who will agree to establish such an industry as has been advocated here this afternoon.

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.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice of Bill.

Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice of bill and resolutions.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill providing for safety at sea of Bank Fishermen.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting certain Retiring Allowances.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Exportation of Timber.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 18th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

—

TUESDAY, May 18th, 1915.

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

PETITIONS.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Samuel Lovitt and others of Seal Cove, in the district of Fortune,

on the subject of the prohibition of the importation and manufacture of intoxicating liquors. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from George Barnes and a number of others of Trout River, in the district of St. Barbe, on the subject of Prohibition.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Stone gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Clapp gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Coaker gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Hickman gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Grimes gave Notice of Question.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House (1) the amount, if any, paid by the Government for telegraph messages in Bonavista District during 1913, 1914, 1915; (2) the names of persons creating the amount; (3) the amount incurred by each.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

The answer is being prepared.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of all expenses in connection with the Customs in Bonavista District and the names of persons to whom the money was paid.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The answer is now under preparation, and will be tabled before the House rises.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing how much Able-bodied Relief was given out by each Relieving Officer in Bonavista District from October to

date; with bills and vouchers for same.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

The answer to that question is being prepared, and will be ready to-morrow.

MR. KENT asked the Right Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a copy of the Report of Professor Dunstan, resulting from his visit to the Colony last year.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the number of male persons between 18 and 50 years who died during 1914.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

The answer to that question will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to move that the Rules for the Proceedings of the House of Assembly be amended by adding thereto the following: "That there shall be a standing Committee of the House to be designated, 'The Committee of Public Accounts,' for the examination of the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by the Legislature to meet the Public Expenditure, and of all other accounts showing expenditure from Public moneys for any purpose, to consist of seven members, who shall be nominated at the commencement of every Session, and of whom three shall be a quorum."

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I think that each member will find a copy of the Additional Estimates on his desk. A number of these votes explain

themselves; but any information that I can give is at the disposal of the hon. members. Under Head I, the interest on \$500,000 at 5 per cent. is \$25,000. The amounts under Head VI. have been discussed already, in Supplementary Supply, Head VIII. These are amounts which have been applied for during the year. Head X., Wharf at Fogo, and pier at Fortune. These are long-felt wants in those localities. The amount under Head XII. was omitted in the main estimates. Head XV., the amount herein mentioned is to be allocated to the dependents of those who have given their lives for the Empire in the present war. To this date, something like fifteen family men have been lost, whose families have received immediate relief from the Patriotic Fund. This Patriotic Society has done considerable work since its institution, having relieved something like 150 cases of distress. Among these were thirty families who were dependents of Newfoundlanders who enlisted in Canada. This Association has paid out something like \$4,000 in relief from time to time. It is the intention of the Government ultimately to bring down a pension Bill. They find however, that it is so beset with difficulties that considerable time would be necessary satisfactorily to effect this. Even in Canada they have not yet been able to bring down such a Bill in a final form. But we anticipate by next session that we will be able to bring down a suitable Bill for the dependents and the wounded. Now the Finance Committee of the Patriotic Association here was appointed for the Patriotic Association which was inaugurated last August. The funds were handed over by the Government to that body and were disposed of as they deemed fit. Last September when we decided to send a contingent of five hundred, that body was formed under the patronage of His Excellen-

cy the Governor, who called that Association together here in the city. Men of all classes responded nobly to his solicitation, and gave what assistance lay in their power. From that Finance Committee, of which Hon. Sir Edgar Bowring was Chairman, most splendid results accrued. All the payments and accounts were carefully audited. Bills to be paid were brought before that Committee, signed by the Chairman, and immediately settled. A Sub-Committee was formed to draft a pension scheme to submit to the House this year, and when they had availed themselves of all the information in this respect they possibly could, they deemed it expedient to suggest to the Government that the pension Bill should not this year be brought down, but rather that they should vote a certain sum, \$10,000, to be placed in their hands to meet the current expenses until such time as this Bill could be properly framed for the consideration of this House. They deemed that it would be most convenient from every point of view that they themselves should attend to the payments of the different dependents of those wounded and disabled through the war. Having the fullest confidence in that Committee, the Government decided to adopt the suggestion. The sum of ten thousand dollars is requested by them as necessary for the carrying out of their ideas. The recommendation was drafted and submitted to the Patriotic Association a few days ago, and the pension scheme proposed is somewhat similar to that which the Canadian Government are adopting. In the case of disablement the Finance Committee recommend the sum of one dollar per day for each individual below commissioned rank; a dollar and fifty cents per day for lieutenants; two dollars per day for captains and two

dollars and fifty cents for majors. That is for total disablement. When a married man is totally disabled his wife will draw the amount due. A widow will draw one-half. It is rather complicated when you consider the details, but the Committee reckon that the ten thousand dollars they ask here will amply suffice their needs for the present. They will take charge of each case and will have everything ready to submit to the next session of the Legislature. The Finance Committee have submitted a suggestion to the Patriotic Association, who have handed it to the Government, and I am asking the Committee this evening to adopt their recommendations by voting in the additional estimates the ten thousand dollars asked for. The number of dependents of men in the Canadian forces, who originally were Newfoundlanders but emigrated to Canada, where they joined the Army, will be entitled to money, which will, however, be reimbursed by the Canadian Government. It is not necessary for me to go into details with regard to this, as nearly every second man in this House is a member of that Committee.

Under Head XVI. we ask for thirty thousand dollars for the election expenses for the prohibition plebiscite. The Government, as you are aware, are bringing down a Bill which will be discussed to-day or to-morrow in connection with this matter. The lowest figure to defray the attendant expenses entailed is fixed at thirty thousand dollars. There is another small amount which has been brought to my notice since I came to this House, which has been omitted through inadvertence from the additional estimates. I refer to the Operator at Brookfield, who receives the sum of \$120. This office which has been closed for some time, the Government now decides to re-open. Any information on this subject in my pow-

er I shall be most pleased to forward to any member desiring same.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: Speaking in connection with the salary of the Analyst, under head nine, I would like to know what the duty of this man is, and what work he has already accomplished to show for this salary.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say that this is an office which could only be dispensed with with great difficulty. Since his appointment he has proved of considerable value to the country. He does all the analyzing in regard to liquors, etc., and performs all the analytical work that is taking place under the Foods Act. In addition to work which he performs through the Crown Lands' Office, he the 21st, resulted in the welcome add-conducts the technical school in St. John's. He and Dr. Brehm have done considerable work in relation to manufactures in this town, and particularly in relation to the Public Health of the town. He has performed indispensable services in relation to sanitary regulations. I think from every point of view this is most likely to prove beneficial to the Colony.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Finance has estimated the cost of the wharf at Fogo amounted to about \$12,000, but I am of the opinion personally that the Hon. Minister would be nearer the mark if he put it down at \$13,000. Whether the country is getting full value for the money which has been spent on this wharf I do not know. I have not seen this wharf recently. I am of the opinion personally that had this job been put out for tender you would have got a dozen men to do it for five or eight thousand dollars. Of course commissioners do not always employ the cheapest methods. I know that in the case of Musgrave they spent \$6,000 without any authority first being obtained, and you come in again and

support these men. In the year 1913 Fogo was honoured by a visit from the Premier. Fogo having only a small landing place it was considerably in need of a wharf, which the Premier promised. The result was an expenditure of thirteen thousand dollars to catch the vote of these people in 1913. Had there been no motive there would have been no wharf. You might say had there been no Sir Edward Morris there would have been no wharf, but I say had there been no Union there would have been no wharf, for these people have been asking for a wharf for several years, and it was only the fear of defeat that prompted the liberality of the Premier. I suppose the Premier has given up the idea of visiting outports now. He has the common sense to perceive the futility of such a course.

The Finance Minister has admitted they are going to pay five per cent. interest on the loan. Now, is the Minister serious when he sees money becoming so dear. When he pays five per cent., or in other words, fifty thousand dollars on every million, and says he is economical. If this is not warning to him nothing would be of any effect. He wants God Almighty to mark words of warning on the side of this building, he is weighed in the balance and found wanting.

I think a pier is necessary for Fortune. I only hope that a good substantial one will be put up, and that we will not have petitions coming in here asking for money to repair it. We consider \$5,000 is a large amount to vote to any place for a wharf, but we will say nothing about it, and should be quite content if \$5,000 is expended similarly down North. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that he gets full value for every cent expended in this direction.

As regards Prohibition, if we are going to have a plebiscite I hope be-

fore we consider this we shall know what the intentions of the Bill are, and I think that if you are going to the expense of thirty thousand dollars we ought to submit at the same time the Products Bill to the people also. It would not be much more of an expenditure, and I think that this 'most iniquitous deal,' as it has been called, should receive the sanction of the people.

Now, for the first time in the history of the Colony the estimates amount to over four millions of dollars, or more, exactly four million and fifty thousand, and I think it is fully time that we should consider what we are doing, for when you have a Colony of two hundred and fifty thousand people, and you take four million and fifty thousand, then all I can say is that it is no wonder that people of the Labrador who slave to earn four hundred dollars a year find it hard to have to hand one-third of that sum to the Government. It is a most terrible condition of things. I think we ought to save every cent we can; for or hand you spend ten thousand dollars in repairing lighthouses. Now, could not this stand until another year, until we see how things drag along; one would think you had bushels of money to give away. The fact of the matter is you have to tax everything conceivable in order to get along as best you can. Why you actually make, or compel, rather, people to pay two cents on every ten dollars worth of goods they buy. On the other hand, you spent ten thousand dollars to repair lighthouses. I think this might well stand for another year. My friend, the member for Bonavista, informs me that it is no use criticizing this expenditure of six thousand dollars because it is already spent, and we cannot get it back; we can only smile pleasantly, because it is a thing of the past, but I must confess that I can in no way congratu-

late the Government on the methods it chooses to employ. However, I have this consolation, that you will not be able to continue these methods very much longer. I hope you men are really serious in your consideration of financial conditions, and that you will earnestly endeavour to curtail wherever possible the expenditures of the future.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: With regard to the Fogo Wharf, I would like to make a few observations based on my personal experience of the time. In 1913 we had a small grant from the Department of Public Works, \$500 of which was passed to the Marine and Fisheries Department to pay off the debt on the Fogo wharf, which was done at the expense of the entire district. The roads and bridges suffered severe neglect, and we were left in a most dangerous condition, for the money which should have gone to them was contributed to the payment of the debt for Fogo wharf. I am glad however to state that this burden is being removed from the remaining section of the district. Of course this wharf was the outcome of the Premier's visit there in 1913. I hope the people will much benefit thereby.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: Just one or two words, more for the sake of strict accuracy than anything else. I should like to say that my visit to Fogo had nothing to do with the wharf. Instructions had been given months before I went. It had no relation whatever to the election. As a matter of fact, one of the Commissioners was a gentleman who it was reasonably expected would be the candidate opposing the Government candidate. Mr. Hodge and Mr. Earle were the Commissioners appointed.

MR. COAKER—Not the M.H.A.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Not himself, but I think it was his

son. These Commissioners were selected on account of their complete knowledge of Fogo, and particularly as to the public wharf that was to be built. Now, when I went down there in April I saw that considerable work had been done, particularly in connection with the excavation. It was found very difficult to get a site at first. I do not know the place well enough to be able to offer an opinion as to whether the site selected was a good one or not. But I have learned that it is not. A wharf in Fogo would be of advantage to the whole district, and also of advantage to Twillingate district. It was not considered that the wharf would cost more than five or six thousand dollars, but after the Commissioners had made their contracts and got out their material and had found it necessary to make a very large expenditure in blasting the site of the wharf, this over-expenditure occurred. Then it was a case of spending the money or losing the work that had been done. Now, it is not correct, as my friend, the Leader of the Fishermen's Union Party in the House says, that I brought the wharf down with me. I was not giving out wharves or giving out anything else. I went down there merely to study the local requirements. I had never been in the District before. It was practically the only district in the country that I had not been in, and I wanted to see Fogo, and I went down there that summer; but it had no relation to the wharf, and I never mentioned it while I was there. I never mentioned it at any meeting there.

MR. COAKER—Perhaps in the houses.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Maybe, if I was spoken to about it, but as a matter of fact, I do not think it was a matter considered of very much importance at that time.

Now in relation to the other matter as regards the amount. The am-

ount put down is five per cent. That is merely to cover a temporary loan. It does not follow that the interest on the loan will be five per cent.

MR. LLOYD.—I understand there is to be another Loan Act introduced.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—
Yea.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

PRODUCTS CORPORATION. BILL.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Chairman: There was a question raised by my learned friend, Dr. Lloyd, the member for Trinity in connection with electric power. I have a slight amendment here which I shall read to the House:

"In any case where the Company, in conserving the flowage of water or developing water power under Clause 1 of the Indenture, the schedule to this Act, shall cause any material depreciation in the capacity for development of a water power which prior to the 16th day of April, 1915, was owned by the holder of a grant, license or lease to cut timber over lands for the operation of which the said water power was necessary, and the said owner and the Company cannot agree as to the compensation to

be paid for such depreciation, it shall be lawful for either the Company or the said owner, in lieu of paying or receiving compensation to require that the said water power be assigned to or taken over by the Company, and the owner shall assign and the Company shall take over from the owner the said water power, and the Company shall, on demand of the assignor supply from the time the water power of the Company is developed, and when the same is required by the assignor for the purposes of operating timber lands or other industrial purposes and continuously thereafter, an equivalent electric energy to that which would have been developed on the assigned water power, and shall supply the same to the assignor at the site of the assigned water power or at a place agreed upon between the parties, at an annual rental equal to ten per cent. of the estimated cost of developing the assigned water power on the said property. Any dispute as to equivalent electric energy or as to the estimated cost of developing the assigned water power shall be determined by arbitration in the manner herein provided."

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I must say that I do not accept that amendment. I think it shows the monstrous nature of the whole contract. The proposal is that instead of compensation in money they shall return in kind what they have taken away. Under the Prime Minister's amendment, if this Company comes in and by the development of a water power over which they have control they injure another water by depreciating its power, there is no compensation in kind.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—
That is not so.

MR. LLOYD—I say what is offered is an illusion and a fraud. They are attempting to give a shadow where they have given away the substance. I say it is similar to what was at-

tempted here in the House the other day in the guise of an amendment, when it was attempted to grab a tremendous area of water power on Labrador under the guise of a doubt as to whether Hamilton River ended at Lake Melville. We have got the same thing here. The Government has approached the Company, and instead of giving something they turn and offer an illusion and a shadow. Now let me prove this is so. I would like to do it by means of a diagram and draw the attention of the House to the fact that over a great area of this country—one of the biggest timber areas in the whole country—the Company is given absolute control so far as the development of water power is concerned. They may injure the water power of another company. Now the proposal is if they should injure such a water power—by lessening it, then they should repay in electrical energy what they have taken away. But there is nothing to compel the Company to develop this power, and their proposal is an illusion and a fraud. I say that an offer of that kind is an illusion and a fraud, and an insult to the intelligence of the House, and shows the monstrous nature of the whole contract. As I said before it's a fraud of the same nature as was attempted to be perpetrated on this House when under the guise of giving a concession on Lake Melville a part of the timber area of Lake Melville was offered in order to grab something not given by the Contract. It is one of these things in which a crafty Solicitor shows his skill in robbing the country. He thought he was dealing with a set of fools who did not see through his tricks, and did not know how to show him up, or did not have the pluck to stand up in this House and expose them. As regards the amendment, I oppose it.

I shall now move the amendment as I have it, and not as the Company of-

fers it to you. The purpose of this amendment is to make the Company give back what they are taking away in absolute disregard of every principle of legislation; in absolute disregard of every right and justice, and in absolute disregard of the rights of British investors. May I point out, Sir, that if outside investors will bring this matter to the attention of the British Colonial Office this Bill will be held up as a fraud on British investors, and a deprivation of rights we have no right to allow. The Company's proposal is a fraud as I have stated, because it takes away substantial rights and returns a shadow for these rights taken away. It says we will give you a return in kind if we develop our water power. We take the right to destroy your water power and then if we develop we will pay you in kind. But having destroyed the water power they may forever leave it undeveloped. Now as I make this statement, I see the Solicitor of this House shake his head and prepare to pass something over to the Premier. Now, Sir, that is to say that a Director of this Company seeking these concessions is in this House fighting for these concessions under the disguise of a gown that is supposed to protect the interests of this House and this country. Now, Sir, I ask under all these circumstances, are hon. members of this House going to allow this robbery to take place. I, for one, am prepared to fight it. I am going to move this amendment, and I call upon every man who has any respect for himself or any respect for the dignity of this House to support it. And for one I am prepared to disown it, and I cannot allow any such resolution to pass that will interfere injuriously with private rights.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the resolution proposed by the Prime Minister ought to go into the bill. It will do more harm to

the bill than if it were left out altogether. Owners of water powers, as the bill stands now, have the right to the proposed form of substituting monetary compensation, but under compensation in kind that the Premier is proposing the owner of a water power will find himself in this position: If he has a timber area he can use the water power in connection with the particular area that he owns. He can use any motive power in connection with that particular area. If he wishes to develop an industry, or if he wishes to use the water power for any other purpose, then he has no remedy, because under this resolution as it is worded at present, he has to take substituted electric energy, so that really it is worse. It makes the position as indicated by Mr. Lloyd, far worse than anything in the bill before. It gives an equivalent power for such power as the owners have to be used for a particular purpose. Mr. Lloyd's amendment gave an equivalent power to the owners of water powers for any purpose, and there is nothing unfair in that. There is nothing that the Company can object to unless there is a desire on their part to take the whole area and control it, and control the development of the area, and cut out any other person from the development of the area, and not only that, but to cut them out at their own price or figure. In the amendment as proposed by Dr. Lloyd, there would be a certain amount of protection for the men who hold a water power in these areas. The amendment proposed by the Prime Minister is worse than if there were no resolutions in the Act at all. If you are not going to accept Mr. Lloyd's amendment then for goodness sake do not put in that one proposed by the Premier.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, the wording of that amendment as proposed by the Prime Minister is so

cleverly drawn that it is a fraud. It does not mean what I proposed, it is an absolute fraud on private rights.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is the amendment as submitted to me.

DR. LLOYD—It is not.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You proposed an amendment. It was your amendment.

MR. LLOYD—Yes, but that is not my amendment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You sent me a draft amendment. I came here today with a resolution stating how far the company was prepared to go. It was your proposal.

MR. LLOYD—It was my proposal, but not in the form in which you have brought it down here.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Now let me say what I was going to say. You proposed a draft resolution, and I came here today to point out how far I was able to get the Company to accept your amendment. There are two or three points to which they will not agree. I have submitted your amendment and they have agreed to it to a certain extent. Now where is the fraud?

MR. LLOYD—This is the fraud. You deprive owners of water powers of the right to get monetary compensation because immediately this agreement goes into force they must take up the water powers from the Company, and furthermore the right to take up water power is deferred until this Company has developed it, which may be never.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I would like to hear some explanation as to why the Premier has proposed this amendment. A member of this House proposed an amendment the other day and the Company has been consulted, and we have now before us a resolution which the Company are willing to concede to, because when it was

put in that form it is adopted by the Government and by the Premier, who is responsible for it. We ought, therefore, to know exactly what it means. For instance, I notice in one of the amendments the right to power is confined to the purpose of operating the equivalent. Now there is a case such as the Penn Company on Junction Brook, who have a water power for any purpose not merely for operating the land. They do not in the development of that power have to confine their power to the land. They can use it for any purpose they like. They can operate anything they like. The water power is not necessarily attached to the timber land. Now why not have the words "Or other industrial purpose" in the amendment. At the present moment the Penn Company has the right to use these water powers for anything. You are going to take away those water powers and this amendment will compel them to take equivalent power for a defined purpose I hope that neither the Premier nor the members of the Government ever thought of that, because if they do, if they deliberately put in that amendment in that form, then it may justify the language used by Mr. Lloyd.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The position is this: an amendment was originally proposed by Mr. Lloyd. I submitted that to the Company. The amendments in that resolution of Mr. Lloyd's are theirs.

MR. LLOYD—The original draft is not my draft copy. It is an amendment on my original.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yea. These interlineations have been removed. Nothing has been added. The amendment was yours. You originally submitted it.

MR. LLOYD—The original draft was mine, but this draft is not mine at all.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is yours with the interlineations.

MR. LLOYD—On Saturday at your request I dictated an amendment and sent it to you. Yesterday you proposed this amendment, which is not the draft copy that I submitted on Saturday. My amendment has never seen the light of day in this House. What has seen the light of day is not mine. I made the amendment by putting in the interlineations, and that has been rejected by the Company.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—As I said, it was your original draft with these interlineations. I left out some of these interlineations, that is the only difference.

MR. LLOYD—The difference is that you left out these interlineations in an amendment proposed by me. I proposed something as a protection for these rights, and put in these amendments. You have changed that and the last is worse than the original. Originally the people had the right to monetary compensation. Now they have no right.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, the substantial point is the one I referred to a minute or two ago. You have left out the words "other industrial purposes." The effect is this: These people are deprived of the right to use the existing water power for any purpose whatever, and you simply call upon this company to give them an equivalent water power for a particular purpose, namely, the operation of their lands. We take away the right to operate these water powers for any purpose they want. There is no reason, as far as I can see, why this amendment should be put in. I suggest that you take further time to consider it, and consider whether you won't put in the words, "other industrial purposes."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The amendment as originally proposed.

ed did not contemplate Hamilton Inlet.

MR. LLOYD—Yes it did.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It only dealt with the Humber River. As regards Clause 2: That has already been dealt with in the agreement to give fifty thousand horse power to owners of properties lying within one hundred miles of the power house. I notice you put in the words "by way of charge." That is not important, is it?

MR. LLOYD—Oh yes it is. It is very important. They must give it back.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—They get it as a mortgage on the whole property; that would be the effect of it.

MR. LLOYD—No, it would be a mortgage on the water power. It is a mortgage in kind.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, it is a charge on the whole water power of the Company.

MR. LLOYD—That is what I intended it to be.

MR. MORINE—Might I ask the Prime Minister to postpone this amendment, and let it stop over this afternoon.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have no objection to any reasonable postponement. I would like to have this matter as perfect as possible. I do not consider the amendment necessary, and I have only proposed it to satisfy the hon. member. I do not see how any right can possibly be affected without the owner getting fully compensated. The hon. member for Trinity suggested to add power compensation in kind, water power for water power, and I have put in that amendment. There was one other matter to which reference was made on May 4th by a question asked by the member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, as to whether the assignments from Jesse Critz King of pat-

ent rights to the Newfoundland Products Corporation were in the hands of the Government. There were no assignments, but there are assignments from Jesse Critz King to a man called McTavish, which I wish to table. The patents have been issued in his name, and are in the Colonial Secretary's office. The original patentee was King, and he assigned his rights to McTavish, the Vice-President of Canada Carbide Works. McTavish has assigned these patents to the Reid Newfoundland Company, and I have these assignments here. They hold them in trust to be reassigned to the Newfoundland Products Company. They have only just come down and were executed on May 5th. As I say these are the assignments by a man named McTavish who holds the patent rights under an assignment. They are held by the Reid Newfoundland Company in trust.

MR. LLOYD—Is there anything in the deed to show the trust?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No, that is what I have been told.

MR. LLOYD—Has anything been done?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No, nothing.

MR. GRIMES—Has the Solicitor of this House drawn them?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No. He had nothing whatever to do with them.

MR. COAKER—Does he say so?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, he says so. He had nothing to do with drafting the resolutions either. They were drafted by the Attorney General and myself. He has had nothing whatever to do with it since they were introduced into the House.

MR. LLOYD—He is in the House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That does not matter.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in regard to the Solicitor of the House being pre-

sent in regard to these matters. This is not the first time that such action has taken place. Last year the same thing happened in regard to the matter of tobacco. He was here when the whole matter took place, and then he advised a Minister of the Crown as to the position which he should take in the matter. During this debate he has listened to the whole proceedings. He has sat in that chair and taken in every word in connection with what has been done. It is all right for the Prime Minister to say that he knew nothing about the thing. That is quite right, but he is a man who sees everything that is going on here, and he hears it as Solicitor of the House. He notices every word that is said. We are not going to put up with that kind of thing. He is most vitally interested in this bill. He is supposed to be Solicitor for this House. Now it is not in the interest of this country that we should have the Solicitor of the House—the Solicitor for the country—also the Solicitor for a corporation that is getting a contract of this kind. It is enough to bring down a curse on the head of every man that votes for it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

PACKING COMPANY AGREEMENT RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions confirming an Agreement between the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland-American Packing Co.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following resolution:

"The contract shall be subject to such terms and conditions as to the annual volume of work, the class and proportion of fish, including bait fishes handled; the minimum space to be devoted to the storing of bait-fishes, price to be paid for fish, and the location of plants as the Governor-in-Council may from time to time determine."

Now, Sir, the object of this resolution is to have provision made so that the Company after two or three years may become dealers in the bait fishery. I think that this might be added both in the interests of the Colony and the Company. I would also like, Sir, to move this resolution:

"2. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may order and cause to be maintained an inspection and supervision of the sanitation, maintenance, and operation of such plant, store-houses or warehouses, and may regulate and control the temperatures to be maintained therein.

"3. The Governor-in-Council may make such regulations as he may consider necessary in order to secure the sufficient enforcement of this Act and agreement, and he may by such regulations impose penalties not exceeding fifty dollars for every violation of this act, the agreement or regulations, and the regulations so made shall be in force from the date of their publication in the Royal Gazette or from such other date as is specified in the Proclamation in that behalf."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not think a repetition is out of order when the member is repeating them to show and explain to the House what he means by them.

MR. MORINE—I rise to a point of order. The Committee having once

given its ruling, no further reference should be made to it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Without wishing to interrupt my hon. friend, for whose opinion I have a very high regard, I think that the Minister had only read the words, and he was going on then, I take it, to explain that one could not take from these words the meaning that it was attempted to construe into them.

MR. MORINE—There was no need for an explanation. He was going on to repeat.

DR. LLOYD—He could not go further than he did. He said it was true, and could anybody doubt it. In spite of the fact that the Committee refuses to act, I intend to ask for a ruling every time this insult is used, and I will insist upon getting it. The fact that it has not been taken to the House does not prevent me from obtaining a ruling. If the Committee is determined not to do justice that is no reason why I should not try to obtain it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman: These are the words as they were taken down: "There are members in this House who come here and make opposition for the sake of making opposition, and with the object of having their opposition speeches reported and circulated and making people think of the excellent opposition made." Now, I cannot put the construction on that which the hon. member on the other side does. Is it correct or not?

MR. MORINE—Now, Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. If this sort of thing is going to be permitted, where is it going to end? The Premier is in charge of the debates of the House, and if he is going to permit this matter to be made a farce of, I ask, where is the thing going to end? Do you want to sit here all night and turn the thing into a bear-garden? Some of us can stay here just as long

as anybody on the other side, if that is necessary.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman: This debate started on the Cold Storage Bill. In explaining that Bill I made certain statements that have delayed this House for the last half hour. Now, in making these statements I was quite in earnest, as regards the amendments proposed this afternoon. Those amendments, as I explained to the House, could not possibly be accepted for the reasons which I have given. I then stated that while I was prepared to stand for the interests of the fishermen of this Colony as much as any other man in the Colony, I was not prepared to accept the amendment made by the hon. member for Green Bay. Then when I told them that they were not, many of them, in earnest, I was attacked by the two principal lawyers on the other side, and by the Leader of the Fishermen's Union. The three of them immediately jumped for my throat. Now, we are not here to hurt one another's feelings, but the other day here, Dr. Lloyd, in his speech on the Newfoundland Products Bill, attacked the Solicitor of this House, who was in the House at the time, but was not in a position to answer for himself.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman: I rise to a point of order.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—He attacked him right here in this House.

MR. MORINE—I rise to a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I have as much respect for the Chair as anybody in this House, but I must say that I expect you to keep order. The Hon. Minister is now referring to a debate which took place in the House on another matter.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I am going on to connect it with this matter.

MR. MORINE—Pardon me. You are

altogether out of order in referring to previous debates.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I am not out of order. It has been the custom in this House.

MR. MORINE—It is contrary to every rule of procedure when debating one subject to refer to another debate.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is only nonsense. Custom is law.

MR. MORINE—Is every bad custom that the Minister has been practising in the past law?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You sit down, or I will deal with what you were guilty of in the past.

MR. MORINE—The Minister should have some respect for his position, if he has none for himself. Mr. Chairman, are you going to permit this? I ask you if it is in order for the Minister to refer to a debate which took place on another subject in discussing the matter before the Chair? I want your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I advise that the hon. member confine himself to the matter before the Chair.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—A few days ago in the House we had an explanation from the gentleman on the other side telling us that he was here in the interest of —

The object of this is that I do not want this Legislature to pass a bill which cannot be amended again for a period of 15 years. As far as I can see, I think that both of these resolutions agree with the wishes as expressed by the Minister on the other side of this House. I want the Government to be empowered by this bill to make any changes which in their mind would be necessary, without waiting until the fifteen years are up.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—While I am as anxious as he to see the interests of the fisher-

men of this Colony conserved as far as it is possible, yet I cannot see eye to eye with the hon. the introducer of these amendments. What he wants and what I favoured in my speech of the other day is provided in this bill. The Company promises certain things. In this bill cold storage for bait is provided. Are we going to dictate to them just because we are going to guarantee them 5 per cent. on their cash invested? This would be most unfair. To bind them to do what the hon. gentlemen asks for, would be very unfair. How are we to know that next season the fishermen will need bait from this plant. If they can catch fish outside they are not going to buy it. What would this Company do with the fish on their hands in such a case as this? We must remember that there are members of this House who make opposition for the sake of making opposition, and of having their speeches reported and circulated in the papers, and of having the people who read these think of the excellent opposition they have made.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I want to know if that remark of the Minister is in order.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Sit down and hold your tongue.

DR. LLOYD—I rise to a point of order and will not sit down until I get satisfaction. I ask if the Minister's remark is in order?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Oh, sit down.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, this is no place for bullying. I ask, who has the floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN—The Minister of Finance has the floor.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling. The Minister has charged certain members of this House with unworthy motives. He has charged certain members with making opposition for opposition's sake, and I

ask if he was in order. You have given no ruling. If you won't I will ask the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I cannot infer anything from the remarks of the Minister.

MR. LLOYD—I ask that the Committee rise and ask the Speaker for a ruling. I ask that the Clerk of the House take down the remarks and the ruling of the Chairman.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman,——

MR. LLOYD—I want a ruling on this point. There are certain rules in this House, and I claim my position.

MR. KENT—When a motion such as has been made by the hon. member is made, it is the duty of the Chairman to have the words in question taken down and handed with the ruling to the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I gave my ruling.

MR. LLOYD—You gave a ruling. Now I ask that that ruling be taken down and reported to the Speaker. I ask you to leave the Chair. The reporter in the box can furnish the necessary words.

(The words as reported were handed to the Chairman.)

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. You were asked for a ruling. What you gave was not a ruling. We want a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I gave a ruling. I said the Minister was not out of order.

DR. LLOYD—I ask that that ruling be given to the Speaker.

MR. COAKER—I think that the Minister was a trifle excited, and that rather than have this continue, will withdraw the statement he made.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I did mean it. That was why I said it.

DR. LLOYD—What I object to, Mr. Chairman, is the attribution to the opposition members of this House of unworthy motives.

(The words as taken down were read to the House.)

MR. MORRIS—Are these the words?

MR. LLOYD—I object to these and ask if they are in order?

MR. MORRIS—The rule is after having the words read, to have the Committee rule upon whether they are in order or not.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, we have taken twenty minutes here today——

MR. LLOYD—Yes, and we will take another twenty before we will be through.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You all heard my words. Here they are as reported. You have heard them read. Are they in order, or not? "There are members in this House who make opposition for the sake of making opposition . . ."

MR. LLOYD—I rise to a point of order. I want a ruling as to whether a repetition is in order. I want another ruling. I object to having insult added to the former words.

MR. MORINE—Now, Mr. Chairman, are you going to stand for this insult to your own dignity. I ask the Minister to stick to the debate now before the House.

THE CHAIRMAN—I have already ruled, and advised the hon. Minister to confine himself to the matter before the Chair.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Some people want to jump on any proposition, cold storage or anything else, which comes down here, no matter in whose interest it is. We were told by some people here last fall that seven-eighths of the fishermen of Newfoundland were starving.

MR. COAKER—Point of Order, Mr. Chairman. Are we discussing what was said about the people or the Cold Storage bill? Now, I hope the hon. Minister won't turn this into a row. I have a certain amount of sympathy

for him when he gets vexed, because sometimes I get vexed myself.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I was going on to say that we were told in this House time and again that seven-eighths of the fishermen were going to starve during the winter. Is not that correct? Well, now, when a proposition comes before the House to give employment to the fishermen of this colony why is it that we find the same men trying to put up an argument to show that it is detrimental to the fishermen of the Island and should not become law? Now, what better proposition could come before this House, so far as the interests of the fishermen are concerned, than the Products Bill? Here you have a proposition that will cost something like sixteen or twenty million dollars to put into operation. Do you mean to tell me that that will not be beneficial to the fishermen of this colony? And yet we have had people putting up this objection and that objection—splitting hairs—and saying that we should not pass that measure. For what purpose, may I ask? Take that bill and read it down and any fair-minded individual can read in that Bill good for the colony. I grant you that there are lots of clauses in the Bill that should be looked into by the different lawyers in this House, but when you come to look at the Bill as a whole it must be admitted that never a better occupied the time of this House. It is in the interests of the fishermen of this Island. It means labor for them. Now, what does this Cold Storage Bill mean? If you can distribute cold storage around this Island in such a way that every fisherman, when he is short of bait during the fishing season can get it—it is a hard thing to do, but if you can do it, then no better proposition could come before this House than one which would have in view the accomplishment of that end.

But how are you going to do it? There is no man in this House, or outside of it, who has made any effort to explain to us how it can be done. We are looked upon as the greatest bait depot of British North America, and what do we find? We find that certain men on the West Coast last year and the year before had to import bait from the United States. Now, if that is to be remedied, it must be done by cold storage; and if you can remedy it, untold good will come to this Island. But I do not want to carry all my eggs in one basket. We were told here, when we were discussing the Newfoundland Products Bill, that if we passed that Bill the result would be to take our fishermen away from their natural avocation. Now, I contradict that statement. Take half, more than half, of the fishermen of this Island and ask them how many quintals of codfish they have taken since last October. Why, two-thirds of our fishermen have not seen a codfish since last October. Only on the West Coast do they prosecute the fishery during the months of January, February, March and April. Two-thirds of our fishermen have not gone fishing yet. They cannot get to St. John's to get supplies for the fishery because the coast is surrounded by ice. And then we are told that if we pass this Newfoundland Products Bill that we are doing an injury to the fishermen of this colony by taking them away from their natural avocation; that those who would go to work on that plant would be taken from the fisheries. Well, that is not an intelligent argument, Sir, because what happened when Grand Falls and other like industries were established around this Island. Did not that tend to enhance the value of the codfishery. All these arguments go to show that the statements made here by Opposition members are made only for Opposition sake.

MR. LLOYD—I rise to a point of order. I ask for a ruling upon whether it is proper for any member of this House to attribute unfair and unworthy motives to other members?

THE CHAIRMAN—It is not in order.

MR. LLOYD—Then I ask whether you consider it in order for a member of this House to charge another member with making speeches for the sake of Opposition?

THE CHAIRMAN—I don't think the Minister said ———

DR. LLOYD—I am asking for a ruling on my point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN—I have not heard anything objectionable.

MR. LLOYD—I am not asking that. I am asking you whether it is in order.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is asking for a ruling upon that must connect the question with the present speaker, otherwise it would be pointless.

MR. LLOYD—But surely that has been done.

MR. MORRIS—The Chairman has already answered your question. He said that he regarded the observations made by the Hon. Minister of Finance as not reflecting upon the characters of hon. members of this House.

MR. LLOYD—That is not the question at all. You were long enough in the Speaker's Chair to know that the Minister was absolutely out of order.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—No, he was not.

MR. LLOYD—You would not rule that from the chair.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I say that people coming here from outside with a proposition like that now before the House should be encouraged on behalf of the fishermen of this Island. We were told the other day by the Premier in his speech that a thousand men could be got on Labrador. Well, should not an

industry like that be encouraged? Should we, then, as members of this House, be indecent enough to get up here and call these men names of all kinds? Were we not told in this House the other day that the class of men who come here and propose these industries and endeavour to promote them were looked upon as pests,—I think that was the word used by the hon. member on the other side?

MR. MORINE—I rise to a point of order. If I understand the hon. member correctly he is now referring to the debate on the Products Corporation and statements made in that debate.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I am speaking of the Cold Storage Bill and showing to this House why the fishermen of Labrador and elsewhere should be employed.

MR. MORINE—A moment ago, when you referred to the statement which I made, were you speaking on the Cold Storage question?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Have a little patience. Now, I don't look upon these men as pests; I look upon them as blessings to this country.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The statement referred to by the Hon. Minister I understand to be a remark made by me ———

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—If the cap fits you, wear it.

MR. MORINE—The language which the hon. member is now commenting upon is language which I used in a speech on the Products Campaign, in referring to the promoter of the Products Corporation. I ask you now, is it proper to be referring to that debate in connection with the Cold Storage Bill? I ask for your ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN—My ruling is that in this case it is just a matter of one

thing leading up to another in the course of observation.

MR. MORINE—But, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister is now referring to language which I used then and is proceeding to condemn that language.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I am not to assume that he is referring to you.

MR. MORINE—But he said so just now.

MR. LLOYD—Ask for a ruling.

MR. MORINE—As Chairman, you should uphold the dignity of the House by insisting that, when a point of order is raised, no member of this House should be permitted to continue to debate out of order. That is what is happening now, and I ask you to prevent it.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I cannot see it.

MR. MORINE—Will you kindly give me your ruling on that, and I will ask the Speaker about it?

MR. CHAIRMAN—I have already said that I cannot assume that the Hon. Minister is referring to you.

MR. MORINE—Well, if the hon. member for Ferryland will say that he is not referring to my language on the Products campaign, then I will withdraw my point of order. I ask him whether he was or not?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I will give you the same answer. You will have to wait until I tell you.

MR. MORINE—That is only what could have been expected from you. You have as little respect for the Chairman as you have for me.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Don't you talk about respect. You have very little reputation in that direction.

MR. MORINE—I can tell the hon. member for Ferryland ———

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I can tell the hon. member for Bonavista, or God knows where ———

MR. MORINE—Well, I happen to know where you came from.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I am not ashamed of it.

MR. MORINE—Well, you have done enough to be.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER—It appears to me that there is occasion for me to take the Chair. I would just like to impress upon the House that the same ruling that governs in the House governs also in Committee, and I would like to see them a little more closely attended to than they have been this evening. This is a case where a sudden disorder appears to have arisen, which justifies me in stepping in and taking the Chair and restoring order. Mr. Parsons is quite right in some of the rulings which he gave this afternoon, in that no ruling of a Committee can be referred to the Speaker. It is solely in the province of the Chairman to decide any question raised, and there is then only the appeal to the Committee. If the Committee supports the Chairman's ruling, that finishes the matter. Now, I just want to say to hon. members that I am sure that every one of them is just as anxious to preserve the dignity and privileges of the House as I would like to see them, and that they will be safe in their keeping. I am now going to ask the Chairman to again take the Chair.

MR. LLOYD—As you have referred to certain rulings ———

MR. SPEAKER—I was just speaking in general.

MR. LLOYD—I am entitled to ask for rulings.

MR. SPEAKER—I have already called the Chairman to the Chair.

MR. LLOYD—But you have not given time to ask for rulings.

MR. SPEAKER—I do not intend to have any discussion whatever. When the Committee rises, if the hon. member has any remarks to make I will be only too glad to give him my attention. Mr. Parsons will take the Chair.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I do not want to delay the House this afternoon any further in connection with the discussion brought on by members on the other side —

MR. MORINE—That is a lie.

MR. COAKER—Nobody ever said a word in connection with the Cold Storage bill of what you are saying now.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I am just going to speak on the Cold Storage Bill. And I want to say that I am not used to being barked at.

MR. COAKER—Well, don't you bark at anybody.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—If I do I apologise for it. But I will not allow you to bark at me. So far as the Products Bill is concerned, you will hear me out when we go into Committee on that Bill.

It being now half past six, the Chairman left the Chair until eight o'clock.

The Chairman resumed the chair at eight o'clock.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman I merely wish to add a few words to the debate before the committee rises. I had nearly finished my remarks when recess was taken. I object to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Twillingate. In my opinion such an amendment would take from this bill, in as much as it is a private bill, by putting too many safeguards around it and frightening the people from coming in at all. They ask for very little, considering the importance of the bill. Cold storage for bait is a long felt want and where to begin has been a conundrum. There is very little reason why the fishermen of Newfoundland should be with-

out bait. Cold storage plants will be easily supplied with herring for bait. But the herring bait is not, as the fisherman knows, the right kind of bait for certain seasons of the year; while the caplin is available for two months only. Squid, however, can be obtained at any season. Well, I take it that these people, before putting fish in cold storage must first put up bait for their own protection. As this is a commercial venture it is only natural to suppose that by putting up that and if they can make money by that transaction, there is no reason why they will not continue to put up bait in cold storage. I fail to see the use of bringing in this amendment, for you are simply frightening away the people. The only thing that we have promised is to give them 5% on their investment, if they do not make sufficient to pay a dividend. I would like to see this bill safeguarded in every way. We must first entice them to come in, then it is very easy to talk to them; but to adopt that amendment you are only carrying out "the dog-in-the-manger" policy. I think that there is sufficient scope in this bill for the Government and for the fishermen of this island, for cold storage bait to be provided them in retail. Read down the bill and you will find that the statement is cold storage for fish purposes. They do not outline what kind of fish it is. Codfish in cold storage has not been a commercial success in the United States, but there the fish was little more than chilled. The fish is taken and gutted and then it is packed in ice. First there is a tier of fish then a tier of ice, then another of fish and so on. But I am afraid that it would be extremely difficult for us to make frozen codfish a commercial success. A frozen fish is very unpalatable; it takes the flavour from it. No market will take that fish. When this bill was framed first, these people asked

to be allowed to export bait. But that is not the policy of the Government to allow bait to be exported. Mr. Chairman I oppose that amendment for those reasons.

MR. LLOYD.—I rise first to support the amendment and in doing so I wish to point out that the ideas embodied in the amendment originated from the other side of the House. They are taken from the policy of the Government itself—from a general Act passed in 1910 on this very question, relating not merely to one company but to all companies which should receive the advantages that are to be given to this Company. That Act was introduced by the present Government and was put through by the strength of the present government in the House and therefore in seeking to attach these amendments to the present bill we are doing no more than asking that there be attached to this measure rules which have already been approved by the Government. Now, Sir, I will draw your attention to Chapter 31 of the Acts of 1910. The first section says that it shall be lawful for the Government to guarantee, on behalf of the Colony, for one or more years, not exceeding fifteen, the annual payment to any person, firm or company engaged in the business of cold storage and other business connected with the fisheries and bait supply of the Colony, of a sum by which the nett annual profits of such person, firm or company may be less than five per cent. on the capital invested. That is the same idea, and therefore in seeking to attach to this present bill the idea of bait supply and putting it in the bill itself, is doing no more than accepting and following up what has already been done in this House. Now, another amendment which is proposed originated in the same section. "Such guarantee shall be subject to such terms and conditions, as to the an-

nual volume of work, class of fish handled, prices to be paid for fish, countries to which fish is to be exported, as to the Governor in Council may appear expedient." Section 6 of the Act says: "The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may order and cause to be maintained an inspection and supervision of the sanitary conditions, maintenance and operation of such plant store or warehouse, and may regulate and control the temperatures to be maintained therein, in accordance with the regulations to be made as hereinafter provided." And the last section is as follows:—"The Governor in Council may make such regulations as he considers necessary in order to secure the sufficient enforcement and operation of this Act, and he may by such regulations impose penalties not exceeding fifty dollars on any person offending against them." Now, I would draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the amendments proposed here proceed from their own initiative on the general scheme of what the guarantee should be given for. The guarantee was to be given in connection with the cold storage of fresh fish and also bait supply. In the present measure there is no undertaking that this company shall deal with bait, though there is nothing in the bill to prevent them from doing it. It is quite competent for them, under the Bill, to deal in bait, but there is no obligation on them to do so.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOM.—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with what the hon. member says. That is my point. We put so many safeguards around that Act that we safeguarded it out of existence. But I don't see why we should put that into this Act which we are now considering. These are only matters of detail. We are guaranteeing these people in this Bill to-night five per cent. on the money ac-

tually invested, and not a cent more. Those people are not coming here and putting up a cold storage plant at a cost of millions of dollars for five per cent. But that is the only consideration we are offering them. We say that if they are not able to pay that dividend we are prepared to pay it. Why should we dictate to those people as to what they should do? It is in their interest to handle the bait end of this business. They are coming here for fish, and to get fish they have got to have bait. The simplest fishermen in this Island knows that you have got to have bait to catch fish. Why then should we frill this Bill around with a lot of nonsense of this sort?

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question which has been asked as to what justification there is for putting an amendment in a private bill, the answer is simply this: That when a private bill or a bill concerning a private company, is brought here, we are justified in putting in regulations which we know will ensure the carrying out of the purpose for which the guarantee is given. As to whether these amendments should be put in this Bill or not, a few days ago, when this matter was before the House, two excellent speeches were made one by the Minister of Finance and Customs and the other by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, dealing with this matter of the bait supply. The only objection to these speeches that I could see was that they were not relative to the Bill at all, because the Bill contains no guarantee to provide a bait supply. The Minister of Finance and Customs spoke of the great necessity for a bait supply through the country. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that he thought the Company ought to be able to provide bait and send it around in floating plants to different places around the

Island. He pointed out the good that it could do. But the difficulty was that none of his theories, sound as they were, found any place in the resolutions or had anything at all to do with the subject before the chair. Now the Minister of Finance and Customs has just said that in order to get fish to put in cold storage this Company will have to supply bait, in order that somebody may catch fish for them. But he has himself said that this Company can never go into the cold storage of codfish, and consequently they won't be supplying bait for the catching of codfish. If they don't put codfish in cold storage, they can only put salmon, halibut and fish of that kind.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—What about herring?

MR. MORINE.—I didn't know that they caught herring with bait. I always thought that they caught them in nets. Now, therefore, if the Company carries on the only business that the Minister himself admits they can carry on, they won't require bait. You don't catch salmon with bait. I don't know whether you catch halibut with bait or otherwise, but they are only caught on a small part of the western coast, or out on the Banks. Now, when the Minister of Finance and Customs and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries talked about the great need of bait—in which I entirely agree with them—they meant bait for the catching of codfish; and if this Company does not deal in codfish then it won't deal in bait.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I didn't say that.

MR. MORINE.—Well, it was equivalent to that.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I said they could not freeze them. They could put them in cold storage but could not freeze them. Now, don't misconstrue me.

MR. MORINE.—The Minister, if I

understood him properly, said, and so far as my slight knowledge goes I agree with him, that cold storage for codfish cannot be profitably carried on by this Company.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No.

MR. MORINE.—Well, if you didn't say so, I say it, and this Company is trying to deal chiefly in other fishes—in salmon, in halibut, in herring, if you like—but certainly not in codfish to any great extent. Now, if that be so, it becomes a mere commercial transaction which this company will carry on, and therefore the question before us now is whether an institution of that kind would be of such benefit to the community as to warrant us in pledging ourselves to \$25,000 a year as a subsidy. Because you must keep on. Under this Bill, if they put up these cold storage buildings to the extent of \$500,000, and fail to work the business commercially, the Colony must go on paying \$25,000 a year, with no return whatever. Now, then, is the prospect of the commercial results sufficiently good to warrant us in giving a guarantee of that amount. It appears to me that outside of the bait question altogether, which is eliminated from this Bill and with which this Bill has really nothing to do there is no sufficient justification to guarantee this amount to any company that may come into this Colony to carry on an ordinary commercial transaction, especially if, as in this case, their success is extremely doubtful. It seems to me that this is axiomatic. If this company has before it a proposition which warrants us in believing that it will be a commercial success, then it requires no guarantee. Commercial men, business men, must be able to say whether that is the case or not. If their success is doubtful, if commercial men are not satisfied about it, then we ought not to give a guar-

antee of such a large amount. As the Minister has very properly said, this company will not go on merely for the guarantee which we are giving it. It will come to an end if it cannot make more profit than the guarantee which we are giving. If it does come to an end, we must go on paying this guarantee and looking at the empty stores and storage plants which they have put up. Now, it appears to me that under these circumstances and in the present financial condition of the Colony, we have not sufficient information before us to justify this measure. I would like to ask whether the prospectus of this Company has been submitted to any sound commercial men in this community for the purpose of asking them whether they think the basis of the company is sound and its success comparatively certain, and that we are justified in giving this guarantee? If there is anything of this kind, I would like to see a report upon it. If nothing of that kind has been done, I would suggest that the opinion of sound business men be obtained upon this proposition and whether it is prudent for us to go on. With such a report as that before us, we might safely deal with this matter.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply to the hon. member. I think the House understood from Mr. Lloyd, when he read the Cold Storage Act, that that was a general act. It has no bearing whatever on the Act before us. Section 5 of that Act reads: "The Governor in Council may, out of any moneys appropriated by the Legislature for the purpose, grant towards the construction of any plant, store or warehouse, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole thirty per cent of the amount expended or approved of in such construction and equipment, etc." I grant you that his argument is alright as regards that

contract, but this is different altogether. These people are not asking for 30 per cent.; they are asking for a guarantee of 5 per cent. If they are not able at the end of the year to pay 5 per cent. to the shareholders who have invested money in this plant, they then ask the Government to come in and pay the difference between what they are able to pay and the 5 per cent. When the hon. gentleman who has just sat down thinks that we should have the opinions of competent business men as to whether this is likely to be successful or not,—well, where are these business men? We have for years been waiting for them to come forward and give their opinions. It is all right to get up in the House and talk that kind of stuff, but where are the men? The fishermen of the Island are waiting for them. This industry has been established in other countries. Take Canada and the United States. There is no necessity for Gloucester or Boston to worry about bait. Why? Because the whole coast is searched from one end to the other by bait catchers, and it is taken and put in cold storage. And the same applies in Canada. The 150 Lunenburg vessels that sailed this spring had their bait ordered, and all they had to do was to go to certain parts of Canada and take it out of cold storage. And here we are in one of the greatest bait deposits in British North America, and our fishermen have to import it. As I stated before, certain men in this Island imported a cargo of squid this year. One of the men interested in that told me personally that they had bought this squid at 4 cents a pound, and sold it at 6 cents a pound. And here we are looking for men to come in and give us an opinion as to whether this business would be profitably carried on.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: If any-

thing which could be said would strengthen the amendment it would be the speech of the hon. member who has just sat down. His speech has been on the necessity of a bait supply and the advantages of a bait supply. That was the burden of his speech the other day, and that was the burden of the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I may say that our position in brief may be stated as this. In dealing with this Company on the question of Cold Storage we make no provision whatever for the storage of fresh fish. The Minister pointed out that in the Act which I have just quoted there is provision made for a subsidy; that being so, with our experience before us while we are now on this very question in this House why not take advantage of this Act and offer a subsidy for the sake of procuring the advantage of cold storage? Why can we not take the advantage of benefitting the country thus, under this scheme?

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, It is not my intention at this hour to participate in the controversy now demanding the attention of honourable members in this House, but I merely wish to say that from the remarks of Mr. Morine one would judge that this company could go on and exact 5% and nothing would result from it, but I think if he looks at section 6 he will see that the Company makes some very advantageous proposals. (Hon. Member reads section 6.) I merely wish to point this out because the Hon. Member carefully excluded from his argument anything in relation to this section.

MR. DOWNEY.—I desire it to be distinctly understood, Mr. Chairman, that I am speaking in no spirit of egotism in making the statement that I believe I am warranted in claiming to be the only person in the House,

and perhaps in this community who has had practical experience in this country in the cold storing and marketing of fresh fish and this experience debars my accepting the statements made in the House this afternoon by the Hon. Minister of Finance and other speakers to the effect that they do not look forward to the Newfoundland-American Packing Co. doing an extensive business in cold stored codfish.

I remember some few years back giving to this House some facts and figures in connection with this business, but as it is so long since and as these facts and figures were then given in connection with a different enterprise, it may perhaps not be out of place if I again briefly refer to them at the present time.

I had for many years convinced myself that the system of Cold Storage could be applied in our fishery operations with the same measure of advantage that it has been applied to the meat and fruit interests of Australia, South America and other countries.

I labored for some years to develop an interest in this scheme through the press and by interviewing individuals but I could succeed in doing nothing and with the inception of the Port aux Basques-Cape Breton steam service in connection with our railway system I thought the time was ripe for a practical effort to prove the feasibility or otherwise of the transportation of fresh fish through the medium of cold storage.

After having posted myself as to the requirements of the American and Canadian markets I, through the assistance of a local firm—and I may say the only one who were sufficiently enterprising and whose foresight enabled them to grasp the possibility of getting away from the stereotyped methods of handling fish that have been so long the only ones resorted to

in this country—located at Port aux Basques so as to be in immediate touch with the transportation facilities that the Bruce service to Cape Breton provided.

In those days, 1899 to 1904 dry codfish only commanded \$4.00 a quintal and I would ask this House to remember that it takes 224 lbs. of "salt-bulk" fish, 208 lbs. of "split" fish and 500 lbs. of "round" fish, to make a dry quintal.

When I began buying fresh fish I paid from a cent to a cent and a quarter a pound for it and as I took this fish with the head on and the bone left in I paid from \$5.00 to \$6.25 for the equivalent of a dry quintal.

As I have already stated dry fish in those days was selling for \$4.00, from which the cost of "curing," of salt, and the discount for cullage, amounting to at least 60 cents, per quintal, had to be deducted, so that the net price to the fisherman could not have been more than \$3.40, consequently when I paid from one cent to a cent and a quarter per pound for fish with the head on and the bone left in, and of which 500 lbs. is required to yield a dry quintal, I was absolutely paying the fishermen from \$5.00 to \$6.25 per quintal when they could realise but \$3.40 for the same as dry fish.

In the case of Salmon the result in advantages to the fishermen was equally marked. As very many hon. members know it requires practically 300 lbs. of fresh salmon to yield a barrel of 200 lbs. when salted and in those days No. 1 salt salmon was selling at about \$10.00 per barrel, from which the cost of the barrel, the salt, inspection and other charges had to be deducted so that very rarely did fishermen realise more than \$9.00 net for their salmon, or just three cents a pound. As we never paid less than six cents and in some cases 6½ and 6¾c. we were really paying the fishermen from \$15.00 to \$21.00 a barrel.

When we initiated the fresh fish business no halibut were being got except what was being got incidentally through the codfishery and it usually sold at from a cent to 2½ cents a pound. With the increased demand certain persons took up the fishing for halibut exclusively and in the course of three years the price had gone to as high as seven cents a pound and an idea of the profits from this fish at this price can best be realized when I state that on one particular occasion a craft that was fishing halibut for us left the wharf at 7 o'clock in the morning and was back again before four in the afternoon with over 12,000 lbs. of fish.

Live lobsters, smelts, eels and other fishes are procurable in considerable quantity for cold storage transportation purposes but only through such means can these be handled or a marketable value imparted to them.

As an illustration of the very great value possessed by certain kinds of fish procurable in great quantities in this country but which at the present time have practically no market value, I might say that owing to the character of the sea bottom in the neighborhood of Port aux Basques caplin very rarely frequent the shores there and only on one occasion in the five years that I was connected with the West Coast fisheries was I enabled to procure a small quantity of caplin at Codroy. These were three days on our hands before we could ship them and they were five days in transit to New York, yet these fish, incredible as it may seem, actually realised 15 cents a pound. It was the only shipment of the sort that I was ever able to make but judging from the many and extensive orders that we received for further shipments one has no trouble in coming to the conclusion that could we put our caplin in an absolutely fresh condition on the Am-

erican market the value realized would be simply a revelation to us.

When locating at Port aux Basques I took it for granted that the "Bruce" service then initiated would be continuous in operation but unfortunately conditions over which nobody could exercise any control operated to prevent this. These conditions were heavy ice in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and snow storms that blocked the railway line compelling the "Bruce", in order to continue the service, to ply between North Sydney and Placentia instead of between North Sydney and Port aux Basques. This very badly handicapped our efforts as quite frequently it left us with considerable quantities of fish on our hands that had been prepared for the fresh fish market and owing to its being impossible for us to transmit it to Cape Breton for shipment to Canada and the United States we time and again had to de-frost such fish and endeavour to convert it into a marketable salt product.

Apart from the assurance that the price that I have quoted will furnish as to the profitable character of a cold storage business, I may say that a further great advantage is the fact that the money invested can be turned over every two weeks as sales are all for spot cash.

Many influences tended to hamper our operations and the extent of our shipments never exceeded about 10,000 lbs. of salmon, probably 7,000 lbs. of halibut and from 5,000 to 10,000 lbs. of codfish per day and all these quantities represented but a tithe of the orders that we always had and could never attempt to fill.

Reviewing these facts then, Mr. Chairman, I can come to no other conclusion than that the Newfoundland-American Packing Co., whose charter we are now discussing, will when in operation find it as decidedly to their advantage to handle our cod-

fish through the medium of their cold storages as they will any of the other varieties of fishes that this country furnishes. I am anticipating a very large measure of success for this Company and will be grievously disappointed if it fails to be as satisfactory to every interest concerned as it ought, and as I confidently anticipate it will be.

MR. MOULTON.—I have very much pleasure in supporting the bill, more especially as I have for many years taken a deep interest in the matter of Cold Storage of our fishes. Something like thirty-five years ago, I was manager of a large plant for the cold storage of mackerel, salmon and other fishes in Gloucester County, New Brunswick. The fishes were caught during the summer season, cold stored and shipped during the winter months to the Boston market, and generally realized profitable prices. Again about the year 1898, I was interested in the New England Cold Storage Company whose head office was at Gloucester. This Company had two large barges employed in the cold storage business under an improved chemical process, from Burgeo to Piacentia. The Government permitted this operation on condition that a sufficient quantity of bait fishes was kept on hand to meet the needs of our fishermen. The fishermen failed to take advantage, probably for the reason that plenty of bait was obtainable in the usual way, with the result that the Company suffered great loss from a financial standpoint, as they had calculated upon selling large quantities of bait to our people. The business of cold storage is so risky and speculative that it is almost impossible to induce capitalists to put their money into such an undertaking unless they are assured of a Government guarantee similar to that provided for in this measure. Some

few years ago, the question of cold storage was a live one, as I believe it is to-day, and at that time I was asked by the Board of Trade to give my views on the matter. During that particular period our dried fish in the foreign markets did not realize the present day good prices and it was thought desirable that these markets could be somewhat relieved if we could send a portion of our staple cold stored into the United States and Canada. I suggested that as this was a question affecting the whole country, that a large and representative company, comprised of as many of our business men as possible, should be found, with a capital, say of a half million dollars to handle the project, and to give it a fair and square trial. The object of the company would be to put up our various fishes, and particularly cod, into every conceivable form (except hard dry cure) in order that our ordinary foreign markets may not be overstocked with the certain result of a fall in price. I also suggested that in order to carry out this undertaking it would be necessary to erect cold storage plants in different portions of the Island and a commencement might be made by constructing one or two on the West Coast. The views of several other business men on the subject at that time were obtained, but nothing seemed to have come from the movement. Several small cold storage plants for bait were in vogue from time to time on the West Coast, but they failed, owing to the lack of patronage on the part of the fishermen. In my opinion these plants can only declare dividends when operated on a large scale, such as contemplated by this Bill. It seems rather an anomaly that in this country, where we so jealously guard our bait fishes as to prohibit their exportation for the use of the fishermen of other countries, that we witnessed last year, the importation

of squid bait from Gloucester, to the value of \$20,000.00 for the use of our fishermen living between Burin and Channel. We all remember the passage of our Bait Act, and the machinery then employed and now being employed, to carry out its provisions, and yet it may not be known to the House, that for some years past, our fishermen rely to a considerable extent, upon frozen squid which they procure from St. Pierre. There is no question whatever but that fertilizing plants, operated in conjunction with large cold storage and boneless plants, will pay handsomely if managed in a proper and skilled manner, and the day must come when a very great quantity of our fish will be exported in a manner different from the usual hand dry cure. I am a great believer and have faith in cold storage, conducted under proper methods, and I welcome a measure such as this one, which to my mind, will greatly aid in bringing about a desirable change in the manner of preparing our staple, and other fishes for the markets of the world.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the various speakers on this measure to-night have been of an extremely amiable character and everybody seems most anxious to accept the suggestions of every member in determining the value of these amendments, but nothing that has been said by the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House will lead me to think that I have been wrong in any suggestion here to-night. Mr. Lloyd has already pointed out that these amendments have been taken from an Act passed in 1910 by the Government itself. These amendments interfere in no way with the work of the Company as far as the engineering and so on is concerned. The regulating of this matter is left entirely in the hands of the Gov-

ernment. I would not like to propose any amendment to injure the Company in any way but I think you ought to put some provision to bear out what I have suggested. I would like to have some response and have these suggestions answered in a practicable way for they could in no way injure the provisions of the Company and are from every point of view reasonable. You have stated that you have said all you are going to say, but I must confess that I will be very sorry to see this Bill going through without these amendments. These amendments were not made from an opposition point of view. The object is not to injure the Bill, but rather to help it, and I sincerely believe that the Government will see eye to eye with me and when you come in and pay \$25,000 to run cold storage plants you will be backward in your duty if you do not compel the company to take upon itself the responsibilities enumerated in the amendment. The Minister of Finance and Customs when he referred to this question of the cold storage debate remarked that \$20,000.00 worth had been imported into the Colony this year by bankers on the West Coast. If you take it into consideration that the Government has been in power for six years and spent thirty million dollars during that time with the result that the fishery continues exactly the same, then I may say it is a very strange thing that the fishermen have to go to Gloucester and other places in Nova Scotia to procure bait which could very reasonably be secured in this country, and the Minister says the fishery is flourishing, but I say that if this is all true the fishery is a failure. I may tell you that if I had the handling of thirty million there would be no place here that would not have a bait depot. It is not to our credit to have thirty thousand dollars worth of squid imported,

It is a matter that could be managed so easily, and these amendments provide for this matter with so little inconvenience to everyone that I cannot see why they are not adopted. What shall I say if you do not accept them? They cannot affect the Bill in any way, but I hope that the Government will be reasonable and appreciate the value of my remarks.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—I arise for the sake of supporting this resolution. We have all heard what Mr. Coaker has said in reference to his resolution, and we have heard with much pleasure his remarks on his amendment to the Bill now before the House. I fear that the hon. member does not realize that in order to invite capitalists to invest their money we must make the proposition inviting. We are all thoroughly aware that the salmon fishing is not what it ought to be. Outside this city there is one of the best salmon grounds that we have, and salmon has been sold in our local market at the low rate of ten cents per pound. This could not be if we had cold storage. The value of the salmon catch is not more than \$300,000 annually, and it ought to be one and a half millions, and the only course to increase such a fishery as that is by the introduction of some such measure as is before us to-night. Not only salmon but caplin, herring and many other fishes, can be utilised under such a scheme as this. If we had cold storage for bait, a matter which has been particularly emphasized in this debate, we would be able to utilize all these industries. These people are not investing \$500,000 for the purpose of getting five per cent. They are coming here to make money. They want to make ten or twenty per cent. and I am sure that in less than two years from now cold storage of bait will be an accomplished fact. On the West Coast this year cold-stored

herring sold for \$1.70 per hundred; squid at more than four cents a pound. Surely it is right that we should do something in this matter. So far the history of cold storage in this Colony has been a failure. If we had cold storage there would not be the same thing as happens year after year, plenty of fish on the grounds and the fishermen looking for bait. The hon. member for Twillingate stated that if bait had been cold stored last year there would be no trouble to get all the fish we want. We all know that there were not enough squid last year. The year previous there were very few but no one has yet made cold-storage of bait a financial success, and consequently it is hardly fair to expect a large company, such as this, to place money in an industry here without getting some interest on it. To encourage this matter the Government is giving five per cent,— the difference between the earnings and 5 per cent, and as has been stated by the hon. member for St. George's, Mr. Downey they can send away cold-stored fishes to an unlimited extent. Herring, salmon, caplin, lobster and all the fishes that we have can be utilised without exception. The fishery of this island is undergoing a very marked change. The introduction of motor boats into the catching of fish will make a marked increase in the catch, and with this increase there will be a great necessity for cold storage. I had hoped that a bill such as this in the interests of the country and of the fishermen would have passed this House without any adverse criticism from the Opposition side, but it is quite clear that no matter what the Government brings down in the way of legislation, having in view the benefit of the people or in reference to the fisheries of the country, it is subject to a captious criticism from members of the other side, and

it appears that it does not matter whether they are fishermen themselves or not. There are unfortunately many men in the Island to-night without fishery supplies for the summer, and I think that if a bill, such as this, had been in force—if an industry such as this had been in operation for a few years, it would have given a material help at such a time as the present, to those suffering from effects of the war in this regard. A year from now we may have a very large supply of our fish sold straight out of the water. If that is so the demand for salt fish will increase, and this will revivify to a very large extent a fishery like the Labrador which is becoming decadent. We must make an effort to get some such industry as this established in the country, so that we may bring back that prosperity which has been lost by the lack of initiative on the part of legislators in the past. To-day we have a Labrador fishery just practically dead. Unfortunately the depression extends not only to the Labrador fishery but to the Shore fishery. It needs some encouragement; it needs some stimulus to make the fishermen catch more fish, take larger chances and get larger prices. I have listened with very great interest to the remarks of members on the other side, but it appears to me that there can be no reason for interfering with this Cold Storage Company to the extent which they suggest by the inclusion of cold storage of bait in the bill. The history of the cold storage of bait as a financial proposition is that it has been a failure and contracts of a nature such as this in the past have not been carried on with financial success. That is why I say that the Opposition's criticism is captious; that is why I say that those on the other side of the House are criticising this not in the interests of the country but to obtain certain political capital by their critic-

ism of the bill. I believe if we allow this bill to pass as it is without amendment when we come into this House for another session next year we will be able to congratulate ourselves upon its passage, and that we will all forget in the general prosperity which it will bring the little disagreement which we have had this afternoon over the subject before the chair.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, just one word. I think the hon. member who has just sat down has been most unfair in his comments. I think the amendment proposed by Mr. Coaker is an amendment introduced for the purpose of improving the bill, and I think that to call his observation "captious criticism" is to say the least uncalled for and unfair. The amendment itself is to my mind an improvement upon the bill. First of all this kind of bill itself is one which I have always contended is wrong in principle. We should not undertake an industry such as this kind by contract. If we are going to encourage the cold storage business or a fish business of any kind, which is the principal industry of this country, it should be done by general legislation laying down conditions on which the fishery may be carried on so that any person who has capital and is prepared to go into the industry in any way will be able to do so. We should not make contracts such as this which are virtually creating a monopoly. We are granting special privileges and special rights, and that to my mind is not in principle in connection with such a business as this. I have always contended that in regulating such an industry it should be done not by contract but by general legislation—a general law as setting out the terms upon which the Government is prepared to encourage any particular business or industry. We have on the Statute Book a law dealing with this subject. If it is not

sufficient to encourage the industry then increase the concessions so that it will be sufficient to induce people to go into it. Some day or other all these contracts will rise up against the country in the shape of claims for arbitration against a government that is desirous to benefit the general good of the fishery. I take that objection in the beginning to the method of legislation. The bill before the House is in itself one to encourage the cold storage of fish. I think if we accept the principle of legislating by contract the Government should inform the House fully on the business status of the people with whom we are contracting. We should know whether this business of cold storage is capable of maintaining itself as other businesses do or not. It is not a bait act. There is nothing in it with regard to bait, except the company desire to enter upon a supply of bait to fishermen. The method of cold storage or any other method whereby bait can be supplied at all times and places where the fishermen require it is one of importance to the fishery. That has been discussed over and over again inside this House and outside. It is one of the fundamental steps that bait should be supplied regularly in places where the fishermen want it. That is one of the things which the Prime Minister has been strongly advocating and so has every member of this House, and the amendment proposed by Mr. Coaker is one for the increase of the supply of bait.

During the period of fifteen years the Government is going to give these people a sum of money equivalent to a percentage on their capital and it is only fair that we should have the power if we require it to compel them to supply bait for certain parts of the country. I think that, accepting the principle of legislating by contract it is a request only in the interest of the country to ask the Government to

hold to themselves the power to make this regulation as the amendment proposes.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks also. The amendment proposed by Mr. Coaker is not for the purpose of destroying this bill but to bring into effect the meaning of the bill as laid down by members of the Government party. At one time they will explain to the House that this Company is not going to touch bait and then they talk as if the whole country was going to be flooded with it. Now this amendment is proposed for the purpose of putting the Government in the position to say to the company at some future date, you shall supply bait to the fishermen. I do not think that the hon. member of Placentia, Mr. Devereaux, knew what he was talking about, and I am sure that there are a lot of members of the Government that are in favour of the amendment proposed. There is nothing in this bill to compel the company to carry bait, and we ask for this amendment to compel the company, if required, to supply the fishermen. I believe in the policy that this country should be run for the fishermen. The fishery resources are the only industry to carry this country through. We are undertaking the expenditure of \$25,000.00 without any assurance that it is going to help the fishermen, and our experience has been in the past that these wonderful companies do not turn out so philanthropic as people imagine. If we want these people to supply bait then we should lay it down in the contract. My opinion is that we should put up bait freezers under a general law. Why should we allow these men to have a monopoly of any particular business. We know that they are not going to be in favour of the fishermen. This party is here to support anything in favour of the fishermen. I just want to make myself plain. We are

here to defend the fishermen, and it is not because we propose amendments which are in favour of them that members on the other side of the House should insult us, and say we are simply opposing the bill for the purpose of opposition. I say that we ought to lay this down in the law and that these bait freezers should be erected if requested, and the mere fact that we propose this amendment does not justify any member in making a charge on the other side of the House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, just one or two words in relation to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Twillingate. I quite sympathise with the last speaker in some of the remarks that he makes and the only way out of the difficulty as far as I can see is for him to come over with us on this side of the House. In relation to the amendment itself I may say that when the contract was being discussed every effort was made to obtain from the Company a guarantee that they would sell bait at certain prices and keep it in cold storage. In the past, unfortunately, the failure of this cold storage scheme has been due to the fact that the contract contained a provision binding the companies down to the establishment of bait depots and selling at certain prices, and the result has been that when they go to New York and other money markets they are unable to get the necessary capital. This is not a mere amendment to the bill. If the amendment passes it would be an amendment not to the bill but to the contract, a contract which has already been signed. The promoters of this scheme have been here and have discussed every item in this contract, and when discussing that the Government urged the desirability in the interest of the country and of the fishermen to put in the contract an

agreement that would bind them to supply bait and keep certain depots of bait running and guarantee certain prices. The promoters of the scheme said to us: "We are establishing in your country large cold storage plants, one floating, and the other stationary, and we cannot guarantee to supply bait at certain prices." As I say in the past the guaranteeing to supply bait and deliver it at certain prices has made it impossible to borrow money. That has been our experience in the past. I was in this House and supported the first cold storage contract that was introduced by Sir Robert Bond when he sat in the place which I occupy to-night. That was a contract with a gentleman from Montreal to supply eighteen cold storage plants, and that gentleman pointed out that the one thing that made it fail was the provision for the supply of bait. Three or four years ago we made a similar contract. It was identical with the previous one with certain Americans who came down here from Maine. This was the contract with Trefethen and Lord from Bangor, in the State of Maine. They came here with the very best of references and made a contract with us. And we were told that the people were accusing us of giving the country away and people were trying to get up a public meeting against this contract with the object of stopping it. Their own merchants can tell them that there is no money in it, else they would be in it. Why do they not touch it? They talk about scarcity, and yet no one will come and undertake this work. When we find some one willing to do it it is our duty to lasso him, and having done this, this is the reply we get. This is the reply we get when we enter into an agreement with a company that has been in the business for 200 years. We catch one million quintals a year. If the fishermen would look after their

bait supply better they could double that without much trouble, but they cannot get anyone to put any money into it as they do not guarantee a market to that person. That is why none of the merchants will put any money into it. It is not a case of any misunderstanding with the Government. Why it is only a few years ago since the whale fishery to the value of \$1,500,000 practically disappeared. Last year and every year the sealing industry is becoming less valuable, and less attractive, and will not pay the merchant, and can he be expected to drop money when the chance is very slim of the venture being successful? My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition stated the case very fairly here to-night. He stated that he was an objector to this form of contract. He favors putting a general law on the Statute Book so that whosoever will may, knowing fully what he is about, take advantage of it. He thinks that a government can in this way be making a contract which will not rise up against them in after years. The hon. gentleman knows that we desire to make no such contract. As to placing one in the Statutes, that too is unnecessary, for there is one there already; one that has been there for years, and one that succeeds one that was put there in 1898. Dr. Lloyd has said so here to-night.

Then there were the amendments of Mr. Coaker the hon. member for Twillingate. These were taken from the general act; but although that act was on the Statute Book for years and years, yet no one ever availed of it. For the last 10 years it has been there and no one has yet taken any notice of it. The act of 1898 which that act succeeded was introduced by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and as no attention has been given to either of these acts, we

are now driven to make another but this time a special contract to have this business carried on. It is my candid opinion that this contract is as good a one as can be made at the present time, and I would emphasize my sincerity in connection with it.

I would like to point out, however, that the amendments as recommended and moved by Mr. Coaker, are not amendments to the law, or to the general act, but amendments to a contract, signed, sealed and delivered which cannot be amended except by the consent of both parties.

What does this contract amount to anyway. It is simply this: This company undertakes to erect and keep running at a fixed rate three plants, and will spend half a million dollars on them. These will run at a standard fixed in the act. What do they ask? What they want is security that they will make 5% on the money. Is this not the least that we will guarantee them? It does not mean that we will have to give them five per cent., but make their profits up to five per cent. For example if they make one, then we will give them four per cent. If they make four, we will give them one per cent. If they make five, we will give them nothing. If the plan is an utter failure the Government is bound to the extent of but 5% of the half million per year; that is \$25,000. That is taking the worst view of it.

It is only an expenditure of \$25,000 per year on the fisheries, and who would object to this. Suppose that without this insurance as it were of a good fishery, the fishery was a failure; no one in this House would I am sure oppose a vote for relief to the extent of \$25,000. Could not this amount be deducted from the votes for bridges, Old Age Pensions, and Education. So then, it will not be quite plain, that this is an investment purely in the interests of the fisheries, to develop them. In addition to

this the company has agreed to undertake things not included in previous acts. My friend, Mr. Coaker, says that we have spent \$30,000,000 for the seven years that we have been in power. So we may have. But the whole of this money came from the country annually, through the public revenue; and every cent was spent on the public services of the Colony. It was spent on repairing roads, pensions, hospitals, public schools, and other public services, which must of necessity be kept in good repair.

I may say that even the amendments proposed here to-night have been discussed by the government and the company, and found to be impossible. This was done not once or twice, but ten times. This company cannot undertake this, nor can any company. It must be remembered that the establishment of cold storage plants in itself is a risky venture. This is the third within the past twelve years. The other two were failures. These failures have been an object lesson to the country. My friend here to-night, Mr. Devereaux, has referred to the condition of the people in some parts of the country when they cannot get a full supply of bait. It is a most serious condition of affairs. Then again there is the lobster fishery. This fishery too is failing. Last year it will be remembered it dropped to 12,000 cases. From 80,000 as it used to be years ago. Then the Labrador fishery, the herring fishery; these are failing too. In fact all our fisheries demand immediate attention to keep them from being lost.

I do not agree with several statements that have been made here to-night, particularly that made by Mr. Morine who is not here now, when he said that it was impossible to sell cod at a profit. What you can buy here for 10 cents, you can sell in Nova

Scotia for 30 cents, and what is true of Nova Scotia is also true of Canada and the United States.

MR. COAKER.—Just a word or two Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Premier. He said he had showed where my amendments were impossible. I do not think that he even touched upon any reasons. He went over the whole of the fishery problem except this one point. He just explained that the merchants would not invest one cent in this industry. Well we knew that, but also know that this Government before it came into power had this as one of its first problems. Six years ago it was mentioned in the speeches of the Minister of Finance and Customs, but nothing has been done yet. If you want the opinion of the fishermen on this matter all you have to do is to look up the memorial to the Governor in 1910 from the F. P. U. and that explains their position. The Union in 1910 offered to operate such depots if the Government would find the material etc. necessary for their building, but nothing was done. The Government kept putting the fishermen off from year to year, and say now that they cannot get any company to undertake the work. Do you know why they have not succeeded? This is why. They put the bait supplied by the fishermen in the depots, and charge so highly for their labour that the fisherman is not going to go to that expense unless it is absolutely necessary. What you want is depots run by the fishermen themselves, and I am sure that with these the fishery would soon improve with the improved conditions. If quarter of the money that has been spent by this Government were spent on things like this to help out the fishermen, this would be a far different country to-day.

As I said before, the Company that cannot accept such an amendment as

I proposed this afternoon is not worth the grass which grows on the South-side Hill. Supposing that you get these plants that you are talking about; supposing they are established, and that they buy 5,000,000 lbs. of codfish and export it. Well, where are you then? About 30,000 quintals of fish will be the equivalent of what they will export. Is that going to make very much difference? Is that going to make the price of fish very much higher? But as I pointed out the other day if you were to raise \$600,000 and spend it in the erection of bait deposits in the outports, that would erect, even if they cost \$4,000 each, 100 bait deposits; and if those 100 bait deposits only had 1,000 quintals each, that would mean 100,000 quintals, which at \$7.00 per quintal would mean \$700,000. But I think, sir, that under this plan you could put up bait deposits for \$2,000 each, and that would mean a total of 200 around the shores of the Island and give you \$200,000 to operate those stations with. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Bay St. George delivered a very excellent speech to-night on the subject of cold storage. The facts that he presented to the House were amazing. It is a wonder to me why the Government does not utilize his knowledge and experience. Why not put him down in the Marine and Fisheries Department instead of having him wasting his time in the Department of Agriculture and Mines. He could use his ability and do some good in the Fisheries Department if you would follow his advice. It is a surprise to me that you should have a man on that side with such ability and experience in connection with this business and yet that you have made no attempt to utilize him. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am serious about this matter. There is no one who wishes, and hopes, to see more come from the fisheries than I do. I have given

five or six of the best years of my life to try and do all I can to uplift the fishermen, and if a matter connected with the fisheries comes before this House I claim the right to propose any amendment which I believe to be in the interests of the fisheries and of the fishermen; and if we have no right to make amendments in connection with matters of this sort, then the least you might have done was to consult us through the Minister of Marine and Fisheries before you prepared your bill so that we might make any suggestions which we thought would improve it. If you had this amendment, you could say to these men, when their plants were established: You will have to get bait deposits, and you will have to supply bait to the fishermen. I don't say many of them would avail of it, but the bankers would avail of it, as was proved by the instance cited here this afternoon of men having to send abroad for bait. But what is the good of my talking? It is useless for us on this side to make suggestions, because you will be making out that we are saying something wrong and our friend from Placentia will be getting up and making another speech like he did this evening. I don't believe he meant what he said, but he said it, and he had no right to say it, because there is no one on that side that I have more respect for than him. He said I was bitter. Well, he has not seen much of my bitterness if he thought I was bitter this afternoon. I am bitter when I am treated badly, but he will find no better if I am treated right. Now, Mr. Chairman, our amendment, of course, will be turned down, but I want to tell you that if that establishment goes ahead you will be sorry that you did not accept it.

(The amendment was thereupon put and lost.)

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I

wish to make one or two remarks now that the amendment proposed by Mr. Coaker has been turned down. I would like to know what action the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take. I understood from his remarks the other day that he was going to try and influence the government to put some clause into the bill that would make it quite sure that bait deposits would be provided by the Company that was undertaking this cold storage business. I am sorry that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here now so that he might inform us as to why that clause is not inserted in the BILL. What has caused a good deal of debate in connection with this BILL is the fact that the members of the Government who have expressed themselves have not been open and above board in their remarks. The burden of the remarks made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and also by the Minister of Finance and Customs during this session on this subject has been on the supply of bait and the great benefits that would be derived from bait depots and we were given to understand that the chief object and aim of these resolutions would be the supplying of bait to the fishermen. Now, if they had not talked in this way but simply spoken to the different clauses of the resolutions and explained what they really meant, a good deal of the time taken up in this debate would have been saved. Even Mr. Devereaux, in his remarks tonight, tried to make it appear that this BILL would result in bait being supplied to the fishermen. His remarks, when boiled down to a fine point, consisted of loud-mouthed nothings—trying to make it appear that we on this side of the House are opposed to Cold Storage—opposed to a measure that is now being brought down by the Government to benefit the interests of the fishermen. This is very misleading. The amendment

which was brought in was for the purpose of trying to make the bill more perfect, so as to insure for the fishermen that bait would be supplied, and that was all the criticism that was offered to this BILL. There is more about jam factories in this bill than there is about bait depots, but nothing has been said about that. We are giving these people exemption from sugar when used for the preservation of berries, fruits, &c., for exportation from the Colony. It includes the dehydration of fish and other products, and so forth. The only person who has been open and free in his expression of opinion as regards bait depots is the Minister. He has told us plainly that they could not get the company to accept this agreement unless bait depots were left out altogether. Bait depots have been left out, and therefore it is only nonsense for anyone speaking to these resolutions to attempt to show that this BILL has anything at all to do with getting bait for the fishermen. It has nothing in the world to do with it. If it claims by putting up fish in a different way than salted and dried to relieve the catch that has to be exported in a dry state, it may help a little; if you give employment by way of jam factories so much the better; if you catch some of the eels and trout that are in the rivers and lakes of this country and make them worth something commercially, alright; but eliminate the idea of bait depots and then we have the bill as it purports to be when it passes this House. All the time that has been spent in making speeches, that have been repeated over and over again whenever any bill dealing with the fisheries comes before this House, might have been saved. Without taking any further time, I may say that it affords me the greatest pleasure to support anything that tends to benefit the country, anything that will give the fishermen

a greater chance of catching fish and of getting a better price for the fish caught; and I hope that now that you have determined to put the thing through, the outcome of it will be of great benefit to the country.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred had passed the Bill with some amendments, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received.

On motion for the adoption of the report, Mr. Coaker moved and Mr. Halfyard seconded, the following amendment:

(The amendment moved by Mr. Coaker in the Committee.)

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment: Messrs. Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Kent, Clift, Lloyd, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman and Grimes, (13); and against it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, LeFeuvre, Currie, Higgins, Geo. Kennedy, Walsh (17); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for the adoption of the report was put, and there appeared in favor of it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, LeFeuvre, Currie, Higgins, Geo. Kennedy, Walsh (17); and against it: Messrs. Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Kent, Clift, Lloyd, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman and Grimes (13); so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An

Act for the confirmation of an agreement between the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland-American Packing Co." was read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

PATRIOTIC ASSOCIATION BILL.

Second reading of Newfoundland Patriotic Association Bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill. When we are in Committee I shall avail of the opportunity to discuss the Bill more fully than it would be possible to do on second reading. The intention is to fulfil the expressed desire of the Patriotic Association to incorporate His Excellency the Governor, the Finance Committee, the President and members of the Legislative Council, the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, the Chief Justice and Judges of the Supreme Court, all the Stipendiary Magistrates of the Colony, the Mayor of St. John's, and their successors in office. As you are aware, the patriotic fund, which is to be administered by this corporation, has been obtained by public subscription all over the country, and there can be no doubt about it that having regard to the means of the people and the many calls made upon them in relation to other matters they have responded splendidly to this appeal. Their splendid effort has not been confined to this fund alone. They have given their money freely and willingly in relation to other aids for the soldiers and sailors, as well as to funds like the Belgian Relief Fund and many others of that nature. The future historian of Newfoundland will not forget to devote a chapter to the way in which the people of this country rose to the great occasion through which we are now passing; and if history is written correctly and dispassionately, and written by one who will properly understand and appreciate the time in

which we live, it cannot fail to render to the people of Newfoundland the fullest measure of praise because of the course they took in connection with the great war which is now raging. We are not a large country, and not what could be called a rich country; but nevertheless I think, having regard to the number of soldiers and sailors that we have sent to the front, the splendid patriotism shown by these young men, and the splendid spirit of sacrifice shown by their mothers and fathers and sisters and brothers—the splendid devotion shown by those who remained at home, especially the mothers and the fathers, who are really in their way doing as much for the Empire as those who have gone—having regard to all these facts, the future Pedley or Prowse will, I have no doubt, paint a picture that, whilst we will not be here to read, will be a source of great consolation to those who will come after us. War was hardly proclaimed before the spirit of the country was evinced by the popular clamor to do our part, and it found its fruition in many ways, but particularly in the matter to which I refer to-night. What must particularly strike everyone, over and above all, is the splendid unanimity that has existed amongst our people in relation to this matter—an example of unanimity borrowed from the Empire as a whole, from the Mother Country and from our sister dominions. It is, then, for the purpose of establishing a permanent board who will take these funds and administer them, not as a charitable fund, because there is no charity about it. It is to go to the men, and to the dependents—the wives and children and families—of the men who are to-day fighting in the trenches for us. This is no charitable dole that this body will have to administer, but a fund the character of which is

as noble and as fine as the private purse of His Majesty the King. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we will all be glad to facilitate the Patriotic Association, who come here and ask us to enact a small measure to give a status to their operations which, I think, they well deserve. Now, when we go into committee to-morrow on this Bill I will be very glad to lay some facts before the Committee in relation to the amount subscribed, the amount spent up to the present time, and generally an outline of the manner in which this corporation proposes to spend the money.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I think everyone will agree that the idea of incorporating the Patriotic Committee is a very good one, and that is the idea which underlies the bill which is now before us. The object of the bill and the object of the committee is one which I am sure everybody will approve of. Our Patriotic Committee, particularly the Finance Committee, which has been in existence since the outbreak of the war, has done very good work indeed. The men who compose that Committee have given considerable attention to the duties which the position imposes on them. These duties, of course, arose out of conditions over which we here have no control. They are regrettable, but they are necessary. They arose out of the war which is raging in Europe at the present time. That our people have done their duty in every way that they could do it as citizens of the Empire cannot be gainsaid. This country is a small one, but proportionately to its population, it ranks as high as any portion of the British Empire. These young men who have enlisted in our military and naval forces for the purpose of defending the Empire against an unprovoked attack, in a war which is being carried on, as we are learning from day to day, in a manner which

shocks the sense of humanity, these are the people and their dependents that this Committee is to take care of—not in the sense of providing for charitable assistance to them, but simply a payment in acknowledgment of duty well done, of a great sacrifice made by them and their families in the cause of the Empire.

These young men have gone forward to give their lives. We are asked to provide a permanent committee of our most prominent citizens to take care of the fund subscribed by the public for their dependents. This committee should be given a corporate existence. I will support the principle of this measure but it is too late to-night to discuss the matter as freely as we would wish. We should like to pay a tribute to these young men. When we go into committee, every member will have an opportunity of paying his tribute of praise to these men and to their families. Let us hope and trust that immense casualties will not visit the troops that we have sent forward. Let us hope that the troubles in Europe will have passed over before our young men will be placed in a position to lose their lives. We know from the reports, that our neighbors in Canada have met with great loss in putting up a fight against the foe which will stand out in history. I am sure that if our men got into the firing line, they too, would put up a fight in the honour of the Empire, that would do credit to their King and Country.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Newfoundland Patriotic Association" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

BANK FISHERMEN'S SAFETY BILL.

Pursuant to order, and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill en-

itled "An Act providing for the safety at sea of Bank Fishermen" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

SAWMILLS BILL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Operation of Saw Mills," with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the Council's amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rise it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday May 19th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 19th, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works (a) what amount is paid annually for fuel and cleaning Conception Hr., Hr. Main and Holy-account of the expenditure of Special road Court Houses. Give a detailed and Main Line grants for Conception Hr. 1909-10, 1910-11.

The Minister of Public Works not being in the House this question was deferred.

MR HALFYARD asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Justice, (a) what fines were collected at Conception Hr. Court House by Magistrate O'Tool's from 1914 to the present. In the case of Mason vs. Whelan, what amount of fine was imposed, and when and how it was collected. Was there a

writ of attachment issued by Magistrate O'Toole and levied against the defendant Whelan, and was the amount of the attachment collected, and if not why not. (b) What amount is paid Magistrate O'Toole of Hr. Main, for travelling expenses. What amount is paid him for special trips to Hr. Main and Holyrood outside his ordinary travelling expenses.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There is no record in the Department of Justice in relation to that case. And I have asked the Department to write the Magistrate for information and will probably have it here not later than Monday, possibly on Friday. The same reply covers the whole question. We have no information but have written for it.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance what duties were collected at the port of Conception Hr. for the year 1913-14. How many fur coats were imported into Conception Hr. and what amount of duties paid thereon. Did the Magistrate of Conception Hr. import a fur coat in 1913-14, if so, how much duty was collected thereon.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I have asked the Assistant Collector to get the information.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is P. J. Fitzgerald, Pickled Fish Inspector and also Surveyor of Dredging. Is he paid for his services as Fishery Inspector \$600, and for Dredge surveying \$1886.25. Does he receive travelling expenses as Pickled Fish Inspector. If so, how much.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That answer is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement, as to the average monthly cost to the country of the Postal Telegraphs news mes-

sage from Halifax, excepting cable and land tolls already covered in the reply to the previous question on this matter. Reply in this instance to cover: (1) any amounts paid to Press Associations or Bureaux for supplying the message for transmission here; (2) Any amount paid for compiling the message before it is put on the wire at Halifax; (3) Any other salaries, or expenses incidental to the preparation of this message.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a list of clubs and other organizations or private persons to whom are being daily supplied copies of the public message, and to ask whether or not these clubs, persons or organizations are paying any amount for this privilege or whether the same is being paid by the Government.

MR. CLAPP asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary why the motor boat plying between Woody Point and Norris Point is not running, and why the old ferry row boat has been re-instated, and if it is the intention of the Government to continue same or not.

In the absence of the Hon. Colonial Secretary these three questions were deferred.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenditure of all public moneys by the Patriotic Association, to date.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is being prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier:—(a) If the Finance Committee of the Patriotic Association has paid all of Captain Timewell's bills since the war began; (b) If Captain Montgomery was paid eight hundred dollars for going across with the Second Contingent; (c) If Captain Paterson was paid four hundred and fifty dollars for crossing with the First Contingent, six hundred dol-

lars for crossing with the second, and will receive six hundred dollars for crossing with the Third Contingent.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That answer is in course of preparation.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs whether any portion of the vote for Customs Inspector voted for 1913-14 and 1914-15 has been expended; if so, to whom paid.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—The answer is being prepared.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works if there is any money allocated for a ferry at Low Point, Bay de Verde District; if so what is the amount paid per annum, and who receives it.

In the absence of the Minister of Public Works this question was deferred.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether kerosene oil for lighthouses has been contracted for for the present year, whether it has been done by tender or private arrangement; if by tender, who tendered? What were their tenders, and whose tenders were accepted. If by private arrangement, with whom was it made, and what was the price agreed upon.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That answer is being prepared.

PACKING COMPANY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act confirming an agreement between the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland American Packing Co. was read a second time and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

BANK FISHERY BILL.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An

Act respecting the Bank Fishery."

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The explanation of this Bill is as follows. In the past a large section of our fishermen prosecuted the Bank Fishery (and indeed are now prosecuting it) and the ships which they use when they go there in the fall of the year are fitted out with nearly all modern appliances for this industry. They are very good vessels most of them being built in Nova Scotia. These vessels contain from seven to ten or eleven dories which are manned by two men each in all from eighteen men to twenty-two or twenty-four. The Bank fishery is a pretty arduous and dangerous one, and there is nothing except the dory carried by these vessels for the safety of the crew such as are carried by foreign vessels. There are no life belts, which according to the British Merchant Shipping Act are carried on all foreign vessels. We have had quite a number of accidents in these vessels. Men have been knocked overboard and otherwise, and there has been nothing nearby to throw them except an oar or a piece of wood. These vessels when the bank fishery terminates take green fish to Halifax and America and other places, and I thought the time would come when some provision should be made to safeguard as far as possible the crews of these vessels without greatly inconveniencing the owners or inconveniencing the space of the ship. As the Bill reads, there are three life-buoys to be kept on deck. Every member knows what a life-buoy is like and is aware of its capabilities of buoyancy. It is thoroughly capable of keeping a man afloat until a vessel comes to his help. At present time our vessels lack this safeguard. Every person on board these boats should be provided with life belts. An act similar to this was brought in force four or five years ago by the American

Government. I do not know if it exists in Canada at this present time, but know they are used there largely. Life belts should be served out for each member of the crew, which he himself looks out for, and keeps it under his pillow, or within reach of his berth, so that at any time he is called he has it at hand. In the olden days the owner supplied a compass for these dories, but I am told at the present time this is not always the case, and I have inserted in this clause a provision to the effect that a compass should be on each dory as before, so that men setting trawls in foggy water can take their course and get back to their vessel again, as owing to compasses sometimes not being supplied men are forced to wait there two or three days. Then there is also a provision for the new Fog Alarm. I shall explain what I mean by the word "approve" here. There are a number of Fog Horns now, the "Jensen" being generally used on the Banks at the present time. There is however, an improved patent on that one which a very good horn and can be heard quite a distance.

Now, in addition to this we might insert a penalty clause which I think would be of considerable use.

I have lately been in communication with a number of Skippers on the West Coast and when I submitted that suggestion to them they agreed that it would be an improvement and might indeed be the means of saving many lives. The Merchant Shipping Act of course is only for foreign going vessels.

As regards other existing conditions on board these ships I think there is no room for improvements. I have much pleasure in submitting this Bill to the House for consideration.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, of course we all sympathize with this Bill but I think before going into Com-

mittee we ought to consider two or three questions. There is one point that strikes me. It says that a Customs Officer shall be satisfied that this Act is carried out in the first instance but there is no provision for its maintenance.

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

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act respecting certain retiring allowances" was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

PROHIBITION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to this Resolution it will be remembered that only a few days ago this subject was before the House in relation to a resolution proposed by the hon. member for Bay de Verde. Mr. Hickman, and on that occasion I gave this House to understand that during this session a resolution would be brought down dealing with this subject and I now beg to submit a series of resolutions which afterwards will be formed in a Bill to enable the electorate of this country to decide the question as to whether we should have prohibition, in relation to the sale, the importation,

and the manufacture of intoxicating liquors. It is not a novel question in this country. For a great many years it has occupied the attention of the whole Colony and on various occasions the attention of this House. The beginning of prohibition to a limited extent was when it found a place in the Statute Book away back in the early seventies in relation to local option which was a prohibition only of sale in specified districts of the country. When that Act was first introduced it was brought into operation by a petition of one-fifth of the electorate, and it required, if I remember rightly, a two-thirds majority in order to become effective. That law has since been altered and to-day many of the districts have local option simply by a bare majority. But it is only fair to say that in a great number of the districts very large majorities have been maintained, and it is now only in St. John's east and west that local option is not in force, and even here in St. John's, in 1909 it will be remembered a vote was taken on this question, which if passed, would practically have meant prohibition for Newfoundland as regards manufacture and sale as well as importation and that vote failed only by a small margin. With the exception of private individuals who would of course have been able to get liquor for their own use, local option in St. John's would practically have meant prohibition throughout the country. On that occasion there were about 7,525 voters, 1,117 of whom voted for local option and 4,547 voted against it, thereby leaving a majority of about 1,490 against local option. That is exactly how it stood in 1909. I mention these facts merely to show that throughout the country there has been growing from year to year a deep sentiment along the lines of prohibition, but it is only recently that cir-

cumstances have resulted in a Committee bringing the matter in a concrete form before the Legislature. Two or three years ago when the Conference of the Methodist Church was meeting here, a resolution was passed asking for a plebiscite and there have been petitions ever since from all over the country signed by a large number of people.

The whole matter comes down to one question which you have to decide, and that question is whether the people shall be allowed the franchise on this question. It may be asked, what there is about this question that distinguishes it from other questions which are settled here in this Legislature; why should a plebiscite be adopted in this case. Well I may say this is a peculiar case, and that is why it was not dealt with when brought before this House the other day. It was not dealt as any other measure. The only answer I can give is that it is an unusual and an extraordinary resolution, and it would be a difficult matter to ascertain the feeling of the public in dealing with this matter. It has been the custom of the Legislature in the past when the question of prohibition has been dealt with usually to refer to the people. It is an interference with the private rights of the people and for that reason the people are allowed to pass upon it.

I know no place that has had prohibition longer than the State of Maine. It is one of the first laws of the State and has become a radical article of the constitution and now indeed in order to have this altered a two-thirds majority of the people is required.

This matter was before the House in 1889 and also in 1889. I remember that in 1888 it was fully discussed in this very room and when the vote was taken it was a tie and the casting vote

was given by the Speaker, Mr. McNeilly. I think it was the next year (or possibly the first year was in 1887 and next year 1888), it came up in the same form as to-day in the form of a proposal for a plebiscite vote, and on that occasion there was a considerable majority against it. Now the question again rises as to whether we are justified in submitting this to the people. In other words is it a wise principle to adopt to send to the country and place before it a question such as this proposed here. The result of this matter may very largely inconvenience a great number of people, are we then justified in taking away a private right from these persons? There is a specially large class in this community who do not abuse liquor, but we must remember that every day citizens have to subscribe to legislation and laws that to a certain extent limit the private rights and liberties of the people. That is our only justification, and it is only because such a strong demand arises that we need now in this way, ascertain what the majority desire.

Now I do not think it is quite fair that it should go abroad that we are passing this piece of legislation because our people are intemperate. I am aware that there is a certain quantity of intoxicating liquors consumed in this country, but the percentage of this country is considerably smaller than that of any other country that I can name. It is only fair to say that the quantity consumed in this country has been going down steadily of late. It is true, however, that there is a large quantity of liquor consumed. I think it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of four dollars worth a head per annum. Anyway this is the outside figure, although Mr. Hickman when introducing his resolution put it up a little higher. For if you take the population to be two hundred and

fifty thousand, I would estimate the outside figure of the liquor Bill would be about one million dollars. I have calculated in various ways putting down first the question of quantity imported, second the duties paid, and thirdly, I have made calculations as to the probable expenses and profits of public houses, and I cannot possibly make it any more than one million, or four dollars per head for the entire population.

And when it is remembered that in Great Britain the consumption is something like \$14.00 per head, one can understand that comparatively there is not a very large amount consumed in Newfoundland. And furthermore, I have often heard it said that notwithstanding the local option practically all over the Island the same quantity of liquor is being consumed. That is not so. The following figures will show: In 1873 about two years after the first Local Option Bill was introduced, we had in Newfoundland in wines and spirits 244,000 gallons, Beer 62,000, wines 14,000 and spirits 167,000, that was 1.51 gallons per head of population. Coming down to 1890, which is the next year in which we had figures, there were 160,000 gallons, making it .78 per head. In 1910 it increased from this 160,000 to 169,000, and as the population had increased during that time the proportion is 68 per head. So that from 1873 down to the present day it has decreased from 1.51 per head to .68. Now how does that compare with other countries. In Belgium it is 2.81 per head of population; in France 2.72; Italy 2.42; West Australia 2.27; Germany 2.90; England 2.50; United States 1.16; Cape Colony .95; New South Wales .90; New Zealand .73; Tasmania .55, and Canada .54. It will be seen by that that we are in a very good position, and that despite a great deal of criticism people should not go away with

the impression that we are not a sober people. The people have asked for this measure. They have asked for a plebiscite upon a measure which is more severe than was ever passed in any country in the world; because here we are not alone preventing the importation or sale, but we propose to prohibit the importation for private individual use. That has never been done in any other country that I am aware of. In the State of Maine today anyone can import any quantity of liquor that he may require for his own use as long as he does not sell. If this bill passes no one will be allowed to import liquor into Newfoundland for any purpose except it be for sacramental purposes or for medicinal purposes. Under the Local Option Law, as now in force for fifty years, we have always permitted a sale in Local Option districts for sacramental and medicinal purposes. I do not know of any settlement that has availed of that provision in the law but they can always do so. In Local Option legislation here we have always preserved the right to sell for these purposes. Now the main resolution here outside of the mere machinery for election is that, if the number of votes polled in the affirmative be a majority of the total votes polled at the election and not less than 40% of the voters on the Electoral List, then the election is carried. In the first place, it will be seen by that that a majority vote has to be obtained, and that majority vote has to be forty per cent. in point of number of electors on the revised list for the election of 1913. In other words as has been certified by the Deputy Colonial Secretary the number of voters for 1913 was 61,471. Forty per cent. of that would be 24,589. Details of that will be found in the Year Book for the various districts, but I have had the Deputy Colonial Secretary take

these figures from the official records and these figures have been furnished me. In the year 1913 there were 49,562 voters who went to the polls and voted out of that 61,000, and of course in addition to that there would be a small per centage who were added on that occasion under the supplementary list of voters, so that when the election takes place in order to carry Prohibition it will be necessary in the first place to have a majority of those who go to the polls to vote, and in addition to that the number in favour of prohibition will have to be forty per cent. of the number on the list. Assuming that it will be carried, a Proclamation will issue that liquor is not to be imported into Newfoundland or manufactured or sold except for the purposes provided in the Act after the first day of January, 1917. That date is fixed in order to give a reasonable amount of time to those who are engaged in the business to dispose of their stocks that they may have on hand, and to undertake some other occupation, and to enable the Government of the day to adjust the financial position of the country, that will be temporarily changed by the passage of the measure. It will be noticed provision is made in this Act that after the passage of the measure spirits may be imported for sacramental purposes and for medicinal purposes. Of course there are people who will point out that we are not justified in permitting the sale after prohibition has been passed for medicinal purposes. In other words that we should leave out this provision on the ground that it is not needed at all. That would be a serious matter for the Legislature to assume; a serious responsibility for us to lay down the principle that no intoxicating liquors should be prescribed by doctors. Some will go so far as to say that if you give the right to doc-

tors and druggists to import liquors for these purposes you will open the door to any amount of smuggling and be simply handing the business into the hands of the druggists. That is an argument that will be used by some. In reply I would say that our experience has been in the outports that druggists have not abused their right or in any way violated the law, and that perhaps while one or two druggists may be found in this country to violate the law there will be dozens who will wish to carry it out in the spirit in which it is enacted. After we have had experience of a year or two if we find that there is any violation being attempted or any effort to break the law it will be an easy matter for this Legislature to restrict the importation in such a way as to make violation impossible. We can in this country, I think, pass a law without having to assume that it will be certainly violated. Here we are with a coast line of thousands of miles, and when this Act becomes law there will be a very large profit to be made in smuggling. There will be a premium upon smuggling because there are plenty of men who would give anything to have it, but these things can be guarded against as they arise from time to time, and none of these arguments are sufficient for us to restrict doctors from prescribing spirits for medicinal purposes and allowing them consequently to import it.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to go through this bill in detail. The time, I think, has passed for the mere discussion of the principle of prohibition. It is not so much a question of whether it would be a good thing for the country. The only question we are concerned with is whether we should allow the people of the country to pass upon the question and see whether they should be

excluded from the sale, manufacture and importation of liquor. That is the only question and I think that any person who will read the bill with a fair mind will come to the conclusion that any less majority of votes would be unsafe in a matter so important as the present. If this measure is to become law; if it is to be effective; if it is to be possible to carry it out, we must have public support given it, and unless we have a reasonable majority; unless we have a great majority in favour of the bill, you will never be able to deal with it, and it will hardly be on the Statute Book when you will be called upon to put down breaches of the most flagrant kind which will call upon the country for very large expenditures. We now undertake to expend about \$20,000 for the purpose of the election, and we should at least provide the necessary machinery that will make the bill effective. There are men in this country who do not believe in prohibition, who believe that a people ought to be made sober by moral persuasion, by example of one kind and another. There are some who require strong restrictions to keep them from temptation. There are others whose argument is that no Legislature should place a restriction upon the individual action of any independent man who does not need such restrictions as these. But for a matter of this kind I think we are justified in taking some risks. It does not mean that those who fight for this measure are abandoning the principle in which they believe, but there is a better way to accomplish this, namely, moral suasion and example. I have always believed and always expressed in this House the opinion that in order to make a sober people there must be education by moral suasion and by example, and that can only be accomplished successfully by taking the

children when young, taking them when they are eight or nine years old, and administering to them the total abstinence pledge, not in a perfunctory way, not in any way that will make them regard it as unimportant, but in the most solemn manner possible and with all the ritual with which you can surround it. Make it a solemn occasion in their lives. Let them believe that they are doing a most important act. Make them believe that liquor is a dangerous thing. Let them take the pledge annually and then the young mind will grow up with a sober notion. Those that know nothing about liquor will never be tempted because all the experience has been that there can be no danger to those who have never tasted it. It is very little use getting after the man who has been accustomed to getting his liquor when he wants it. The man who has been accustomed to take liquor has to make a very much greater effort than those who have never been known to want it. We are told that the use of liquor in moderation is all right, and that the danger is in the abuse of it, and that this abuse of it is causing more misery in the world to-day than all the diseases put together. The passage of this bill need not prevent that other good work from going on. Of one thing rest assured that in the days to come prohibition or no prohibition, the people will come to realise that it is time to discontinue the abuse of this terrible evil and they will grow up a sober people.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself alone I wish to say that my objections to these resolutions are chiefly matters of details which will have to be dealt with when we go into a Committee of the Whole House. Upon the question of principle I take issue with the requirements that forty per cent. of the registered voters are

required to bring this into operation.

The provision is that if the number who vote for this measure is not a majority of the electors, and that the number of electors shall be forty per cent. of the total number of registered voters, then this shall not come into operation. In other words in order to carry this bill the friends of prohibition have to have a majority of those who vote and forty per cent. of the total number of registered voters in the island. So that all those that oppose this measure may stay away from the polls and allow the friends of prohibition to try to stir up 25,000 voters in favour of it. If those that are opposed to it go to the polls it will be necessary that the total vote shall be 49,200 and out of that number 24,600 must vote in favour of it. The total vote at the last general election was 49,000. So that in that case there must be a larger vote polled than at the last general election, so that all those interested in favour of prohibition must struggle so that they can get 200 votes more than were polled that time. While the number of people on the list will probably be somewhat larger than were on the list at the last election there are thousands of men out of the country really off the list, so that really at this election there will not be in the country to vote as many people as at the last election although there are more on the list, so that all those who are away and all the persons who are sick, will by this method be turned into anti-voters. Their absence will help to cut down the total number of those who vote and unless the majority constitute forty per cent. of those who are on the list these resolutions will not go into effect. Or if you take the other method all that will be necessary will be that those that are opposed shall remain at home and allow those who are in favour of it to get 25,000

votes if they can. It appears to me that that is very unfair. It is throwing a burden of work upon those who are in favour of it and allowing those who are against it to remain at home. It is allowing those who are afraid to stand for the strength of their convictions to remain at home. It is forcing the friends of prohibition out into the field. It is covering up those that are against prohibition and driving the friends of it out into the open. It is throwing all the effort upon one side and none on the other. And surely it is a fair proposition that one side should be as active as the other and that mere carelessness, neglect, illness or absence should not be counted against the proposition, and there should be as much interest, as much intelligence and energy and as much fighting on one side as on the other. The very absence of these men will be more detrimental to prohibition workers than their presence because if they are first to go out and fight, the argument to their fight will all help those who are working for prohibition and get their forces into the field because if all that are opposed to the proposition can remain in the back ground then not only in point of numbers but in point of interest it will tell against the workers for prohibition; and the friends of temperance would make a mistake if they did not force this question before the people as they would if those who are opposed to it had to get out and get 25000 votes in the same way as those who are in favour of it have to do.

These resolutions amount to this: If you can get the weight of the country to go to the polls and vote against the liquor traffic, then you can have prohibition and not before. Every person who does not vote for you votes against you. I say this is unfair. It is the same as making it a

rule that no member shall be elected to this House unless he get not only the majority of the electors, but also a certain percentage of the voters registered. As it has been said a Government should not rule unless it has a certain percentage of those who are registered on the lists. That percentage, however, ought not be an excessive one. If it is this it is unconstitutional. Why should the vote for this be on a different scale to everything else. It seems to me to be manifestly unfair to the body of people who will have to see this thing through without the help of either political party. For this reason I shall, when we go into committee move that this section be stricken out and a more moderate clause put in. I shall ask that it be made the majority of those who vote, and not some fixed percentage of the electorate. Let the people vote for or against prohibition, and let the majority win.

There are two or three suggestions I will want to make when we go into committee. In the first place I will move that provision be made for some central authority, responsible to this Legislature to take complete charge of the importation of liquor, and thus make the measure a full one. Doctors and clergymen could get their supplies direct from him, and from no other. It is provided here that doctors may import. Now that may be necessary where there are no druggists but certainly not where there are some. These druggists will of course get their supply from the central authority, who will of course make no profit, but just take charge of the importation. We must remember, and this is the cause of this precaution being necessary, that the demand for this liquor will be greater than formerly, and that we must beware and not turn our druggist shops into saloons.

Now we have provided here this section: "Every medical practitioner, licensed hereunder shall keep a record book of all intoxicating liquors dispensed by him for medicinal purposes, giving the date of such transaction character and amount of liquor dispensed, name and address of patient and name and address of the person to whom the intoxicating liquor was delivered." But this provides no way by which these prescriptions may be checked with the amount imported. We do not provide any way to stop any leakage. You make a method to have books kept, but you appoint no one to have the power to examine these and no one with this authority. Now we should provide that those who trade in this stuff, will have to make monthly or quarterly returns to some person who will check them with the amount imported, and this would also provide a method for the distribution to doctors. A return once a month as I have suggested would make the country certain that its wishes were being carried out to the fullest extent.

If you are going to have a law like this upon your statutes then have a law which will be as good as one can be. It is no good having one that can be violated. Great care must be exercised in this direction.

So, sir there are two things for which I shall press when the House goes into committee on these resolutions; the first that the vote be made a majority vote and nothing more or less; the second that suitable arrangements be made to have this law a most rigid and effectual one.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, just one word in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. He has said that under British law the majority rules, and that it is not correct to limit that majority to a percentage of voters.

My learned friend went on to point out instances to prove his statements. We will look for a minute at what happened in Canada, a country my hon. friend has set up as an example. In 1898 a plebiscite was granted, and the majority voted for prohibition, but the Government of the day did not consider that the vote for it was a sufficient one to govern the whole country, and accordingly did not declare prohibition. Since that time that country has had a change of government, and this government has not thought it advisable to have a change of the present system. This was just what happened. When the vote was taken, 278,000 voted for prohibition, and 264,000 against it. This was out of a population of some 7,000,000 people. My learned friend will agree with me that such a small vote as that should not rule, even though they be the majority of the electorate who go to the polls.

We want this bill to be as thorough as such a bill can be. We want to leave no openings, but have the people face the square issue. As to the matter of a central authority, I shall be glad to accept the suggestion of the hon. member; for while I do not doubt the veracity of either our doctors or druggists, nevertheless I think with him that it would be best to have someone to check the returns as they would be passed in.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt but that by the time we finish with these resolutions we will have a very good bill or at least one which will be a great improvement on the present. With regard to the Prime Minister's reference to Canada, I may say that though it is a Canadian proceeding, yet I do not stand for it. It is only as a warning that I would ask its consideration at this time. In this case the people were granted a plebiscite, but were not told that they

should get a certain percentage of the electorate. They got a majority, but those in charge went back on the original contract and told the temperance people that the majority was not large enough and the matter was dropped. A great many of the inhabitants of the North West took no interest in it, and without knowing it, became anti-temperance voters. This was accounted for largely by the vast extent of country in those regions.

I think it only just and fair that the Government should fix a certain majority before a bill so rigid and important as this should go through, and that they should fix say 25% of the electorate, but 40% is altogether too high, an impossible figure. Why 40% is more votes than put the present Government in power at the last election. You are asking that those in favor of prohibition get more votes than you yourselves got to put you in power for four years. For this reason I will move that the vote be made 25% instead of 40% as here and in this way will meet the Premier half way; 25% will mean 15,000 voters, and at the same time a majority of those who do vote. If the majority want it, and at the same time total 15,000 people, then surely they should get what they want; 15,000 men ought to get their wish. In my opinion 25% is quite a good percentage to get.

MR. COAKER.—Just a remark or two Mr. Chairman, on this subject. I cannot see eye to eye with the Premier in some of the remarks he just made. I believe that 25% is a high percentage to ask for. I think that 20% would be quite high enough. This is a different country from Maine and therefore ought to have different constitutional practice. I think that if prohibition once became law, the change would become so great that the Government would never be ask-

ed to repeal the act. I think that they have made a mistake in quoting so high a percentage, and feel that they will reconsider their decision before these resolutions pass the House; 40% is an impossible vote to get in Newfoundland, and I think that unless the Government is prepared to make it smaller, they may as well withdraw these resolutions. They are asking for 3,000 more votes than they got in the last election, before they will grant prohibition. If Newfoundland does not go into Confederation before she gets 40% of her voters to vote in favor of it, then I am afraid that she will never get that.

As far as a prohibition fight is concerned, we as a union are not going to take an active part. This is a matter that has never come up before us at our conventions, nor has it been spoken of by us. If this measure becomes law, as it is now, Newfoundland will never get prohibition. I hope that this objectionable clause will be cut out. If you made it 30 or even 35% I believe there would be some possible chance for the temperance workers, but at 40% I would call it an impossibility.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, the only point of friction as I can understand it, between the two parties, is the percentage question. I think, however, that the hon. member who opposes this will admit that some restriction is necessary in order that the position taken by Canada may not be followed here.

Considerable has been said this afternoon already, and very well said, on the subject of the percentage vote. The hon. member for Bonavista and myself had that point more or less in dispute between us on the last occasion. At that time I stated that I thought that the ordinary majority which obtains at an ordinary election

ought not in this case be the guide or standard. A great deal has also been said this afternoon and on the last occasion when this petition was before us about the fact that this Government does not stand here with a majority of the electorate behind it; and of course the argument, on the face of it, is a clever one, and without being analysed would commend itself. I have no doubt, to those who think that the idea of putting in a percentage here is bad; but as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, there is no analogy at all between the two cases. There is no similarity, no possible method of comparison between what decides the return of a government or otherwise and what decides prohibition, for this reason, that a Government is not returned or defeated upon the number of votes which it secures but upon the number of representatives that it can bring to this House. Therefore, even, if as a matter of fact, as the hon. member for Bonavista (Mr. Morine) and the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Coaker) have very properly and truly said, from the standpoint of votes, a minority in number of representatives did receive more votes than a majority, (yet whether that is true or not is not a question of debate), but even assuming that it is true, that is a condition that does not at all compare with the present issue. This is a straight issue. It is not a question of a number of representatives who might be elected by a minority vote. If, for argument sake, in an ordinary election, down in the district of Bonavista a huge vote is secured by one side and only three men returned, and in some other district three men from the opposing side are returned with a very small majority, the great majority in Bonavista would not count; but here what is going to be voted up-

on is: Do you think we ought have prohibition. Yes or No? In other words, it is a straight line-up on two sides. There is no fair comparison, I submit, at all, between the two cases, and it is only more or less begging the question to suggest that there is. That is, No. 1. There is likewise no comparison between a plebiscite of this nature and the return of a member to the House of Assembly in this sense, that in the case of the return of a member for the Assembly (and I don't know whether or not it is more important than prohibition) there is an established institution. There is the fact that all that the electors are called upon to decide is as to whether one man will have the place or someone else, but now they are asked to make a great tariff change. Up to the present time the right has been here to manufacture, import and sell liquors in certain parts of the Island and to purchase and use in all parts. The people of the country are now going to be asked to have all that condition changed. It has been said here, and I think truly said, that the Government in its bill has met the situation to an extent greater than the most ardent advocate of temperance could even expect, because the Government has gone to the extent of saying that in no shape or form shall liquor of any kind be imported into, or manufactured in, the Colony except for the two purposes named—medicinal and sacramental; the Government has even gone to the extent of saying that it shall not even be permitted for private use. We were told in advance that when this proposition came up it was going to be a matter of prohibiting the importation for sale, but now the country is going to be asked to prohibit the industry, and no man from the Governor down can obtain liquor for private use.

That being so, and this measure being attended with such far-reaching consequences surely it is only right, and not alone only right but only in line with the duty of the Government, who are bringing in this Bill, and of the House in considering it, that they should say that before such a drastic change can be made there shall be a substantial pronouncement of public opinion; and I am sure that the strongest advocate of prohibition would not attempt to say that if out of 61,000 electors, 25,000 went to the polls, and 13,000 voted for prohibition and 12,000 against it, that prohibition ought to come into force. Why, the very argument of the hon. member for Twillingate is a justification of the position of the Government, when he truly says that it would be a thousand times better not to have prohibition at all than have a condition of things which would be worse than those which exist to-day. And in support of the position which the Government takes, we have right in front of us, right in the community in which we live, the evidence of what is the opinion of those who met together to consider this matter in the interest of prohibition, and who placed upon record a resolution to the effect that in their opinion there ought to be one-third, or 33½ per cent. of the electorate of the Island in favor of prohibition before it should be carried. Now, does not that show that those people who have so much at heart the cause for which they are striving recognize that to have that cause a success it must have public opinion behind it. It is idle for us to discuss here as to whether prohibition is going to carry. As the introducer of the resolutions has said, this is not the time for that, and I am somewhat surprised at the poor opinion of temperance sentiment that the hon. member for Bonavista has. I don't think

that one who is such a recognized advocate of prohibition as he is, will seriously maintain that 40 per cent. will not be secured in the Island; and I don't think that he himself, ardent prohibitionist that he is, would contend that, if that did happen—if it were really a fact (which, as I say, I doubt) that not four people out of ten are looking for prohibition, because that is what it means—that prohibition should carry. This thing put down in plain language means that four people out of very ten have got to support prohibition before it can carry; and surely that is not an unreasonable proportion; surely four out of ten is not a large percentage to ask. We have, as I say the illustration in front of us that those who have given this subject earnest consideration have themselves placed the standard at 33½% and it is only fair to assume that in placing that standard they did so unconsciously with the idea that they were well within the percentage which they thought would be secured. It is only natural to suppose that those who have so well at heart the cause for which they are striving would place a standard that they felt safe about. I would commend to the attention of the hon. member the statements that have been made in public here by those who have been interested in this matter and which are exactly on a line with a statement which I took the liberty of quoting to the House on the last occasion when this matter was before us, namely, the position taken by the Government in the Old Country on this question, when it was said that a matter like this, which contemplated such a radical, such a drastic change, should not be gone into unless public opinion were behind it. I think we can fairly say this, Mr. Chairman, that if we cannot get four out of every ten of the electorate to

vote for a cause like prohibition, that any prohibition which would be put in force would be a farce; if it is a fact, as has been said, that you cannot get that number, then all I have to say in advance is that I think that the putting of the measure on the Statute book at all is only labor lost. If that is really the position, then the advocates of prohibition will only have to continue their good work and educate the public in this matter. I do not think that we are justified in taking the position here today that this country is not four out of ten in favor of prohibition, whatever may be our individual opinions upon it, whether for or against. I think that the hon. member for Bonavista has very commendably and very frankly expressed the spirit in which the Government has met the position when he points out that in this case the Government has come down and put before the country a plain measure which leaves no room to doubt that the Government has come to all who are interested, whether for or against the importation and sale of liquor, and has said: We are going to take a vote, and after the vote has been taken we will decide what we are to do. If that vote, by a majority which amounts to forty per cent. of the electorate, is in favor of prohibition, then on such a date the importation, manufacture and sale of liquor will be stopped in the Colony. No advocate of prohibition could possibly hope for a fuller measure of prohibition to be put before the country. I do not think that it will be the case, as has been suggested here, that you may have a vote of 49,000 and have 25,000 for and 24,000 against, and have prohibition carried by a bare majority of 1,000. If that is going to be the position, if the forty per cent. that will be secured is only going to be a bare majority, even then it seems to

me that the public sentiment is not strong enough. I hope, if prohibition is to be carried, that the majority will be so pronounced as to leave no doubt whatever as to what the people want, because I think that those who have themselves given so much time to the matter will be the first to admit that it will not be possible to carry out successfully any measure of this kind unless public sentiment is strongly behind it. For instance it is proposed here that liquor be admitted in for medicinal purposes. What kind of abuse or misuse of that liberty will be made if the great bulk of the people are not in favor of prohibition; but if public sentiment is strongly in favor of it, no matter what liberties you may allow you will not have any violations of the law. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the proportion or the percentage in this case is not one that can be reasonably objected to. I think that it would be wholly improper to have this measure carried except by making sure that there was a substantial majority in favor of this change. I think finally that this cannot at all be compared with anything in the way of the previous elections which have been referred to on other issues because it must be remembered that this is the first time that this House has had before it a measure as great as this. It is the first time that those who have been so earnestly advocating temperance have had their wishes gratified. For years and years past we have heard the cry of earnest workers in the cause of temperance of the desirability of having machinery so that they might have a chance of testing the feelings of the people; petitions have been coming in here numerous signed by some of the prominent people of the Island, asking for a plebiscite to test the sentiment and find out if the majority of the people wanted prohibition; and

legislature after legislature has been asked for that. To-day, I think it can be truly said, the prayer of these people has been acceded to for the first time in the form of these resolutions. I do feel that there may be differences of opinion amongst us as to whether or not the percentage is high, but in the light of what I have said I think it will be found that it is only a fair proportion to ask, because the success of carrying out a prohibition measure after it is passed is going to depend upon the strength of the sentiment that is behind it, which sentiment we hope to see expressed at the polls.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, occasionally we find that the best friends of temperance say something or do something which other people—I won't say those against it—make use of. We have an illustration of that now in the suggestion that some Church bodies and Temperance bodies suggested 33½ per cent. I think it is probable that somebody amongst those who passed that resolution was told that some such percentage as that would be necessary in order to get the Government to bring these resolutions in, but I am not governed by the opinions of other people in matters of this kind, unless I have a chance of letting these people know what my opinion is, and I fancy that if I had the chance of pointing out to those temperance people the speciousness of the Government's position I would not have very much difficulty in getting them to reverse that resolution. The proposition is fair or unfair upon its merits, despite any opinion given by anybody outside this House. The next point is this: The clever member for St. John's East, who is going far in this House and will soon fill a position for which he is eminently qualified, has thrown out another specious argument this afternoon in his suggestion that because

the English administration recently said, or some newspaper man said for them, that they would not enact drastic liquor legislation in Great Britain at this time without knowing that the body of the people were behind them, that that has some sort of application here. Now, it is a well known fact that in England the liquor interests are so tremendous in their influence, and the drinking habits of the people are so set and so widespread, that they have to deal with different conditions altogether from what we have to deal with in this country, where the liquor interests, outside of the city of St. John's, are of no political importance and have no weight, and where the habits of the people are such that what we decide will be the law will be loyally accepted by the people; and therefore a remark made in England, applying to the conditions there, that may or may not have been statesmanlike, has no application to this country at all. I hope, therefore, that we won't have any further suggestions regarding conditions in England brought out as arguments here. Now, I did not say, as the member for St. John's East seems to think, that there would not be forty per cent. of the vote polled. I was pointing out the unfairness of so handling this matter that the opponents of the measure could stop at home while the friends of it had to do all the work, and I said that it was not fair to impose upon one person a heavier obligation than was imposed upon the other. It is not fair to count the dead and the sick and the absent as opponents of this measure, as you are in this proposition. I said that I was prepared to consider as large a proportion of the total vote as 25 per cent. The member for St. John's East could see no analogy whatever between the principle upon which the Government comes in with a majority

and the principle which would make this law. He pointed out that the Government is a question of representatives, and therefore you may have a majority of representatives but not of the total vote. That is quite true, but the whole people, even the opponents of the party elected, loyally accept the decision. The people know the law of the country, and even those who voted against them, accept it; and therefore the principle which is in force, and which the people accept and act upon, is a good enough principle for this prohibition question. Now, I want to suggest an amendment, in that connection, and I hope the member for St. John's East will give me his hearty support, and that is this: That instead of having prohibition by a total vote of the people, it be prohibition by districts. Let candidates for and against go to the districts; let them have a congress in St. John's; and let the majority of the representatives carry or defeat prohibition. Now, the member for St. John's East wants to follow the analogy of the Government. Well, then, let us put it in that way. Let us put up what the United States call electors to be voted for by the people; let all districts elect as many electors as they have representatives in this House; and then let them meet and see whether we will have prohibition in this country or not. Then we will carry out the analogy of the election of a government; then we will carry out the analogy on which all our laws are made. I am satisfied that the temperance people of this country will be prepared to accept that proposition.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The representatives might represent a minority vote.

MR. MORINE.—That is the principle which put you in office as Premier and forced the present govern-

ment upon the country, so that you ought to be in favor of my proposition. Another false statement which I have heard here this evening and which seems to be accepted by everybody except myself, is that in order to enforce prohibition in this country you have got to have a majority of people in favor of it. I don't believe any such thing. We enforce all sorts of laws in this country and we don't ask whether the people are in favor of them or not. The people obey because it is the law. You make prohibition the law of the country and eight out of every ten will obey it because it is the law, no matter whether they agree with it or not. Once let prohibition be carried and become the law of the land, and there is a large body of law-abiding people in this country who will at once accept it. This is the first time that we have adopted the principle of referendum in this country, and I hope it will be the last time that we will go to the expense of referring a question to the people instead of handling it here, as we do every other question, as a result of conviction. I think, Sir, in conclusion, that we have no right to put burdens upon those who are in favour of this measure. We ought to give them a fair show; and while we may call for a fairly strong and respectable vote by the people, and at the same time a majority of it, we ought not put them in a position where, in order to carry out their wishes, they would have to secure a bigger vote than would be given in a general election.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words on this subject. The voting on such a subject as this, is different from general elections. They cannot be put upon the same basis. That being so I submit that for the successful carrying out of such a measure as this, individual

right and liberty should not be interfered with. That is why I am prepared to support the Government on the 40%.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, in regard to this, I think it impossible to carry a vote of 40%, and in doing that, we consider that you have treated us unfairly. It is not altogether the kind of people that do not believe in prohibition, that won't go to the polls, but those who think it too much trouble to go. The people who go to the polls in favour of prohibition, will not amount to 24,500. It is utterly impossible for us to get that number. Take this matter of prohibition. I have received a thousand letters from supporters lately on this subject, and not a single letter was against prohibition. What is that but public opinion? Do not start out by giving this thing a fatal blow. Do not put a stumbling block in the way of the people. I am sure that this 40% business was not put there by prohibition supporters on that side of the House. I vote that you take it out. Make it 21½%. I do not want it carried without the sanction of public opinion, but it will not be carried at all if there is such a limit as that.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, I intend to say only a few words in reply to the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins. He stated that this resolution contained more than any advocate of temperance ever expected. It does not contain as much as I expected and I don't believe that this question of majority is commendable to those members who are temperance people at heart. I think that a majority vote is the right way to carry prohibition. If a man does not want prohibition let him go to the polls and vote against it. Although I have my opinion, yet I am satisfied for anything reasonable. If we are going to give the temperance people an op-

portunity to have prohibition, we must give it fairly, and put heart and soul into it.

MR. M. J. KENNEDY.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in favour of prohibition. I have been a temperance man all my life; and I am glad that I belong to the Government which gives the people a chance for prohibition. In the remarks made by Mr. Morine, he said that it was hard to expect a vote according to the required majority. Well, I say that the temperance people need not fear that 40%. The temperance people have hitherto said that the Government would not give them a chance to have a say in it. But now the Government of to-day has given them a fair chance, and I am confident that prohibition will come before long if the temperance workers do their share. What is to hinder it when practically the whole Island voted in favour of local option? If they carry one they ought to carry the other. The temperance people ought to be glad to have the opportunity of carrying it with a 40% vote. With regard to doctors having liquors for medicinal purposes, no doctor is going to risk his reputation, by selling it for purposes other than medicinal. Mr. Chairman, I can conscientiously vote in favor of these resolutions.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that a vote of 40% of the electorate should decide this matter. Only those who vote should be considered. I think that the Government is not assisting the temperance people in any way in carrying on their work. At the last general election there were 62,000 voters, and out of those 48,000 voted; 11,000 did not vote. Some of these were out of the country. Now nearly 2,000 of our men have gone away to the war. In other words about 17,000 will not be voting, and defeat is almost assured. The

Government should consider the proposition, and not thus aid the anti prohibitionist.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of entering into this discussion, but I would like to set my hon. friend right in the figures which he just quoted. He should not go uncorrected. At the last election the number of voters was 51,473 out of those 49,562 voted, there being a difference of 11,971 between the registered list and the number of those who voted. That is according to the official records.

MR. GRIMES.—That is a very large number.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Well, that is the number who voted at the election. If every one voted then it would require 50%. I grant that outside of that, 10% vote against; but that 10% represents those who did not vote at the last election.

Mr. Chairman, I have always taken a part in any debate that has come before the House in reference to this question. I look upon it in an impartial manner, and have always been an advocate for prohibition, but I do not think that this is the right place to settle a question of this kind. It ought to be settled outside. No reasonable opposition should be entertained to submitting it to the people. The hon. member for Bonavista claims that this question should be decided by the majority of those that go to the polls. But he must remember that in Canada, where that might have seemed justified there was not sufficient interest taken. That is why it failed there. I think that the Government has demonstrated its sincerity to the people by bringing down this bill. There is no opposition to prohibition in the Government ranks if the people want it, but not to be carried by a small majority of the people. No man wants to advocate anything

that is going to injure the people of this country.

Our present legislation on this subject has not prevented the consumption of liquor in these districts that voted for local option and they now ask that more stringent legislation be introduced to prevent conditions that they voted against. Now, I think that this is a very sad position and that these people are justified in looking for such legislation. There is a strong sentiment abroad in favour of prohibition. At the same time if you have prohibition I think you ought to have public sentiment behind it; you should have a measure that will be backed by the people. I feel sure that those in favour of prohibition will not stand in the back ground. No doubt there will be indifference, but it will be by the people who do not care whether this bill passes or not. Unless you can get forty per cent. of the vote you should not have prohibition. You should not have it unless you have a strong endorsement from the people. That is what this bill means. There is no desire to burke the question or fool the people. It is entirely frank and honest and I claim that the Government have gone further than any other Government upon the question for a number of years. They are not afraid to grapple the issue and they now bring down a measure that should be acceptable in its entirety to the whole community, with perhaps one or two exceptions. I feel sure the temperance people do not want to carry this thing with a small number of voters. I personally believe that the temperance people will have a very large and a far reaching influence working to carry this measure; because every settlement has its clergyman and every clergyman I believe, will be a prohibitionist and will have a large influence on the voters in this matter. On the other hand I

do not see how any opposition can be got up by those of a different opinion. I do not believe you will have any opposition. I believe that generally around the country there will be no opposition in regard to this movement, and the question will be left entirely to the consideration and judgment of the people themselves. Therefore, I believe, if this measure passes you will have a measure that will have the endorsement of the people, or of a majority of them and it will be accepted and carried out.

I was glad that the hon. member for Bonavista this afternoon pointed out one clause of the Bill which probably was its weak point, that was as regards the method of distributing intoxicating liquors for medicinal purposes. We all know and appreciate that if there was not some very strong provision and very careful supervision great and far reaching evils might accrue from that source. I know the thing is bristling with difficulties. The Government have had the matter under consideration on several occasions and while we want the people to have spirits that the doctors may prescribe, we also want some method that will be acceptable to everybody. The difficulty is, of course, how to control this distribution. Perhaps there is something in the contention of my friend that we ought have some central distributing authority, some man who will have a check over the liquor sold so that it will not be diverted into channels that this measure is intended to prevent it from reaching. No man in this House or outside of it wants to have a law on the Statute book that will not be a credit to the Colony and to those who enact it; and to make a law without providing safeguards so that it will be respected and carried out only amounts to a delusion and a snare. The Government do not want

that to happen as regards this measure.

I intend, sir, to vote for this Bill as it is. I believe in submitting the question to the people. I think it is the best move ever made by the temperance people. I think, sir, we are going to settle this question and we will have no more occasion to come here year after year and amend these laws on the Statute Book, and I hope that these improved conditions will exist which the temperance people are so much concerned about. I feel that once this measure is put to the people it will receive very strong support all over the country.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, the Colonial Secretary very properly said that he did not intend to refer to the motives that brought this matter into the House. I think he was wise in that; because we too often have the debates of this House sullied by the imputation of motives that after all have nothing whatever to do with the question at issue. It makes no difference what a man's motives are as far as his argument is concerned; that argument is either strong or weak according to the facts upon which it is based. I am glad to say that on this occasion there is no disposition to talk of that kind. I think that this discussion should be confined to the merits of the measure before us. Now the Colonial Secretary has a touching faith in the friends of prohibition—the Orange Society and the other societies—he did not name the others but referred to them indirectly; he says he is certain they are going to work for prohibition and he has no doubt as to the result of their work; then why did he put this 40% in the Bill. It is put in, Sir, because those opposed to prohibition do not think there is a ghost of a chance of it being carried under this Bill. Now if our friends on the other side of the House have as

much faith as the Colonial Secretary in the outcome of this measure why introduce this Bill at all. Why not introduce a prohibition measure right here now. I for one am prepared to vote for it. It would save all the expense that the election will bring. Now let us get down to the figures, throwing aside the odd numbers. There were 61,000 voters on the Registered List last election. Now at the last election 49,000 voted; forty per cent. of 61,000 is 24,500. Now if the vote is as large as last election, all things considered, the temperance people must get 24,500 in order to have the desired number. The other people have only to stay away to the tune of 24,500 and prohibition is defeated. That is all. Under the terms of this measure all the careless, all the indifferent, all the opponents of prohibition have merely to stay away and say to the temperance people "carry it if you can." There would be no objection in their going because if the temperance people got 24,500 they would carry it. All the opponents of prohibition have to do is to say to the electors, don't worry about prohibition; don't worry about getting your drink, let the other fellows do the worrying. Now it may be fair that you should make people show their anxiety and interest. But why make only one side do so. Why make the people that are voting for prohibition, many of whom have not the slightest personal interest in the matter, who are voting for a theory if you like, voting for morals, voting for righteousness, why make these people work and go to the polls, while the other people, the interested, the careless and the indifferent can stay away? Why put an enactment of that class on the Statute Book? If you are against prohibition you need not vote, you need not show your colours; you need not go to the polls and show how

you intend to vote. If you go to the polls you have to face the hatred, the accusations and the suspicion of those vested interests, and you must do all this if you want to vote for this measure for the betterment of others. Now that is unfair, and it ought not be permitted. It has evidently come to this condition in this country that if you have convictions and believe in temperance you have to show it and work for it and suffer for it; but if you are against it you do not have to put up with any of these penalties; you do not need to do anything and the Legislature will look out for you.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a couple of questions. What is the meaning of this? What do these Resolutions mean that are before us? What are they for? Are they not for the benefit of the country and our fellow-creatures, and for the benefit of those unfortunate people that cannot help themselves. It seems to me that it does not make very much difference what kind of laws you want to carry out in this country they will be brought into the House of Assembly and passed but when you come to a temperance law we must talk and have a lot of agitation in regard to the matter. Now if I understand this matter right and if I understand the temperance teaching the desire is to make our fellows better. It is to try and do some good for our brothers, our mothers, our sisters and our children, and it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to try and do all we can to help those who cannot help themselves. To my mind this about the greatest resolution ever brought into the House of Assembly is correct. It seems to me we cannot have anything much better than that. We could settle the whole thing here now, but it appears we must spend a whole lot of money before we can get anything definite

about it. It seems we must spend \$25,000 before we can carry it through. I wonder why the Government do not bring the matter before the House at once and see if the members would pass it or not. It seems they mean to spend \$25,000 before we can have this thing settled and the Government is not even satisfied with that part of it but they want to have a 49% vote. Now nearly every kind of a law, whether in societies or the House of Assembly, or in church matters, and in fact everything I have ever been connected with, has been decided by a majority vote. If a thing is carried in this House it is done by a majority. The majority is the Government; and it does not matter very much what we want if they vote against it we do not carry it.

It seems this thing cannot be carried unless it gets 49%. I am not in favour of that, and if it is to go before the country in the same way as every other thing is voted upon. That is my idea of it. I believe the majority vote should carry it. As I said before, this is about the greatest bill ever brought into this House to help the men, women and children of this country, and I think we should do all we can to put this measure through, and yet we are making it necessary to spend this sum of money and get this 49% before this can be done. I do not think it is anything like fair to those who are working for temperance. I do not think it is fair to the mothers of this country who are suffering through this evil. I do not think it is fair to the children who cannot get an education, because their fathers spend their earnings in liquor and the poor children have to suffer. I do not think it fair to the wives of this country and the fathers and sisters who suffer so much through this curse of liquor. I think if we were anxious to help these peo-

ple we could vote on it now and put it through quickly. I think those who sympathize with these suffering ones, and who have any interest in temperance would be satisfied to see a majority vote go through.

It being now half past six the chairman left the chair until eight o'clock.

HON. MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, before this resolution goes through I wish to place myself on record as being entirely in favour of it as it now stands. It will be remembered that when this matter was brought before the House some two or three weeks ago by the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman, I opposed the then resolution on the ground that there was no mandate from the people of this country to warrant the Legislature taking such a drastic step as the enactment of a measure to prohibit the importation of intoxicating liquors into this Colony. I stated that on that occasion that we had no authority from the people for taking such a step, and I am still of the opinion that it would have been a very high-handed proceeding on our part had we agreed to the terms of that resolution. It may not be out of place to remind this House that in the Resolution now under discussion we are going a very long way in the direction of temperance reform, for as far as I can understand no country in the world has prevented an individual from importing intoxicating liquors for his own use. The passage of this measure will mark the creation of a precedent in the way of legislation. Although I am in favour of this measure and intend to vote for it, I deny that there is any real necessity in this country for the adoption of such extreme legislation, for I believe that it would be difficult to get a more sober and law-abiding people than those who inhabit this country. Particularly is this the

case in the Outports, for no matter what time of year one may visit them, a person under the influence of drink is rarely met with. We carry out our pledge in a willing manner to provide machinery to allow the people to pass on this momentous question. The prohibition of the importation of liquor unquestionably affects the liberty of the individual and is far-reaching in its consequences in affecting the revenues of the Colony. Whether we are acting in a wise manner or not at this juncture when business is so depressed owing to the war, remains to be seen but whatever shortage in the revenue will result from the non-importation of liquors must be made up in some other manner, and the people must be prepared to supply the shortage. It must not be imagined for one moment that the prohibition law will be carried out in its entirety, for our coast line is so vast that some liquors will find their way in, and it is possible that a large amount of money will be required for looking after smugglers.

I am in accord with the Resolution which provides that in order to carry prohibition a vote of forty per cent. of the registered List of Electors taken in 1913, must be obtained. This percentage is provided for the purpose of ascertaining the sentiment of the country. It would be manifestly unfair to say that a majority of the voters should carry prohibition for it might happen that a very small percentage of the electorate would go to the polls and in such a case a few people would determine whether every individual should be prevented from importing a bottle of wine into the country. Under this Bill it will take about twenty-five thousand votes to pass a prohibition law, and those in favour of the movement should have no difficulty in procuring that number.

People will be very much surprised

if this measure does not carry at the polls but it would be unfair to put a measure like this and allow it to be carried without a fair majority. This is a very serious thing to do. If it were simply a question of the prohibition of the importation of liquor for sale it would be a different matter but when it comes down to seriously interfering with the rights of individuals then it is only fair and reasonable that the people of the country should be consulted and the sentiment of the country at large should be ascertained before such a measure is passed. If there is any amendment required in connection with the establishment of a central depot and if it is found that it would be advantageous to have this centre rather than place it in the hands of doctors and druggists I am quite prepared to accept any amendment in a reasonable way.

MR MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, the Premier has privately intimated to me that he would be prepared to accept an amendment looking to the appointment of a central authority for the importation and distribution of liquor and I have suggested to him that before these resolutions go through it would be the proper place to put in an amendment living up to that suggestion and I beg now to propose this amendment:

Resolved—Upon the issue of the Proclamation last mentioned the Governor in Council shall appoint a controller of the importation distribution and sale of Intoxicating Liquors permitted hereunder and shall make rules and regulations for the performance of his duties and prescribe such fees as to the issue of licenses as may be sufficient to cover the salary of the controller, and the expenses incident to his office, which after publication in the Royal Gazette shall have the force and effect of law as fully as if enacted herein.

The Controller shall annually make a report to the Governor in Council to be laid upon the tables of both houses of the Legislature at the session thereof. Such report shall be in such form and shall contain such particulars as may be prescribed in the rules and regulations made by the Governor in Council under the next preceding section.

If that resolution is adopted it will, I think, cover the point which I have raised. I beg to move the adoption of that amendment.

(On the amendment being put it was carried.)

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this matter. In the first place, I would like to say that I am wholly and solely in favour of the prohibition of the sale and importation and manufacture of this gigantic evil that saps the life of thousands of people all over the world. There are many evils in the world. But liquor is by far the worst and most far reaching in its effects. If it were not an evil it would not be restricted. If it is an evil, then it should not be licensed. We should absolutely prohibit its use anywhere. There are some people who say that such a law cannot be enforced. I say it can be enforced as well as any other law. We do not license murder or theft. Some people maintain the idea that such restriction is an interference with British freedom. Such people are entirely wrong. We prohibit stealing, murder and other offences. We are not allowed to catch trout out of season. There are always restrictions of some kind or another in every phase of life that cannot be looked upon as unwarranted restrictions on our individual freedom. They are necessary. We have a law already on our Statute Book in regard to this very matter. We make liquor sellers close shop at six o'clock. But there is no one in this House or out-

side of it that can put up a good case to justify licensing. Some say that the liquor traffic is necessary. They say it is necessary to the revenue. To these people I say "never mind the revenue." That is a matter that is bound to adjust itself. The good that will be done by the abolition of this gigantic evil will more than offset the loss in direct revenue from this source. Strong drink cannot but have an evil influence. It weakens the will, distracts the mind and undermines the health. The greatest minds in the world have been overcome by it. There is an overwhelming weight of medical testimony against its use. It has wrecked the most educated of families and interfered with the conduct of every business. The case against strong drink is indisputable. Whoever got any good from its use? What man ever rose under its influence? The history of strong drink is written in blood. War cannot equal its ravages. It works more death and destruction than any other disease. No one can say a good word in its favour. It is the cause of more crime than can be imagined and when people cannot so control themselves as to keep away from their worst enemy, then the law should step in and protect them and make them sober.

Before concluding I would like to ask a few questions. Does it pay to have a hundred homes closed, ruined and turned into veritable hells so that we may support this evil? Does it pay to have 50 women and children turned out of doors so that their husbands may become sodden with drink? Does it pay to tolerate an evil traffic that does nothing more than create crime and disease? We know that it does not. We know it without argument and we can prove it by figures. Look at the State of Kansas. For thirty years they have had prohibition. In 70 out of 105 counties there are no insane. In 38 counties there are no

poor houses. In some counties they have not had a serious crime for ten years. Last year they had \$200,000,000 in the banks. Farmers own \$225,000,000 worth of property. In one year \$45,000,000 was added to taxable property. Only 2% of rented property is held there. The mortality rate has dropped from 17 to 7 per thousand. Does it pay that State? Persons who question have only to look at those wonderful figures.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the next resolution I suggest that it be split into two. On the top of page four the definition of the term "Intoxicating Liquors" should be a separate section as it applies to the whole of the resolutions. I notice a little bit of confusion in mixing up the sale and manufacture and the sale and importation and I think it would make for clearness if we dealt with importation, sale and manufacture in separate sections. In the first part of that section I suggest the following, "From the day named in the proclamation issued in the next preceding section provided no person except the Comptrollers shall import intoxicating liquors into this Colony." That deals with the importation itself and we can deal with the sale and manufacture in a succeeding one. It would be better if these resolutions were numbered for the sake of reference. Then we want a penalty clause attached to that. It ought to vary from a small to a large amount so that the convicting magistrate will have a large discretion, say \$10.00 to \$1,000.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, just one word in regard to this matter. There are a number of questions which arise in regard to this matter that need consideration. Take the question of druggists. If a doctor prescribes spirits for medicinal purposes according to the amendment as I read it he would have to go to the comptroller to get the liquor. Every time

he wanted to fill a prescription he would have to go to the comptroller. The same would apply to the clergymen, as they would not be allowed to keep in their possession wines for sacramental purposes. I do not think that that ought to be necessary for druggists and clergyman.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Is it your suggestion that a department be made consisting of a controller who would import all intoxicating liquors and that he would sell it in turn to druggists and doctors? The original bill provides that druggists and doctors should be permitted to import for medicinal purposes direct. I agree with you that it would be too open and too broad if every doctor and druggist were allowed to import separately for himself. I think your proposal to have a central authority to supply all these would be better, and will make provision for that.

MR. MORINE.—There are also changes to be made in this clause. In my opinion provision ought be made for examination of these books. Say once a month. Adopt the suggestion of the Premier and say "under a penalty not exceeding \$500. (As to the clause prohibiting manufacture.)"

MR. MORINE.—Make a separate clause applying to the sale of spirits. Have this clause for manufacturing only.

MR. GRIMES.—I would ask the Premier why the fines are being made so small.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In case of very small breaches of the act. We are leaving it to the discretion of the Magistrate.

MR. GRIMES.—A fine of \$10 is not very large. No one would mind that.

MR. MORINE.—It is left entirely to the discretion of the Magistrate. He will fine according to the seriousness of the offence. This will permit him to deal with any case before him in a

free manner. Fine according to the case, be it small or large.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—It appears to me that the object of permitting the importation of liquors for medicinal purpose is so that the people all over the Island may have an opportunity of getting wines and liquors for that purpose. Now we are providing a system whereby we appoint a controller and he issues licenses to Magistrates, or Doctors or Druggists all over the country. Now these people will be under a very great responsibility. In the first place we compel them to keep a record book of liquors dispensed and lay down penalties, slight or heavy, for any breaches of the regulations; but we cannot form any idea whether the doctors or druggists all over the Island will accept licenses; you have no machinery in the Bill which provides that men will be able to get liquors for medicinal purposes, because neither doctors nor druggists are compelled to keep liquors. There may be no doctor or druggist in a settlement. In a good many places the doctor is the druggist. He might say he did not intend to keep liquor, that he was not going to assume the responsibility the Act calls for and may refuse to accept a license. That defeats the clause which purports to provide liquor for medicinal purposes. I submit that position for members. There may be some means devised to get over this difficulty.

MR. MORINE.—I think if doctors decline to give prescriptions for liquor for medicinal purpose it will be because he thinks it is not necessary. If you allow anybody else to issue such prescriptions everybody will be getting sick. You may be sure if a doctor thinks it is necessary for medicinal purposes he will keep it; he can command his own price for it; but if he does not think it necessary he will not supply it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The position I take is that we have no means of compelling anybody to accept a license. This may lead to a very serious situation, wherein people who need liquor for medicinal purposes may not be able to obtain it.

MR. HALFYARD.—I suppose there is nothing in the Act at the present time that compels any doctor to take a license; but if a doctor needs it in his practice and needs it to cure his patients, I daresay he will keep liquor in the same way as he keeps drugs now.

MR. KENT.—There is one matter which should be borne in mind in connection with this sale of liquor for medicinal purposes. Take this country in winter. There are a number of settlements which from one end of the winter to another do not see a doctor. There is a great body of medical opinion which considers the use of alcoholic liquors as necessary in medical practice. Now in settlements where there is no doctor or druggist the people are prevented from obtaining liquors for medicinal purposes. I think it would be well to consider under what conditions people living in such settlements would be able to obtain liquor for medicinal purposes.

MR. MORINE.—I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition prepare an amendment which can be put in the Bill at a later date.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The election under this Act is not going to take place until next November. The Legislature will be meeting again before the Act goes into operation, and if any amendment is needed in the meantime it can be made. This is merely an outline so that the public who are going to vote on the Bill may be fully aware how it is going to be worked out. After all there are only two main points in the Bill; first that an election will be held; and secondly that prohibition will come into opera-

tion on a particular day if sufficient votes are cast in the affirmative. The Legislature will meet again before that day and any necessary amendments will be made. It was thought desirable to put as much as possible in the present bill, so that the public who have to vote on it would be informed of details.

In reference to the fees to be paid they will be as follows:—Returning Officer, \$25.00; Election Clerk \$20.00; Deputy Returning Officer, \$7.50; Poll Clerk, \$5.00; Booth Hire, \$5.00. These reductions have been made as the work will not be difficult and they will reduce the cost of the election considerably.

MR. COAKER.—I beg to propose an amendment that instead of the words "forty per cent." the words "thirty-three and one third per cent." be inserted.

MR. GRIMES.—I beg to second the amendment.

The amendment was lost.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I would like to suggest a slight alteration in clause 18.

MR. MORINE.—I would suggest to the Premier that when the Bill founded on these Resolutions is brought down it would be wise to have a special clause in it providing that manufacturers may obtain liquors necessary for manufacturing purposes from the controller.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is provided for in Section 25.

MR. MORINE.—That section says: "It shall be lawful for him to have in his possession, &c.": but there is no provision where he is to get it. There should be a clause providing that the manufacturer is to get it from the controller.

I would like to make another suggestion with reference to that clause on page 5 providing that druggists, &c. shall keep a record. You will

notice the fine is for giving liquor. There is no penalty for a failure to supply the record called for under the Act. I think also there should be a provision to the effect that the controller make an annual report to the Legislature of the work under his control.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred had passed the Resolutions with some amendments, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors" was read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

GRAND BANK WATER CO. BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the providing of a water supply for the town of Grand Bank.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, these resolutions have been founded on a report made by the Government Engineer in relation to providing a water supply for Grand Bank, in the District of Burin. I propose to table the report of the Government Engineer, so that before the matter is passed by the House every member of the committee may have an opportunity of reading Mr. Hall's report. The substance of the report is that having visited Grand Bank and having made a very thorough examination of the water supply there he has reported in favor of providing a water supply for that town, and he

has made an estimate of the cost which is somewhere in the vicinity of \$35,000. Now the people of Grand Bank have asked that this Legislation be enacted, and these Resolutions are founded on the existing legislation dealing with Placentia, Carbonar, Harbor Grace and other towns in this Colony that at present have a water supply. In the case of Placentia, the original stock there was, I think, \$8,000 and it is now \$16,000. The Government guarantee has always been met and they have always paid the interest. In the case of Carbonar the capital stock amounts to \$40,000 and in the case of Harbor Grace to \$76,000. Now the Government Engineer estimates that the cost of this undertaking will be \$36,000; but in order that there may be sufficient we are going to ask in the Bill for \$40,000. In addition to the ordinary manner of meeting this the people of Grand Bank are satisfied that a tax on coal going into Grand Bank be inserted in this Bill in order that they may be able to meet the interest on the guarantee.

Now by the first section of the Bill you will notice that the people to be incorporated are George A. Buffett, George R. Forsey, George Bell, Samuel Harris, John B. Patten, William Forsey, Simeon Tibbo, Thomas Foote, Allan MacDonald, M.D.; Aaron F. Buffett, George C. Harris, Samuel Percy, John H. Forsey, Lionel B. Clarke, Robert Dunford, William Wood, George Dunford, John B. Foote and Thomas Stoodley.

These names that I have read will be a sufficient guarantee to this House that the directorate of this Company will consist of such men as to ensure success. I hope that other important places in the Colony may be able to avail of a similar guarantee. This question of water supply is an important one. A great many of the

settlements are so small that it would be impossible for them to have a water supply. The whole question will have to be taken up in relation to wells before long. In many of the settlements the water is not conducive to the health of the people. There should be an arrangement that will prevent impurities of any character from going into the wells. The water should be tested and then a concrete wall and a cover on top should be put there. In many places everyone that comes for water rinses his bucket into the well, and foreign matters are thrown into them. Some comprehensive scheme will have to be thought out and some system adopted to keep the water pure and from freezing in winter.

The sections on this bill are based on the Placentia Water Company's Act. I will draw the attentions of the committee to any alteration.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman of the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Grand Bank Water Company," was read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a personal explanation before this House in reference to what some newspapers have been saying, namely that I am compensated by the Harmsworth Company for protecting their interests in opposing the resolutions in relation to the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Ltd.. I wish to say that I receive nothing from the Company for my work here. I have no interest in any way in the matter.

PATRIOTIC ASSOCIATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Newfoundland Patriotic Association."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

CUSTOMS BILL AMENDMENT.

(Council's amendments to Customs Bill.)

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I do not see any reason why we should not pass that bill. Wharfage has always been charged and we did not dispute it.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I do not raise any objection to the matter itself. But it introduces confusion in to our law.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I think it quite reasonable that this should find a place in our Customs Act.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, in regard to this amendment, I might ask the Government if they are prepared to go on record as taxing flour two cents a barrel more. I fail to see why the Government should insert this amendment at all. You are simply accommodating the men in the Upper House. I know better than some of the members of this House why that amendment was put there. Why should we protect them?

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the amendment made by the Legislative

Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend the Customs Act, 1898" was read a second time, and concurred in; and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendment without amendment.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works (a) What amount is paid annually for fuel and cleaning Conception Harbor Hr. Main and Holyrood Court Houses. Give a detailed account of expenditure of same; (b) Give a detailed account of Expenditure of Special and Main Line Grants for Conception Hr. 1909-10 and 1910-11.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

—That answer will be tabled to-morrow.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of Newfoundland Savings Bank for year 1914.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend and continue for a further period the Act 5 George V., Sess. 1, entitled "An Act Respecting a Volunteer Force in the Colony."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow Thursday, May 20th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 20th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. WALSH.—I beg leave to present a petition from 180 inhabitants

of South East and North East Arms of Placentia, asking that the boundaries there for net fishery be extended. I have personal knowledge that last year there were over 40 nets spread over the present area, and this great number meant that they were considerably crowded. As the salmon caught here average in value about \$4,000 it is my belief, sir, that it should be encouraged as much as possible. To have these limits changed would not affect anglers at all, but would be the means of giving the residents an opportunity to catch lots of salmon at the proper season, rather than catch lots at a time when half of them would only be good for fertilizer. Then better results could be had when the spawning commences.

I hope that the Government will consider this matter and decide to grant the request of this petition. I would assure them that the cause is a deserving one, and I have no doubt but that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give it a suitable recommendation when the time comes. I ask that it be referred to his department.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—I have pleasure in supporting this petition, and I might say that some three or four years ago I presented the same petition. That petition was referred by the Minister of Marine to the Fishery Board, and they refused to endorse it. The people have put up with it thus long but now are asking for this reasonable alteration. I would endorse all that has been said by the introducer of this petition, and would express the hope that it will be favorably considered by the Government.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—I have much pleasure in supporting this petition. The people presented a similar one through my colleague Mr. Morris some years ago. There is a great deal of

feeling over this matter there, especially in the arms interested, and the people are demanding their request. I would strongly urge upon the Government that this request be acceded to, and that these boundaries be extended as the people ask.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am sure that when this matter comes before the Government, every consideration will be given to it.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I remember this petition being presented some years ago by Mr. Devereaux, the hon. member for Placentia, and it was referred to the Board of Fisheries. That Board sent Mr. Croke to examine into the conditions, and their decision was the result of his report.

The first thing to be done when this petition comes before the Board will be to have another investigation, and if the investigation approves of the widening then it will be done. I would say that personally, I endorse what my friend, Mr. Walsh has said, and hope that the request of the inhabitants of this portion of his district will be granted by the Board in charge of this work.

MR. KENT.—I would like to repeat, that there is considerable feeling at Placentia about this matter. I would strongly urge that a thorough general investigation be held, and that this matter be adjusted to the satisfaction of all concerned.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

Dr. Lloyd gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement shewing the names and ages of the Old Age Pensioners residing at Collier's, in the District of Harbor Main.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In answer to the hon. member I may say that this matter is in the Depart-

ment of Finance and Customs. All Old Age pensions are paid in that Department.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amount of money sent to Collier's, Harbor Main District, during the years 1913 and 1914, on account of Main Line, Local and Special Grants, and the copies of all returns for same, wherever returns have been received by the Department.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—That statement is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House copies of the returns for Poor Relief in the District of Fogo, for the quarter ending March 31st, 1915.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to lay on the table the information asked for. This is an original document, and I would ask that it be carefully looked after.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Rt. Hon. Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the number of sheep, bulls, and pigs; the prices paid for each; and all vouchers for same; bought from Messrs. LeMoine Bros., of Sydney, during the years 1912 and 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is being prepared. I hope to be able to table it here next day.

PATRIOTIC ASSOCIATION BILL.

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

SAWMILLS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Legislative Council's amendments to the Saw Mills Act.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that early in the session an amendment was introduced in relation to the Saw Mills Act, and the amendments which the Council has made I shall be glad to explain. There is, in the first place, an amendment proposed by adding the following words to section 1: "But any person actually engaged in the construction of any boat or vessel may be permitted to have such quantity of lumber as may be bona fide required for such actual construction sawn or manufactured in a saw mill and such sawing or manufacture shall not be a violation of the provisions of this Act." In section 2 it is proposed to strike out the words "one year" and substitute "eighteen months." When the Act went up from here the section read "twelve months." Then it is proposed to add as a new section 1: "Section 1 of Act 4, George 5, Cap. 17, entitled 'An Act respecting the Operation of Saw Mills' is hereby amended by the addition of the following sub-section: (h) The quantity of timber which a licensee under this section shall be permitted to manufacture in staves or heading for making barrels for fishery requirements or for the making of shingles, lobster laths or lobster boxes shall not exceed a total of 50,000 feet board measure in any one year." It will be remembered that in this section there are a number of sub-sections defining the various conditions that are to form part of

license. Now, it is proposed to add this additional one. It seems that this will be a reasonable limitation for this class of mill. Then section 2 is amended by striking out the words "On what is known as the three mile limit," so that the license will only apply in the future to places outside that area. Then this is added as a new section 3: "Section 3 of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the words "2,000 herring barrel staves shall equal 1,000 feet board measure" and substituting therefor the following: "2,000 barrel staves shall equal 1,000 feet board measure." The only change there is leaving out the word "herring," and making it "barrel staves" instead of "herring barrel staves." Herring barrel staves was used as the standard in last year's Act, and there appears to be some doubt as to what is a herring barrel stave.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the amendments without amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the amendments being read a second time and concurred in, it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that this House had passed the amendments without amendment.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION AGREEMENT RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions, in relation to an agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in relation to the resolution which we were discussing the last time we were in Committee, I have had this section redrafted, and I think everything of any importance that was suggested by my learned friend, Dr. Lloyd, the hon. member for Trinity, has been inserted, except that this afternoon he has drawn my attention to the fourth last line, and suggested that the words "on their said property" be stricken out, as being words of limitation, and I agree to that. Then, in relation to the resolution on page 5, the second last on the page, I want to move the reconsideration of that and still further reduce it from 25 miles to 20 miles.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Resolutions with some amendments.

On motion this report was received.

On the motion for the adoption of the report, Mr. Kent moved and Mr. Clift seconded the following amendments:

1. That Resolution 2 be amended so to read as follows:

Resolved—All construction material and machinery for the Company's mills, factories and works for the purpose of manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, and other fertilizers, carbide of Calcium, cement and their by-products both for original installation and further extension, but not in substitution for old, imported into this Colony within twenty years of the enactment hereof, shall be admitted free of Customs duties.

2. That Resolution 3 be amended so as to read as follows:

Resolved—All lands, waters, water powers, buildings, erections and all

property whatsoever of the company for use in connection with the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, and other fertilizers, carbide of calcium, cement, or their by-products situate at Bay of Islands, or within the drainage area of the Humber, or within the drainage area of Corner Brook, or within a radius of ten miles from the mouth of Corner Brook, or at Labrador, shall be exempt from Municipal taxation during twenty years from the enactment hereof. Section 6 of the agreement in the Schedule hereto shall be held to include only such lands, waters, water powers, buildings, erections and property as are for use in connection with the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, or other fertilizers calcium carbide, cement, or their by-products situate as last mentioned.

3. That resolution 4 be amended so as to read as follows:

Resolved—That stock, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages and other securities of the Company shall be exempt from taxation during twenty years from the enactment thereof.

4. That resolution 5 be amended so as to read as follows:

Resolved—All phosphate rock, pyrites electrodes, soda, and bags and packages for distribution of the Company's products required by the Company for the purpose of the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement or their by-products imported into this Colony within twenty years of the enactment hereof shall be free of Customs Duties.

5. That resolution 6 be amended so as to read as follows:

Resolved—All coal required by the company for the purposes in the next preceding resolution mentioned im-

ported into Labrador within twenty years of the enactment hereof shall be free of Customs duties.

6. That resolution 4 be amended so as to read as follows:

Resolved—That exemption from taxation upon the stocks, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages and other securities of the Company shall include only such stocks, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages or other securities as are bona fide required for the purpose of or relate to or are derived from the works, business or operations of the Company in relation to the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia and other fertilizers, carbide of calcium cement, and their by-products.

7. That resolution 11 be amended so as to read as follows:

Resolved—The expenditure by the company of the sum of five million dollars, provided in section 13, in and about the business and operations of the company, shall mean an expenditure at Bay of Islands and or within the drainage area of the Humber; and or within a radius of ten miles of the mouth of Corner Brook, in and about the construction of dams, buildings, docks, and transmission lines for the business and operations of the company in and about the manufacture of phosphate of ammonia, nitrate of ammonia, or other fertilizers, calcium carbide, cement or their by-products; and the failure to begin actual construction work or to expend such money within the times mentioned shall absolutely prevent the company from taking or holding any rights whatever under any section of the indenture of the Schedule hereto, and the indenture, the demise under Section 1 thereof, and the grant under Section 1 thereof, shall be wholly void ab initio.

The word "begin" in the said sec-

tion shall mean the expenditure in construction of not less than one hundred thousand dollars within two years from the enactment hereof; and not less than five hundred thousand dollars shall be expended in the work of construction each year for two years thereafter.

8. That resolution 16 be amended so as to read as follows:

Resolved—The right of all persons to drive their logs or timber down any stream, river or other body of water, as by law or custom established, shall not be interfered with lessened or restricted by anything herein or in the Schedule hereto or in any lease or grant hereunder; and if any dam, weir or other structure be erected or built in connection with development work by the company, with the object, intention or effect of damming the water or impeding the flow thereof, full and proper provision shall be made by the company for the safe and convenient passage of logs and timber over and through the same.

The company shall not destroy or obstruct the passing to and fro in boats of any river, stream, pond or body of water; but shall furnish such locks, canals, passages and other means as may be necessary for the proper and safe surmounting or passing of any dams, weirs or other work made or erected by the company.

9. That the following additional amendments be adopted:

Resolved—Durable and efficient log sluices, and fish ways for the free passage of fish at all times and seasons, shall be constructed by the company in or about all dams to the satisfaction of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Resolved—Not later than the first day of January, 1917, the company shall pay over to the Minister of Finance the sum of one million dollars, which shall be held in trust as secur-

ity for the payment and compensation of all judgments and awards by arbitration against the company hereunder, made within six years from the enactment hereof, and the amount of any such judgment or award not paid by the company within one month from the date thereof shall be paid out of the said fund. The balance of such fund together with interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per centum per annum computed annually, shall be repaid to the company at the end of seven years from the enactment hereof. Upon failure on the part of the company to comply with the provisions of this section, the said agreement and all rights, leases and grants thereunder shall cease and determine and become void.

Resolved—Nothing contained herein, or in the schedule of this Act, shall take from the public or any member thereof, any right now existing by law or custom to fish, shoot, hunt, and trap, or of navigating streams, rivers and lakes, and to maintain thereon, for use in such navigation, any kind of vessel or boat.

Resolved—There shall be reserved to the Government of the Colony a right of way through the areas hereby demised for roads, railways, telegraphs and telephone lines, except overlands covered by buildings.

Resolved—It shall not be lawful for the company to enter on or take any land under the provisions of section 10 of the schedule hereof except within a period of five years from the enactment hereof.

Resolved—The company shall develop and utilize the water powers hereby demised by the construction of necessary works and the installation of suitable and necessary plant and machinery for the production of some form of power to the extent which such powers are reasonably capable of physically, and shall use

the power so developed in the operation of machinery or some other commercial, mechanical or industrial purpose, or if the said power so developed or any part thereof shall not be required for such purpose or purposes by the company it shall furnish power to any person, company, or corporation requiring the same up to the amount of power which the said water powers are reasonably capable of developing, or such lesser quantity as shall be actually required or in demand. Upon report being made by the Government Engineer to the Governor in Council that the water powers aforesaid have not been developed and utilized to the full extent of which they are physically capable by the works constructed or the plant and machinery installed by the company, and that there is a bona fide demand for power in excess of the quantity of power developed and utilized by the said company which might in whole or in part be supplied from the water powers aforesaid then the Governor in Council may by Order in Council require the said company to develop and render available for use the additional quantity of power so shown to be undeveloped and capable of development or any part thereof, by the construction of the necessary works and the installation of suitable and necessary plant and machinery within a period of time to be named in the said order, and in default of compliance with the said requirement the Governor in Council may order and direct that the lease and grants hereunder or any of them shall be forfeited and cancelled and the same shall be forfeited and cancelled accordingly.

Resolved—Notwithstanding anything contained in the indenture appended, the company shall have no right of renewal of this demise when the term expires at the end of 39 years from these presents

Resolved—Except as hereinafter provided no adult male person shall be employed by the company at a lower rate of pay than twenty cents per hour; Provided that this shall not apply to persons who are given board and lodging by the company while in its employ

Resolved—The provisions of section 4 of the agreement forming the schedule hereto which provides that "notwithstanding anything contained in Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes (second series) entitled 'Of Patents' such letters patent shall be valid and continue for and during the period of twenty-one years from the date of the original patents" shall be held and construed to include in the provisions of Section 12 of the said chapter, but all the other provisions thereof shall fully apply to the said patents and each of them. Nothing in section 4 of the said agreement shall be held or construed to prejudice or affect the rights or interest of third parties.

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared for the amendments, Messrs. Kent, Clift, Lloyd, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman, Grimes, Abbott, Winsor, Targett, Stone, Halfyard, Coaker, (13); and against it Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, LeFeuvre, Currie, Higgins, Geo. Kennedy (17); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion was put, and there appeared for the adoption of the report, Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moulton, Parsons, LeFeuvre, Currie, Hig-

gina, Geo. Kennedy (17); and against it Messrs. Kent, Clift, Lloyd, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman, Grimes, Abbott, Winsor, Targett, Stone, Halfyard, Coaker (12); so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion this Bill entitled "An Act for the confirmation of an agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited" was read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on tomorrow.

BANK FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Bank Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I have nothing else to say with regard to this bill. I gave an explanation of what it was for; the safety of our fishermen while at the banks. I am sure that every member will support this bill. I do not think that any more can be added to it.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to make to this bill, and I don't think that anyone else will have any objection to it; but I do wonder why it took so long as it did, to provide such a measure. I am glad to see that the Minister is taking an exceptional interest in the fishermen, and I hope that next year when we meet, we will find that he will bring down quite a number of bills in the interests of the fishermen. I notice that the Upper House opposes anything that the Fishermen's Union introduces, so we would rather that the other side introduced such measures.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, I agree with this bill and will certainly support it. There ought to be more life belts on board of these bankers. While I agree with this bill, I should like to have it include not only bankers, but all schooners. Every person ought to be forced to have a life belt on the water. But nevertheless I heartily agree with this bill.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I may say that the bill covers all these classes of schooners. The bank fishery schooners form a class in themselves. All those classes are in that act; but like a great many other laws, they have never been carried out. I think that the customs officer should have the authority to go and look over the ships to see that the act is carried out. Go around to the customs officials clear of St. John's and ask them for the Merchant Shipping Act, and you will find that they don't know what it means. I advise that they should all have one, they cost but 15 shillings. I asked Mr. Le-Messurier if they had ever been sent around. Every man should have these acts, and I think that from now on, that law will be enforced.

MR. LEFEUVRE.—Mr. Chairman, I think that this bill will meet with general approval, and I have every reason to believe that it will. There is on the act a regulation regarding coastal vessels. As a matter of fact a man has a much better chance of being rescued from a banker, than from a coaster; because there are comparatively but a few men on board of a coaster. But I hope that our vessels will be notified that this act is now in force. We know what diversities of regulations there are in regard to these. The rules in one part are different from the rules in another part. The people are not acquainted with those rules and it is very necessary that they should know them. I

hope, Mr. Charman, that this bill will be enforced. I hope that it will not be put on the Statute Book and left there unobserved, but that it will be carried out in every particular.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in supporting this bill. I believe that it is one of the class that ought to have been introduced years ago. We should all support a measure of this kind. Catalina, my native home, has always been a banking centre until recent years. But even now many of the captains who go to the West Coast, come from there. The first banker sailed from there under Captain John Hiscock. Mr. Chairman, I give this bill my hearty support and hope that before long other bills of the same nature will be introduced.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture, and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

GRAND BANK WATER CO. BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Grand Bank Water Company" was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.

—Mr. Speaker: This is the seventh occasion upon which I have had the privilege of presenting the annual financial statement of this Colony. I would be very pleased if I could address the House in other circumstances than those by which we are surrounded, as the result of the terrible war now devastating Europe. The hostilities have changed the entire financial aspect of the world and even our Colony has not been free from the effects of the dislocation of commerce which the struggle has brought about. On former occasions I have been able to hold up the bright side of the shield, but this year, while the aspect might be much darker, I regret that I cannot speak of expanding revenues or the substantial increases in production which have been the record for years past.

This, of course, is not a condition in which Newfoundland is in any way peculiar. It is common to all portions of the Empire and the whole of the world, more or less, has been thrown into financial and industrial depression, the extent and duration of which no man can predict at the present time. We have but one duty to perform, and that is to face the situation with fortitude, and to remember, moreover, that during the past generation this Colony has passed through periods of depression, when no war at all affected the situation, quite as serious as this, and each time we have weathered the storm and emerged from the period of trouble and

anxiety smiling and prosperous and with renewed confidence in the future of our Island home.

Without further preliminary I shall now proceed to deal with the figures covering the financial year ending on June 30th, 1914, respecting which I can offer a completed statement; that respecting the present financial year, which ends six weeks hence and respecting which it is possible to approximate very closely what the position will be when our books are closed; and that for the financial year which ends on the 30th of June, 1915, and regarding which I can only say that, in the light of existing and prospective events, I must ask the indulgence of the House.

The position regarding the financial year that closed last June has been more or less anticipated by statements already presented in this House, and it will suffice, I think, if I merely state just now that for that year the Revenue of the Colony on Current Account was \$3,618,328.85, being \$309,711.58 less than that received for 1912-13, which was \$3,919,040.43.

The only heads of revenue which increased were those of Postal and Telegraphs, from \$203,987 to \$215,125, an advance of \$11,138.00. Crown Lands from \$105,009 to \$146,021, an advance of \$41,012.00. Inland Revenue Stamps from \$16,646 to \$18,152, an advance of \$1,506, and the fees of the public institutions, which rose from \$3,965 to \$4,459, an advance of \$494. On the other hand, there were decreases in Customs Revenue, from \$3,283,304.00 to \$3,053,313.00, a diminution of \$199,991; in taxes and assessments, from \$55,729 to \$38,651, a drop of \$17,077; in fees of Penitentiary Broom Department from \$11,617 to \$9,340, a decline of \$2,277; in interest on guaranteed loans from \$58,398 to \$56,214, a shortage of \$2,082, while in miscellaneous there was a drop from \$84,765 to \$36,736, a shortage of \$48,028. The increase

in the Postal and Telegraph Revenue is a general advance due to expanding business, and maintains the average rate of increase which has continued for the last decade. The increase in Crown Lands is due to the payment, after the closing of the account for 1912-13, of large amounts of arrears accumulating for several years and enforced at that time. The increase in Inland Revenue Stamps, like that in Postal and Telegraph revenue, is due to the growth of business. The decrease in Customs revenue of practically \$200,000 is of course, explained in part by the duty-free importation of tea, sugar, pork and salt beef, there not being the expected increased import of other articles which pay duty. The shortage on the guaranteed loans is due to the failure of the Harbour Grace Water Company to pay its interest on its stock. The Penitentiary Broom Factory has not been able to do as much business as in previous years; hence the decline there. The big shortage in taxes and assessments is due to the Direct and Western Union Cable Companies declining to pay the annual tax on their cables on grounds that are now before the Courts to be passed upon. The large shortage, too, in miscellaneous and general Revenue is occasioned by the reduced receipts on account of the interest payable on the loan for railway construction deposited in the local banks, and also by our credit balances in the Bank of Montreal being smaller than in the previous year.

The expenditure during the current year 1913-14 amounted to \$3,928,178.21, an increase of \$111,616.79 over that for 1912-13. This is spread virtually over the whole of the heads of expenditure and was obligatory in order to properly carry out the public services.

With a revenue, therefore, of \$3,

\$12,225.85 and an expenditure of \$1,520,187.21, there is a deficit of \$307,843.26, or, in round figures \$308,000.

This deficit, the first in the history of the Colony during the regime of the present Government, was due in part to the removal of duties from necessaries of life used by our people, which the Government undertook in the session of 1913, in pursuance of a pledge made to the electorate; and due partly also to the period of depression which affected the world during the summer of 1913 and the early months of last year. With reference to the reduction in duties and the resulting deficit, I would ask the House to remember that when this Government met the Legislature in June 1908, following the double election, the condition of the Colony was such that a deficit of \$199,000 existed on ordinary operations though at that time there was some of the circumstances tending to such an outcome as has been the misfortune of the country and the world during the past two years. We met that deficit by raising a loan and beginning with a clean slate, and the following year, thanks to the manner in which conditions had improved, the Colony enjoyed a record surplus of \$420,214 followed by a surplus the year after of \$174,330 despite the fact that large additions have been made to various items of public expenditure and the railways extension policy had been decided upon, followed again the following year (1911-12) by a surplus of \$243,803 and followed the next year by a further surplus of \$115,479, these splendid returns being coupled with reductions of taxation on the one hand, and large increases for the various heads of the public service on the other. In other words, during these four years we increased the public outlays from \$2,947,868 to \$3,803,541 and spent in addition to ordinary votes all this

surplus money, nearly a million dollars, on special public services such as old age pensions, road extension, telegraph extension, lighthouse extension, hospital extension, and marine and public works and other undertakings of the same character.

Conceiving ourselves therefore in the session of 1913 to be justified under these circumstances in deciding upon a reduction of the taxes borne by our people on many necessaries of life we resolved upon removing the duties from tea, sugar, pork, and salt beef, which were at that time bringing us in a revenue of, roughly \$360,000. Unfortunately, however, a period of depression overspread the world and instead of, as we expected this entire amount being made up to the Treasury by increased purchases of duty paying articles, that only occurred to the extent of about 25 per cent., and we are now left with a deficit of \$200,000, but that this depression was a genuine and far reaching one is attested by the following statement by the Canadian Minister of Finance, Mr. White, in his Budget Speech at Ottawa in April 1914—just 12 months ago—which reads as follows:—

"Looking back upon the year 1913, it is apparent that the whole world passed through one of those severe financial crises with which the student of economics is familiar as regularly recurring phenomena in the financial world. The Balkan war, while immediately responsible for the critical conditions which developed, probably disclosed rather than caused the situation. World-wide expansion in trade, unprecedented demand from all parts of the world upon the loanable capital in the international financial centres, the constantly increasing expenditures upon militarism and armaments, the exhausting wars of the past few years, personal and public extra-

gence, speculation and price inflation, all co-operated to bring about the financial conditions under review. The banking community always the first to sense approaching money-scarcity, took precautions well in advance, curtailing credits, and limiting the commitments of their customers. Liquidation was forced throughout the world, with the result that at length, about the end of 1913, the money supply was more equalized to demand. Since the turn of the year the Bank of England rate has fallen to three per cent and the outlook for easier money conditions appears much more favorable than at any time during the past two years. So far as the financial stringency is concerned, we may consider that the worst is over. From this time forward until the culmination of the next economic cycle we are, on the experience of the past, justified in looking for much more normal monetary conditions. For the immediate future it must not be forgotten that vast refunding operations must still be carried out in London, Paris and other centres, making heavy demands upon the money supply available. On the whole, Canada received generous treatment at the hands of British capital last year. More money was borrowed than in any previous year, but it is probable that a very substantial part of the total was devoted to the liquidation of floating indebtedness of treasury bills negotiated at an earlier date. When we consider, apart altogether from its physical resources and its economic strength as a community, the great public works owned and paid for by the Dominion—its canals, railways, including the Intercolonial and the now almost completed National Transcontinental—it can be affirmed with certainty that the national debt of Canada has been kept within very moderate bounds indeed."

These words are as true of New-

foundland as they are of Canada. Our Colony was enjoying conditions of an exampled prosperity when the period of depression occurred and a wave of depression overspread us as it did the rest of the world. Our borrowings had been such as the legitimate demands for public expansion had given rise to, and we were proving ourselves able to meet our obligations; and everything looked favourable for a continuance of these gratifying conditions and for our country attaining a height of material prosperity and our people enjoying such sustained well being as never previously existed in our history.

Then the world war began last August and introduced such extraordinary complications and disturbances into the trade and commerce of every country in the world, that no statesman or financier can foreshadow the eventual outcome. Whereas we might, under other circumstances, with the additions to the tariff we made at the last session have been able, during the current year, to have not alone met our extraordinary expenses, but to have provided something towards paying off the deficit arising on last year's operations, we find ourselves confronted to-day with the fact that there is a still larger deficit to be met. Therefore to dispose of the deficit of \$302,000 on last year's account, we are taking that sum from the \$500,000 of cash reserve deposited in the Bank of Montreal to meet such emergencies, and by this means we square the accounts for 1913-14; leaving a balance to our credit of \$198,000.

For the current fiscal year the position is as follows: The Revenue for the ten months which ended on April 30th amounted to \$2,452,578 and I estimate for May and June \$347,000 more, making a total of \$2,799,578.00. Against this the Expenditure for these ten months was \$2,826,970.00, and the estimated expenditure for May and June

will be \$1,188,000.00, a total of \$4,014,979.00. This will leave a deficit for the year of \$714,392, but we have available the remainder of the cash reserve, \$198,000, and we propose to apply that towards reducing the gross deficit, so that we therefore estimate that there will be, when the accounts are squared, a shortage of \$516,000, which is unprovided for. We propose to raise a loan to meet this shortage and a Bill with that object in view will be introduced in a day or two.

In passing I might say that the funded Public Debt of the Colony on the 30th of April was \$30,459,765.27. We also have a floating debt, occasioned by our raising temporary loans from the Bank of Montreal of \$460,000 in place of loans authorised at recent sessions for the same sum, but which for the reasons already given were not easily floatable in the local market and now we propose the raising of a loan of \$516,000 to meet the deficit on this year's account. This will make our public debt, on June 30th, roundly \$31,500,000. Besides that, as the House is aware we have made provision for a war loan from the Imperial authorities of \$1,000,000 on account of which there has been expended, roughly, about \$500,000, and it may be estimated that the remainder of the amount will be exhausted by the end of December. Our obligations, therefore, at the end of 1915 will total \$32,500,000.

I will anticipate any criticism that may be made in regard to the situation in the Colony at present by pointing out that the conditions which prevail here to-day are only what exist in every other part of the world, and that the record of every country of which we know is that of deficits and the inevitable expedients which these compel, for making each country's accounts square so far as is possible.

In the United States the Treasury

Department, after the outbreak of the war, made provision to cope with an expected deficit of \$190,000,000, although the United States is not at war and has not a man in the field. In Canada, where participation in the war has been undertaken on a substantial scale, a very heavy deficit will also, it is admitted, have to be faced, apart from its war outlay—and this will be increased in proportion as Canada enlarges her contingent for active service. With reference to other countries, it is in the knowledge of every one who hears me, that in Europe the nations are burdening themselves with obligations that will continue for at least a generation, in the endeavour to do their part in the struggle which is now being carried on there. Moreover, the paralyzing effect of the war on the world's trade, even that of neutral countries, is well illustrated by some returns just made public by the Department of Commerce of the United States. Although it was predicted at the outset of the war that America's opportunities for an enormous expansion of trade were to be found in the paralysis of European commerce as a result of hostilities, these trade returns show that the very reverse is the case. Though there is no war in South America and though the British command of the sea has destroyed the big German trade previously done with Argentina, the United States finds she sold but a quarter million dollars worth of goods more in that market last January than she did a year before.

Similarly, American trade with Brazil fell off at the rate of a million a month during the past nine months. China took five million dollars worth less of American goods in the same period. While Japan actually is in the war, intercourse with her, so far as America was concerned, continued as free as ever; yet American exports to Japan sank by nearly thirteen mil-

lion dollars the past nine months. Similarly, commerce between Canada and America, though as uninterrupted as ever, resulted in America selling thirty million dollars worth of goods less in the seven months from June to January than she did in the seven corresponding months of the previous year. Under these circumstances we have cause for gratitude, I think, that Newfoundland has been able, during the ten months since last July to sell her fish at prices never exceeded and to enjoy unrestricted access to the markets in which her staple commodities are sold, and, viewing this fact, we cannot but congratulate ourselves that our position is very much better than might have been, had different conditions prevailed on the ocean and uninterrupted intercourse with the outside world been restricted as it might easily have been but for the work of the British Navy. It is true, of course, that the war compelled a very serious reduction in the operations of the mining companies at Bell Island, but even there we now find that conditions are improving and that the prospect is that operations this year will be enlarged considerably, and that possibly a resumption of activity on old time lines may be looked forward to.

For the fiscal year beginning on the first of July and ending on the 30th of June, 1916, we estimate an expenditure of \$4,072,000 made up of \$1,369,000 voted by the House in main estimates within the past two weeks and the sum of \$2,703,000 for Supplemental Estimates introduced by me yesterday. Against this I am estimating that the Revenue for the coming year will amount to about \$4,000,000 as well. For this anticipation I will probably be accused of being too sanguine, but I would point out in the first place that the Deputy Minister of Customs, who is an expert

in such matters, calculates that under normal conditions, the duties now imposed should yield the Colony \$750,000 more than we are at present receiving, and as conditions gradually return towards the normal there will be a gradual betterment in the Revenue returns. His statement showing the increase of revenue, which would come in normal times, from the addition to the tariff since 11th March, 1914, is as follows:

Alcohol	\$ 89
Cordials	139
Brandy	6,532
Whiskey	28,452
Gin	3,687
Rum	75,359
Champagne	274
Tobacco	3,776
Cigarettes	17,670
Ale, Porter and Beer	11,909
Tea	41,533
Sugar	147,860
Sugar	7,636
Flour	98,422
Kero Oil	65,808
Beef	19,232
Pigs Heads	2,577
Pigs Jowls	1,936
Pork, Mess &c.	28,356
Pork, Family	1,122
Automobiles	4,578
10 per cent Surtax	31,492
	<hr/>
	\$ 597,539
Excise Beer	2,076
Tobacco	30,079
Butterine	39,336
Cigarettes	46,140
	<hr/>
	\$ 715,170

In the next place I am encouraged to hope that there may be a large increase in revenue during the next financial year, because, admittedly, imports have been reduced very considerably since the war began, and dealers have been pushing their old

stock where possible and refusing to import again until the situation became more clear, and that, as these stocks are exhausted, they will have to be supplemented by others. In the third place, I look forward to a very substantial betterment as a result of the increased operations at Bell Island, where, I am reliably informed, the Dominion Steel Company expects to employ a force of a thousand men all through this year, and where the Nova Scotia Company will also, it is expected, increase its output somewhat. In the fourth place, I think we may count upon another large augmentation of Revenue through the starting up of the new fertiliser enterprise on the West Coast, should the Legislature confirm the contract with Mr. Willson and his associates. In the fifth place we hope for substantial returns from the pit prop policy which we are asking the Legislature to endorse, and which we trust will serve the double purpose of providing employment for our fisherfolk who are unable to secure supplies for Labrador, and of increasing our revenue by the export duty.

We do not, however, intend to trust entirely to these conditions to ensure the desired increase of revenue for we purpose to bring into effect certain tariff changes.

Through all of these factors we expect to secure an augmentation of the Revenue by about \$750,000 and we are hopeful that the improvement in the conditions generally will enable us to witness a restoration of the equilibrium between Revenue and Expenditure to June next.

Non. members opposite will, no doubt, maintain that this expectation will not be realized, and possibly they may be right. Much will depend on the continuance of the war and the conditions which will attend it, but, as I have already said, it is im-

possible to forecast with any great accuracy the likely situation which will prevail a year hence and we must allow a large margin in our calculations. I might point out, however, that Mr. Lloyd George, the British Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech delivered last week, emphasized to the people of the United Kingdom through the Imperial Parliament that it would be impossible for many months yet, to forecast the requirements of the British Exchequer, as much would depend on the progress of the war and its effects upon commerce and industry. For us here I can only say that this is a time when in my humble judgment, we should endeavour to cultivate the most cheerful and hopeful view of the situation. That the view we take is not an unreasonable one I might instance by some quotations from the figures of the various Departments for the past year. The customs revenue for the financial year 1912-13 was, altogether \$3,283,304.35 and that for 1913-14 was \$3,089,627.53, the decrease being only \$193,676.82. This shows further that, as a matter of actual fact the reduction of duties put into effect at the session of 1913 actually only brought about a shrinkage of less than \$200,000 in the Customs Revenue, the other \$190,000 being due to reductions in Crown Lands and other revenues arising from the world depression then in existence. For the current year the principal shortage in the Revenue of the Customs Department will be represented by the reduction in ore shipments from which royalty we received in 1913-14, \$95,475.23. The Crown Land Revenue has, of course, suffered most as a result of the war, the struggle having paralyzed activities in connection therewith for whereas the actual Revenue in the last fiscal year was \$145,000, the actual Revenue for the ten months

which ended with April amounted to \$43, 829.29 and the estimate for the remaining two months is \$8,100, making a total of \$77,929.29 or, say, \$78,000 altogether, a reduction of nearly \$67,000 on last year's figures. The figures regarding the Crown Lands Revenue in the various sub-divisions are as follows:

	Revenue	Estimated
Timber	\$2,470.91	7,000
Royalties, New Act	950.42	400
Agriculture	2,327.90	200
Mineral	14,080.00	500
	69,829.29	8,100
	8,100.00	
Total	\$77,929.29	

The total trade of the Colony for the past fiscal year amounted to \$30,328,269, the imports totalling \$15,193,726 and the exports \$15,134,543, there being therefore an excess of \$59,182 in imports over exports. It may not be amiss here to supply some figures showing the increase in total trade since the present Government took office:

Year Ended	Imports	Exports	Ttl. Trade
June 30 1909	11,402,737	11,848,913	23,251,650
1910	12,799,896	11,824,997	24,624,893
1911	13,383,910	11,975,747	25,359,657
1912	14,732,490	12,874,809	28,608,299
1913	16,012,265	14,672,889	30,685,254
1914	15,193,726	15,134,543	30,328,269

It will be seen from this that the total trade of this Colony for the twelve months which ended on June 30th, 1914, maintained itself with that of the previous year, notwithstanding the depression which prevailed abroad as well as at home.

In connection with the trade of the Colony during the current fiscal year, it may not be amiss to quote the references of the Board of Trade to

this matter in its annual report for the year 1914:

"It may be of interest first to consider the effect which the war has had on the trade of the Colony. At the outbreak of the war, a feeling of uncertainty and direct uneasiness was manifested among all sections of the community, especially as to the effect the war would have on the Colony's trade, and more especially as regards the fish markets, and it is a good thing to be able to record that thus far Newfoundland has not suffered to any great extent from anything worse than this uneasiness. There were, however, many serious problems to be considered and dealt with, and more especially those connected with the important questions of exchange and war risk insurance for a time gave considerable anxiety, with the result that extreme caution was exercised, and great reluctance shown by the trade generally, in incurring any heavy commitments in purchase of the Colony's produce. By clever organization on the part of the special agents of the fish trade abroad, the first difficulty was finally overcome and by the statesmanlike action of the British Government in their splendid handling of the question of war insurance, these difficult problems were finally solved, with the result that renewal of confidence was established, and prices of the Colony's chief export, codfish, gradually rose from the moderately low figure of about \$2.60 per cwt. (unfortunately unequal) to its present unprecedented figure of \$7.50 unequal."

I think it is not unreasonable to claim, Mr. Chairman, that the prosperity of this Colony is merely temporarily arrested as a result of the war and that once a restoration of peace occurs, the rebound back to its old-time condition of financial and commercial security will be quite as mark-

ed as it has been in previous periods of depression in Newfoundland. The worst consequences which present conditions could impose upon the Colony, namely, a condition of absolute depression for a large section of our people has been dissipated by the fact that 2,500 of our men have gone on active service as soldiers or Reservists thus relieving the labor market very materially, an outcome which is very welcome, seeing that railway construction on any large scale will not be possible while the war continues because of the inability of securing funds to carry on that undertaking; and while, of course, we are adding to the Colony's burdens by the

amount we are providing for war expenditure, yet a goodly portion of that money is being disbursed amongst our own people, first in providing out-fits for the men and second, by the sum which they leave to their relatives when they go forward.

Criticisms will doubtless be directed at the expenditures by the present Government since taking office, but I propose to show that these have been justified in every instance. In the five years between 1908-9 and 1912-14, the last complete year we are considering to-day, we increased the vote for the public service in the following proportions:

Head of Expenditure	1908-9	1912-14	Increase
Interest on Public Debt	572,072	1,115,354	243,312
Civil Government	141,419	275,722	134,303
Pensions	9,568	19,128	9,570
Administration of Justice	190,137	191,432	1,295
Legislation	32,141	42,896	10,745
Education	268,013	266,924	98,921
Public Charities	391,721	420,592	118,862
Light Houses	71,868	112,712	41,854
Agriculture and Mines	29,552	61,221	31,679
*Marine and Fisheries	104,567	105,725	
Roads and Bridges	179,389	188,905	9,577
Postal and Telegraphs	459,424	690,445	231,021
Customs	212,541	290,823	77,282
Contingencies	16,356	19,972	3,616
Audit Act	14,998	17,182	2,184
**Elections	41,093		
	\$2,947,869	\$3,829,178	\$1,041,221

The net increase in expenditure, therefore, in five years is \$971,219, and with respect to this I would say:—

The increase of, roundly, a quarter million dollars in the item of interest is due to the increase in the Public Debt represented by the branch rail-

ways and the other public works of first importance undertaken by the present Government during its term. The increase of \$134,900 under the head of Civil Government is represented by \$32,000 for Old Age pensions, \$11,000 in salaries, \$17,900 in depart-

*Decrease, \$809.

**As there was no general election this year that amount is also dropped.

mental contingencies, \$5,000 for allowances under the Marine Disasters Bill, \$9,000 for increased fuel and light, and \$34,000 for repairs to public buildings. This latter item, I might explain does not represent an actual increase, but is due to the transfer of repairs under Public Charities and Administration of Justice, to the vote for Civil Government. The increase of \$9,570 for pensions is due to the fact that there are many more on the list now, the number of those previously paid out for Departmental Contingencies having been eliminated from that vote and put on the regular pension list. The Administration of Justice costs us practically no more than formerly, but on account of legislation there is an increase of \$2600 in the printing and \$8,000 in the various contingencies. We spend nearly \$100,000 more in education now than five years ago, of which \$89,000 goes for salaries, a thousand dollars for retiring allowances, \$1,200 for travelling expenses of inspectors, \$2,500 for Higher Education, and the interest on the vote of \$100,000 for the erection of new buildings, \$5,000 more. On Public Charities we spent nearly \$120,000, represented by \$22,000 more for permanent and casual \$3,000 for orphanages, \$3,500 for conveyance, \$5,000 for medical attendance, \$2,500 for Labrador sick, \$2,000 for extraordinary outlays \$7,000 for public charities, \$12,000 for public health, \$30,000 for tuberculosis, and \$6,000 for the Lazaretto. On the Lighthouse Department we spent \$42,000 more, \$30,000 being represented by maintenance, this including many new lighthouses that have been laid, \$7,000 for public charities, \$12,000 being the salaries for the keepers to operate these new stations. We spend \$32,000 more under Agriculture and Mines, \$28,000 of this being by the Board of Agriculture, \$6,000 for forest fire prevention, \$1,000 for timber

inspection, \$4,000 for the Fire Patrol Service, and \$1,000 annually for the Imperial Institute, while we drop \$4,500 from the vote for supplies and petty surveys, and \$4,000 for the coal boring vote. Roads and bridges show an increase of nearly \$10,000 due to new ferries and motor services. We have increased the outlays for the Postal and Telegraph Department by \$230,000 in round figures. Of this amount new mail subsidies represent \$85,000, railway subsidies \$9,000, the extension and improvement of the telegraph service \$44,000, salaries in both branches \$49,000, annual contribution to the Postal Union, \$4,700, Ocean and Gulf steamer subsidies \$20,000, contingencies \$15,000, etc. On the Customs Department we spent \$77,000 more, this being not altogether a matter of actual outlay, the coal duties and water rates paid out to the Municipal Council accounting for \$24,000, refunds for \$25,000, contingencies for \$12,000 and salaries for only \$12,000 and the whole service. The amounts under Contingencies and Audit Act vary each year according to special requirements, and the increases are only trivial, particularly in view of the largely increased Revenue and Expenditure during the period.

The amount on deposit in the Colonial Savings Bank on the 31st of December last was \$2,483,732.95. The amount on deposit in the Savings bureaux of the four Canadian Banks doing business in the Colony on the same date was \$6,187,985.49 and the amounts on deposit at interest \$2,733,958.19 all of these may be legitimately regarded as savings of the people and the sum total \$11,405,676.33 is therefore very creditable. The value of the Government debentures held in the Colony on the same date was \$3,804,218.64 and the amount of securities held by the Colony at the end

of last year on account of life insurance, was \$1,583,480.00.

The customary financial statements will be found on the desks of hon. members, and therefore it is unnecessary that I should refer to them at length, and I attach hereto extracts from the Auditor-General's report giving certain explanation regarding the trust and other funds. I regret, as I am sure you all do, that it is not possible to make a more encouraging presentation of the Colony's financial condition, but I feel certain that I am equally voicing the sentiments of every member of the House when I say that this condition is the direct outcome of the tragic struggle which is now convulsing the world. This has made the fairest fields of Europe a

battle ground, on which in due time, we may look to see the sons of our Island home do their part with their brothers from all the rest of the Empire to uphold liberty and freedom. I am sure that we will all be prepared to recognize the necessity of sacrifices at this present time and to take our part in bearing such sacrifices on behalf of our common country. If we cannot adopt as a watchword that which did service in the Mother Country for a time and contend for "Business as Usual" we may not unreasonably set out that the expectation of this Colony is that it may ere long, enjoy, with the rest of the Empire and the Allied nations, the benefits of a successful peace and be able to progress as usual along the lines of former years.

EXTRACTS FROM AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

The extracts from the Auditor General's report mentioned by the Minister of Finance and Customs in the closing paragraphs of his Budget Speech are as follows:—

SURPLUS TRUST FUND.

The position of the Surplus Trust Fund at the close of the fiscal year 1912-13 was as follows, viz:—

DR.

To total amount received from Consolidated Account from 1901-2 to 1912-13, inclusive	\$1,372,897.47
--	----------------

CR.

By expended to June 30th, 1914, as follows, viz:—

Roads	\$501,414.23	
Light House Construction	57,000.00	
Harbor Improvements and Marine Works	239,477.15	
Outport Government Buildings	23,347.52	
Extension Marconi System	14,000.00	
Completing Fever Hospital	3,000.00	
Construction Museum (in aid of)	20,000.00	
Extension and Improvement General Hospital (in aid of)		30,254.48
Encouragement Herring Fishery	26,045.03	
General Elections 1908 and 1912	91,897.33	
To cover part deficit Current Act, 1904-9.	6,784.92	
Festival of Empire (in aid of)	10,212.90	
Government Bonds for Old Age Pensions	200,000.10	
Education	10,000.00	
Erection of Fence around Constabulary Grounds		1,212.30

Board of Agriculture (in aid of)	7,224.73	
St. John's Agricultural Society for hay		6,235.62
Post Office Contingencies (in aid of)	7,999.45	
		<u>1,266,110.06</u>
Balance		6,697.41

The following statement shows the disposition of last year's credit balances for 1913-14:—

Service	Balance	Received in 1913-14	Total	Expended in 1913-14	Balance 1914-15
1. Roads	\$ 1,283.07	13,733.56	15,016.63	14,950.00	\$ 66.63
2. Constb. Fence . .		1,213.30	1,213.30	1,213.30	
3. Board of Agr.		8,000.00	8,000.00	7,224.73	775.27
4. St. John's Ag. Society		8,500.00	8,500.00	6,235.62	2,264.38
5. Postal Conting.		8,000.00	8,000.00	7,999.45	55
6. En. Her. Fishy. . .	22.91		22.91		22.91
7. Mar. Works	18,682.36	2,032.15	20,714.51	17,578.10	3,136.41
8. Lighthouse Con.		12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	
9. Elections, 1913 . .		52,000.00	52,000.00	51,568.74	431.26
	<u>\$19,988.34</u>	<u>\$105,479.01</u>	<u>\$125,467.35</u>	<u>\$118,769.94</u>	<u>\$6,697.41</u>

This balance appeared as \$19,355.23 in last year's accounts. The expenditure on account of Loan, 1914, which was advanced from the Surplus for 1912-13, and which was replaced when the loan was raised, was \$633.11 over the actual surplus. The full amount of the expenditure having been repaid, the overdraft of \$633.11 has to be added to the amount appearing to the credit of the Surplus Trust Fund in the balance sheet for 1912-13.

Of the foregoing expenditures, 1, 2, 3, 7, 8 and 9, are self-explanatory.

With regard to 3, the sum of \$8,000 was appropriated in aid of the vote for the Board of Agriculture. Of this sum \$7,224.73 was spent which, added to the outlay under the vote, gave a total expenditure of \$48,983.76 on an original vote of \$40,000. Notwithstanding the above mentioned assistance, this vote was overdrawn by \$1,759.03.

With regard to 4, the sum of \$8,500

of which \$6,235.62 has been spent, was appropriated to cover the indebtedness of the St. John's Agricultural Society for hay, this indebtedness having been taken over by the Government.

With regard to 5, which is a sum appropriated in aid of Postal Contingencies, it was all spent with the exception of 55 cents. The total vote including Supplementary Supply and transfers from credit votes, was \$36,902.00, this added to the amount received 'in aid' from the Surplus Trust Fund shows a total of \$44,902.00. Of this sum \$44,899.49 was expended, leaving a balance of \$1.96 under the Public Service Act, and 55 cents under Surplus Trust. The original vote was \$19,000.00.

The following statement shows the expenditure under the several Loan Accounts for the year under report, viz:—

LOAN EXPENDITURE 1913-14.

Act, etc.	Service	Additions &		Balance to
		Balance from	Expend.	
		1912-13	1913-14	1914-15
1. 61st Vic.				
Cap. 10. New Market House		\$ 10,000.00		\$10,000.00
2. 61, 62, 63 Vic.				
Cap. 33 Agriculture Bounty		939.69		939.69
3. 1st Geo. V.				
Cap. 32. New Poor Asylum		148,768.95	\$ 342.58	\$148,426.37
Marconi Installation		8,876.99	40.62	8,836.37
Hr. Grace Public Building		1,336.83	1,336.83	
Improvements to General Hospital		2.19		2.19
		<u>\$158,984.96</u>	<u>\$1,720.03</u>	<u>\$157,264.93</u>
4. 4th Geo. V.				
Cap. 24 Telegraph Construction . .		80,776.34	78,271.32	2,505.02
Cap. 24 Lighthouse Construction . .		45,000.00	12,804.99	32,195.10
Cap. 24 General Hospital Impts. . .		14,000.19	11,907.62	2,092.57
Cap. 24 Addition to Gen. P. O. . . .		11,000.00	7,500.30	3,499.70
Cap. 24 Public Bldg. Freshwater . .		240.00	237.05	2.95
Cap. 24 Public Bldg., Grand Falls		3,387.35	3,387.35	70
Cap. 24 Pub. Bld., Spaniard's Bay		9,495.00	7,809.75	1,685.25
Cap. 24 Pub. Bld. Bay Roberts . . .		17,489.00	14,817.97	2,671.03
Cap. 24 Pub. Bld., Channel		8,500.00	6,000.00	2,500.00
Cap. 24 Pub. Bld., Harbor Grace		4,000.00	2,838.39	1,161.61
		<u>\$193,887.88</u>	<u>\$145,574.65</u>	<u>\$48,313.23</u>
5. 10th Ed. VII.				
Cap. 39. Railway Construction and				
Arbitration Awards		\$1,290,363.85	\$1,290,363.85	
6. 4th Geo. V.				
Cap. 23. Railway Construction and				
Arbitration Awards		437,750.09	175,570.41	\$312,179.59

Expenditure on account of services marked thus * was made in 1912-13 on Surplus Trust Account in that year. The total sum spent, viz: \$116,112.12, was re-imbursed from Loan Act, 4th Geo. V. Cap. 24 in 1913-14. Explanations as to the foregoing, viz:—

(1) This sum of \$10,000.000, voted under the Appropriation Act of 1898 for the erection of a New Mar-

ket House, still remains to the credit of the Loan in the Bank of Montreal.

(2) The balance of the credit of the Agricultural Loan is self-explanatory.

(3) The several amounts authorized by and the expenditure to date under this Loan are as follows, viz:

Service	Amount Authorized.	Expended 1912-13	Expended 1913-14	Total	Balance
School Bldgs. . .	\$100,000.00		\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	
New Poor Asy.	150,000.00	\$ 1,231.05	342.58	1,573.63	148,426.37
Lights, etc., Mar.	100,000.00	91,123.01	40.62	91,163.63	8,836.37
Dredge	50,000.00	50,000.00		50,000.00	
St. J's. MI. Con.	32,000.00	32,000.00		32,000.00	
Hr. Gr. Pub. Bld.	15,000.00	12,663.17	1,336.83	15,000.00	
Imp. Gen. Hosp.	73,000.00	72,997.81		72,997.81	2.19
	\$520,000.00	\$261,015.04	\$101,720.63	\$362,735.67	\$157,264.93

Some further explanation is desirable respecting this Loan, viz:

School Buildings.

This sum was really spent on Temporary Loan in 1911-12. As sufficient money was not subscribed to the Loan by the public until 1914, the Temporary Loan was not paid off until that year, hence the charge, appearing above.

New Poor Asylum.

The expenditure is on account of

the new new Lunatic Asylum. The Government has been asked by me to amend the Act so as to make the Loan applicable to the latter institution.

Lighthouses and Marconi.

The balance shown is held on account of Marconi construction.

(4) The several amounts authorized by and the expenditure under the Loan Act, Geo. V., Cap. 24, are as follows, viz:—

Service	Amount Authorized	Expended 1912-13	Expended 1913-14	Total	Balance
Ex. Tel. system	\$140,000.00	\$59,223.63	\$ 78,271.32	\$137,494.95	\$ 2,505.05
Erec. Lt. Houses	45,000.00		12,504.90	12,504.90	32,195.10
New Pub. Bldgs.	50,000.00	38,999.81	11,907.62	47,907.43	2,092.57
Add. to G. P.O.	14,000.00	2,000.00	7,500.30	10,500.30	2,499.70
Pub. Bld. F'wtr.	5,250.00	5,010.00	237.05	5,247.05	2.95
Grand Falls ..	16,250.00	12,862.65	3,287.35	16,250.00	
Esplanade's Bay	9,500.00	5.09	7,809.75	7,814.75	1,685.25
Bay Roberts .	17,500.00	11.00	14,817.97	14,828.97	2,671.03
Channel	8,500.00		6,000.00	6,000.00	2,500.00
Harbor Grace ..	4,000.00		2,838.29	2,838.29	1,161.61
Unappropriated	50,000.00				50,000.00
	\$360,000.00	\$116,112.12	\$145,574.65	\$261,686.77	\$98,313.23

With regard to this loan, the expenditure in 1912-13 was advanced from the Surplus Trust Fund and re-imbursed to the said Fund in 1913-14, from a Temporary Loan, obtained from the Act 10 Ed. VII. Cap. 39. Balance from Act 4, Geo. V. Cap. 23. Amount received in 1913-14

Bank of Montreal.

5 and 6. The expenditure on account of Railway Loans for 1913-14 is made up as follows:—

Act 10 Ed. VII. Cap. 39. Balance from 1912-13	\$1,290,363.85
Act 4, Geo. V. Cap. 23. Amount received in 1913-14	487,750.00

\$1,778,113.85

To Reid Nfld. Co. for Construction and Equipment	\$1,256,194.40
To Agriculture and Mines Department for sundry persons and Arbitration	209,327.86
	<hr/>
	\$1,465,522.26
	<hr/>
Balance to 1914-15	\$312,179.59

OTHER LOANS.

The following is a statement of the Debenture Conversion Loan, 5th Ed. VII, Cap. 1.

	Balance from 1913-13	Received in 1913-14	Balance in 1913-14	Balance to 1914-15
Conversion of Debenture	\$349.15		\$317.90	\$32.15

This is the Act regulating the conversion to Debentures in coupon bearing Bonds. Under it, \$9,500.00, in Debentures, was redeemed during the year 1913-14, and replaced by Bonds. The amount in hand represents the adjustment of difference between the

value of Debentures surrendered, and the Bonds given in exchange. The aggregate of Debentures converted since the passing of the Act is \$2,097,770.41, leaving \$77,410.15 to be converted.

TEMPORARY LOANS.

On the 30th June last the position of the Temporary Loan Account was as follows, viz:—

Loan Act.	Service	Amount Raised	Amount Expended	Balance
1912.	Light House construction	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	
	Extension Telegraphs	140,000.00	137,494.98	2,505.02
	Light House construction	45,000.00	12,804.90	32,195.10
	Con. and Improv. Pub. Buildings	175,000.00	111,386.89	63,613.11
		<hr/>	<hr/>	
		\$460,000.00	\$361,686.77	\$98,313.23

The above \$460,000 has been obtained on Temporary Loan from the bank of Montreal, bearing interest at

the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum on \$300,000, and 3½ per cent. per annum on \$160,000.

PUBLIC DEBT.

The Funded Public Debt of the Colony was increased by the following sum during the fiscal year ended June 30th, 1914, viz:—Under

Act 4th Geo. V., Cap. 22, Railway Construction	\$973,323.22
Act 50th Vic., Cap. 1, St. John's Rebuilding Act	4,290.00
Act 29th Vic., Cap. 25, Carbonate Street Act	3,195.80
Act 5th Ed. VII, Cap. 1, Conversion of Debentures	9,500.00
Act 1st Geo. V., Cap. 22, Public Service	250.00

\$990,479.12

And reduced under:—

Act 55 Vic., Cap. 4, Public Service	\$3,000.00	
Act 61 Vic., Cap. 10, Public Service	3,600.00	
Act 56 Vic., Cap. 1, St. John's Rebuilding Act	3,174.40	9,774.40

The net increase for the year being	980,704.73
Add the balance on 1st July, 1913	\$29,470,060.54

Giving a total of	\$30,450,765.27
To this should be added the amount of the Temporary Loan in the Bank of Montreal to which reference is made in the preceding paragraph	460,000.00

Gross Public Debt	\$30,910,765.27
-------------------------	-----------------

To arrive at the net Public Debt of the Colony it will be necessary to make certain deduction from this, viz:

Gross Debt, as above	\$30,910,765.27
Less. Due to the Colony by the St. John's Municipal Council	\$1,429,631.22
Shares of the Harbour Grace Water Company held by the Government	13,700.00
Amount paid off by the operation of the Sinking Fund established under 56th Victoria, Cap. 13, as on the 30th June, 1914	698,104.65
	2,141,435.87

Net Public Debt	\$28,769,329.40
-----------------------	-----------------

The Colony continued to pay interest of that portion of Loan 56th Victoria, Cap. 13 which has been paid off; this interest is added to the Sinking Fund, and applied to the purchase and cancellation of Debentures held under the same Act.

BALANCES.

The balances to the credit of the Colony at the close of the fiscal year 1913-14 were as follows, viz:—

IN THE BANK OF MONTREAL.

Surplus Trust Fund	\$ 6,697.41
Agricultural Bonus	939.69
Conversion of Debentures	32.15
Loan 1898—Market House	10,000.00
Loan 1911—Deposit Receipt (of Temporary Loan of \$100,000)	22,014.93
Loan 1914—Deposit Receipt (of Temporary Loan of \$360,000)	98,313.23
Railway Loan, 1914	312,179.59
Reserve Fund	500,000.00
Harbor Grace Water Company for St. John's Municipal Council Guaranteed Debt	13,700.00
	1,429,631.22
Amount to Credit of Colony	\$2,393,508.22
And to its Debt:—	
Exchequer Account—Current	\$ 301,549.36
Imported Bronze Coins, Balance Account, copper and minting	495.88
Temporary Loans	460,000.00
	\$762,345.24

In addition to the foregoing balances in the Bank of Montreal, there were, at the close of the year under report, the following credits to the several Departmental Trust Fund Accounts, indicated, viz:—

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT:—

For extension of the Telegraph system in Twillingate Dist.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT—

For Constabulary for purchase of machinery \$ 1,044.81

For Education—balance of votes to credit of the several

Denominations 282.50

\$1,327.31

AGRICULTURE AND MINES DEPARTMENT—

For Railway Awards—Balance from 1912-13 205.00

Received from Loan 1913-14 299,827.86

\$210,032.86

Paid out for awards 1913-14 204,775.27

Balance to 1914-15 \$5,257.59

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT—

Marine Works, to cover allocations issued, the work on which was completed at the close of the year 219.55

Musgrave Harbor Breakwater. The balance on July, 1912, was \$2,066.69. \$2,000 thereof was spent in 1912-13 for public wharves in the District of Fogo, leaving a balance of

66.29 285.84

\$7,179.64

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Treasury Cash Notes, viz:—

Balance July 1st, 1914 \$126,381.30

Cash received from Departments for purchase of Notes 261,325.00

\$387,706.30

Notes redeemed and cancelled 272,238.45

Balance to 1914-15 \$115,467.85

Outstanding Letters of Credit cheques of the several Departments for 1912-13, being provision for their encashment

\$1,949.89

117,417.74

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Unallocated Road Grants \$1,995.55

Cash Notes, for redemption of balance of old issues of cash Notes from Public Works Department still in circulation

3,894.51

5,890.06

AND IN SAVINGS BANK.

Cash to credit of Teachers' Pension Fund 8,040.33

\$138,437.77

The Teachers' Pension Fund, established under the Education Act of 1912, stood as follows on June 30th, 1914:—

Bonds of the Colony in the custody of the Savings Bank	\$200,000.00
Cash to credit of Current Account in the Savings Bank	8,946.33
	<hr/>
	\$208,946.33

The Old Age Pensions Fund amounts to \$200,000 in Bonds of the Colony in the custody of the Treasurer.

Copper Coin to the value of \$2,449 was, on the 30th of June last, held by the Treasury for issue. \$500 of the total issue of \$4,900 having been sold and the proceeds paid to the Bank of Montreal in redemption of the cost of importation, viz:—\$1,655.88.

The Treasury Cash Notes Stock Account stood as follows on June 30th, 1914:—

Balance from 1912-13	\$ 57,242.50
Received from Manufacturers in 1913-14	175,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$232,242.50
Notes issued to Departments	210,325.00
	<hr/>
Balance to 1914-15	\$21,917.50

The Auditor General has checked stock in hand and found it correct.

The register of Life Insurance Companies securities has been examined by me and compared with the receipt lists given by the Bank of Montreal, in which Bank these securities are deposited, and I have found the entries, amounting to \$1,685,489.57, are correct.

In July last he audited the accounts of the Harbor Grace, Carbonar and Placentia Water Companies.

Their accounts were found to be correct. The first named Company has much difficulty in making revenue and expenditure balance. This is due to (1) the difficulty experienced in collecting the rates, and (2) the decline in the value of property. The water system was constructed when the town was prosperous and appeared likely to extend. Instead of expansion, contraction has taken place.

He has also verified the following stocks of postal and revenue stamps as on the 30th June last, viz:

Postal Stamps	\$275,910.30
Inland Revenue Stamps	115,171.35

Un-issued British Postal Orders, to the value of \$12,954.99, are held by the Money Order Department, General Post Office. He has checked these and found them correct.

Under the provisions of the Registrar Supreme Court Act, 1913, he has examined the accounts of the Registrar of the Supreme Court, and has found the same correct. The Debenture and other securities, to the amount of \$227,190, he checked and found correct. The amount of cash to the credit of the Registrar he also found correct as follows, viz:—

Government Savings Bank	\$25,367.76
Royal Bank of Canada, Savings Department	248.91
Bank of Nova Scotia, Savings Department	4,600.00
	<hr/>
	\$26,216.67

He has examined the accounts of the Commissioners of Pilots to date, and found them correct.

Under the provisions of Section 2 of the Act respecting Companies operating Marine Docks in the Colony, application was made to the Government to pay to the Harbor Grace Marine Dock Company, and the St. John's Floating Dock Company, the sum by which the profits of these respective

Companies for the year ending June 30th, 1914, proved to be less than five per cent. upon the actual capital of the said respective Companies, paid up in cash. Acting under the instructions to me set forth in Section 3 of the said Act, he examined the accounts, etc., of the Companies and found with regard to

- (1) The Harbor Grace Marine Dock Company that it had made no profits and that therefore the whole of the amount represented by 5 per cent. on the paid up capital of \$37,119, viz: \$1,855.50, had to be paid by the Government.
- (2) The St. John's Floating Dock Company, that the sum required to be paid by the Government in order that the shareholders should realize a dividend of 5 per cent., was \$685.12.

He gave two certificates for these sums, which have been paid from the vote for General Contingencies.

He has at the request of the Governors and Directors of the Government Savings Bank, conducted a regular audit of its accounts both in St. John's and in the several outport branches, commencing on the 1st of January, 1914. He found the accounts of the St. John's and outport branches correct, being carefully and satisfactorily kept, and has also checked the securities, owned by the Bank, and found them correct.

TARIFF CHANGES.

Proposed by the Minister of Finance and Customs in connection with his Budget Speech.

1.—Schedule A of the Revenue Act, 1905, as amended by subsequent Acts, is hereby further amended by the addition thereto of the words and figures following:—

Admiralty Charts, ad val. 10 p.c.
 Agricultural Implements and Machinery, N.E.S.; and Hay-binders, Bone Crush-

ers, Hay and Feed Cutters, Air Motors, Churns, Cream Separators and Incubators; Wire Fencing, and Fasteners for the same; Gates for wire fences, when the gates are made chiefly of wire, ad val. 10 p.c.

Animals, imported by Agricultural Societies, or by private persons, under the approval of the Governor in Council for improvement of stock, and Poultry when imported for breeding purposes, ad val. 10 p.c.

Bark, Extract of Bark, Cutch, Bichromate of Potash, Logwood, ad. val. 10 p.c.

Boiler and Ship's Plates, when of the thickness of one-quarter of an inch or over that thickness, ad val. 10 p.c.

Books, printed and not to be written or drawn upon, and Supplements for periodicals specially imported for the bona fide use of incorporated institutes; Official Reports, Newspapers, and Monthly and Semi-Monthly Magazines; Weekly Library Papers unbound, and Christmas Annuals; Blackboards, specimens, medals and wall diagrams, illustrative of natural history and imported for colleges, schools and public libraries; Kindergarten Requisites, and Catalogues and Price Lists of persons, firms and companies domiciled elsewhere, and not personally doing business here, ad val. 10 p.c.

Chair Cane or Reed of Withrod, when imported in an unmanufactured state, ad val. 10 p.c.

Engravers' Plates of Steel, polished, for engraving thereupon; Photo Engraving Machinery, viz:—router, bevelling and squaring machines, screen-holders, cross-line screens, chemicals for use in engraving, wood for blocking, graving tools and process plates, ad val. 10 p.c.

Hoop Iron or Hoop Steel, splayed, punched or nosed, and cut in lengths not to exceed sixty-eight inches, to be used in making herring barrels, ad val. 10 p.c.

Indian Corn, ad val. 10 p.c.

Junk, Old Iron, Old Copper, and Old Composition Metal, ad val. 10 p.c.

Machinery of all kinds to be used in the actual breaking of coal or ore bodies underground or in the open pit, viz:—Rock Drills, Coal Cutters; Pumping Engines of all kinds, to be used in transferring water from the underground, or open pit workings, to the surface; Hoisting Engines or other machinery to be used as a motive power to lift ores or coal from the underground, or from an open pit, to the surface; Crushers, or other machinery, to be used in the actual breaking of ores, so as to facilitate refining or transportation; Special Machinery of all kinds, to be used for the washing, concentration, reduction, or the refining of any ore or coal, or for the manufacture of brick; Prospecting Drills of all kinds, to be used for the proving the extent or existence

underground of coal, oil or ore bodies; Cranes and Derricks, when used for the actual handling of coal or ore from the working to the surface; Compressors to be used for the operation of any of the above machines; Fire Clay and Fire Brick, to be used in the construction of any ore reduction or smelting plant; Dynamite, Detonators, Blasting Powder, Fuses of all kinds; Blasting Batteries, Battery Wire and Drill Steel, when used for mining purposes; Wrought Iron or other pipes, to be used in transmitting steam, compressed air or water through the underground or open pit workings, and from the point of accumulation to the point of exit; Hoisting and Hauling Cables, to be used in the lifting and transporting of coal or ore from the working face to the point of shipment; Machinery, or other equipment to be used in conveying coal or ore from the mine or from the workings to the surface; Provided; that should any of the foregoing mentioned articles in this section be used for any other purpose than that for which they are here set forth, they shall be dealt with as smuggled goods, to be subject to all the provisions in such cases provided under the Customs Acts, 1898 to 1905. The words "machinery" in this item are not to include or relate to steam boilers, or parts

thereof, ad val.	10 p.c.	package in which it is imported, ad val.	10 p.c.
Motor Engines, other than steam, when imported for agricultural purposes, and to be used in vessels owned in this Colony and employed in its fisheries, ad val.	10 p.c.	Music, written, ad val.	10 p.c.
Manures and Fertilisers of all kinds, and Sulphuric Acid, when imported to be used in the manufacture of manures, ad val.	10 p.c.	Oil Cake, Oil Cake Meal, Cotton Seed Cake, Cotton Seed Meal, Pease Meal, Bran and other preparations for cattle and chicken feed, ad val.	10 p.c.
Material for sheathing the bottom of vessels, such as Zinc, Copper, and Composition metal, together with Nails and Paper for felt, which may be used for or under such sheathing when used for sheathing vessels, under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council; Casings or Copings and Lockings for timber of dories; and Lignum Vitae, ad val.	10 p.c.	Ores, to be used as flux, ad val.	10 p.c.
Boards and Planks of hardwood over eighteen feet in length, when imported for shipbuilding; Mast Pieces of Pitch Pine, Oregon Pine, or similar hardwood; Timber of hardwood when imported for shipbuilding; Galvanized Iron Bars and Bolts, Galvanized Nails, pressed or wrought, Spikes and Windlasses, when imported for the construction of new ships, upon such certificate as may be required by the Minister of Finance and Customs, ad val.	10 p.c.	Paper, known as Soiling Paper, and Papers to be used by manufacturers in enclosing their manufactures; Tin, in sheets and blocks and solder; Printed and Lithographed Labels when imported by persons engaged in the manufacture of fish tins or packages or in the preserving of fish for market, provided that the labels cannot be manufactured in this Colony; Ammonia, when imported for refrigerating purposes; and Mineral and Lubricating Oils when imported by Cold Storage Companies for use in connection with their machinery; Lead Sheets, Steel and Wood Boxes and Labels when imported by Tea dealers, to be used by them in Packing Tea in small packages, ad val.	10 p.c.
Molasses produced in the West India Islands, in the process of the manufacture of sugar from the juice of sugar cane, and the		Shooks, Tins, and other coverings with labels, when imported by manufacturers for their use in the manufacture of Tobacco, ad val.	10 p.c.
		Plants, Trees and Shrubs; also seeds for Agricultural purposes, N. E. S., and Florists' Seeds, ad val.	10 p.c.
		Printing Paper, Printing Presses, Printing Types,	

Printer's Ink and Printers' Office Furniture when imported by bona fide printers for use in their business ad val.	10 p.c.
Rice, Uncleaned or Refuse Rice, ad val.	10 p.c.
Sand and Fire Clay; Sausage Skins or Castings, ad val.	10 p.c.
Scrap-iron and Scrap-steel (old), and fit only to be manufactured, being part of or recovered from any vessel wrecked in waters subject to the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, ad val.	10 p.c.
Steel Shafting, when imported for use in steam vessels, ad val.	10 p.c.
Stereotypes, Electrotypes and Celluloids for Almanacs, Calendars, Illustrated Pamphlets, Newspapers, Advertisements or Engravings, and all other like work for commercial, trade or other purposes, and matrices or copper shells for the same, ad val.	10 p.c.
Material for installing wireless telegraphy on board ships engaged in the trade and fisheries of the Colony, ad val.	10 p.c.
Wheat, whole, not ground or crushed, ad val.	10 p.c.
Works of Art, viz:—Paintings in oil or water colors, by artists of well known merit, or copies of the old masters by such artists; and paintings in oil and water colors, the production of Newfoundland artists, under regulations prescribed by the Governor in Council, and engravings, when produced by the Art Union Society of London, ad val. ...	10 p.c.

2.—Schedule B of the said Act, amended as aforesaid, is hereby further amended by striking out therefrom the words and figures following:—

Admiralty Charts.
Agricultural Implements and Machinery, N. E. S., and Hay-binders, Bone Crushers, Hay and Feed Cutters, Air Motors, Churns, Cream Separators and Incubators; Wire Fencing and fasteners for the same; Gates for wire fences, when the gates are made chiefly of wire.
Animals, imported by Agricultural Societies, or by private persons, under the approval of the Governor in Council, for the improvement of stock, and Poultry when imported for breeding purposes.

Bark, Extract of Bark, Cutch, Bichromate of potash, Logwood.

Boiler and Ships' Plates, when of the thickness of one-quarter of an inch or over that thickness.

Books, printed and not to be written or drawn upon and supplements for periodicals specially imported for the bona fide use of incorporated institutes; official reports, newspapers, and monthly and semi-monthly magazines; Weekly library papers unbound, and Christmas Annuals.

Blackboards, specimens, medals and wall diagrams, illustrative of natural history and imported for colleges, school and public libraries; Kindergarten requisites, and Catalogues and price lists of persons, firms and companies domiciled elsewhere, and not personally doing business here.

Chair case or Reeds of Withrod, when imported in an unmanufactured state.

Engravers' Plates of Steel, polished, for engraving thereupon; Photo Machinery, viz—

Router, Beveling and Squaring Machines, Screen-holders, Cross line Screens, Chemicals, for use in engraving, Wood for blocking, graving tools and Process Plates.

Hoop Iron or Hoop Steel, slayed, punched or nosed, and cut in lengths not to exceed sixty-eight inches, to be used in making herring barrels.

Indian Corn.

Junk, Old Iron, Old Copper, and Old Composition Metal.

Machinery of all kinds to be used in the actual breaking of coal or ore bodies underground or in the open pit, viz:—Rock Drills, Coal Cutters, Pumping Engines of all kinds, to be used in transferring water from the underground, or open pit workings, to the surface; Hoisting Engines or other machinery to be used as a motive power to lift ores or coals from underground, or from an open pit, to the surface; Crushers or other machinery, to be used in the actual breaking of ores, so as to facilitate refining or transportation; Special machinery of all kinds, to be used for the washing, concentration, reduction, or the refining of any ore or coal, or for the manufacture of Brick; Prospecting Drills of all kinds, to be used for proving the extent or existence underground of coal, oil or ore bodies; Crane and Derricks, when used for the actual handling of coal or ore from the working to the surface; Compressors to be used for the operation of any of the above machines; Fire Clay and Fire Brick, to be used in the construction of any ore reduction or Smelting Plant; Dynamite, Detonators, Blasting Powder. Fuses of all kinds; Blasting Batteries, Battery wire and Drill Steel, when used for mining purposes; Wrought Iron or other Pipes, to be used in transmitting steam, compressed air or water through the underground or open pit workings, and from the point of accumulation to the point of exit; Hoisting and Hauling Cables, to be used in the lifting and transporting of coal or ore from the working face to the point of shipment. Machinery, or other equipment to be used in conveying

coal or ore from the working face to the point of shipment. Machinery, or other equipment to be used in conveying coal or ore from the mine or from the workings to the surface: Provided that should any of the foregoing mentioned articles in this section be used for any other purpose than that for which they are here set forth as being duty free, they shall be dealt with as smuggled goods, and be subject to all the provisions in such cases provided under the Customs' Act, 1898 to 1905. The words 'machinery' in this item are not to include or relate to steam boilers or parts thereof.

Manures and Fertilizers of all kinds, and Sulphuric Acid, when imported to be used in the manufacture of manures.

Material for sheathing the bottoms of vessels, such as Zinc, Copper, and Composition Metal, together with nails, and paper or felt, which may be used for or under such sheathing when used for sheathing vessels, under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council; Casings or Copings and Lockings for timber or dorles; and Lignum Vitae.

Boards and Planks of hardwood over eighteen feet in length, when imported for ship-building; mast-pieces of Pitch-pine, Oregon-pine, or similar hardwood when imported for ship-building; galvanized Iron bars and bolts, galvanized nails, pressed or wrought, spikes and windlasses when imported for the construction of new ships, under such certificate as may be required by the Minister of Finance and Customs.

Molasses, produced in the West India Islands, in the process of the manufacture of sugar from the juice of the sugar cane, and the package in which it is imported.

Oil Cake, Oil Cake Meal, Cotton Seed Cake, Cotton Seed Meal, Pease Meal, Bran, and other preparations

for cattle and chicken feed.

Ores to be used as Flux.

Paper, known as Solling Paper, and Papers to be used by manufacturers in enclosing their manufactures. Tin in sheets and blocks and solder; printed and lithographed labels when imported by persons engaged in the manufacture of fish tins or packages or in the preserving of fish for market, provided that the labels cannot be manufactured in this Colony; Ammonia, when imported for refrigerating purposes; and Mineral and Lubricating Oils when imported by Cold Storage Companies for use in connection with their machinery; Lead Sheets, Steel and Wood boxes and Labels when imported by Tea dealers, to be used by them in packing tea in small packages.

Printing Paper, Printing Presses, Printing Types, Printers' Ink and Printers' Office Furniture, when imported by bona fide printers for use in their business.

Shooks, tins and other covering when imported by manufacturers for use in the manufacture of tobacco.

Rice, uncleaned or Refuse Rice.

Sand and Fire-Clay, Sausage Skins or Casings.

Scrap-iron and Scrap-Steel (old), and fit only to be re-manufactured, being part of or recovered from any vessel wrecked in waters subject to the jurisdiction of Newfoundland.

Steel Shaftings, when imported for use in steam vessels.

Stereotypes, Electrotypes and Celluloids for Almanacs, Calendars, Illustrated Pamphlets, Newspapers, Advertisements or Engravings, and all other

like work for commercial, trade or other purposes, and matrices or copper shells for the same.

Material for installing wireless telegraphs on board ships engaged in the trade and fisheries of the Colony.

Wheat, whole, not ground or crushed.

Works of Art, viz:—Paintings in oil or water colours, by artists of well known merit, or copies of the old masters by such artists; and paintings in oil in water colors, the production of Newfoundland artists, under regulations prescribed by the Governor in Council, and engravings, when produced by the Art Union Society of London.

3.—The surtax of 10 per cent. provided by the Act 4, George V., Cap. 25, entitled "An Act to further amend the Revenue Act, 1905," shall apply to all duties imposed hereunder, and to all duties imposed by any Act amending the Revenue Act, 1905, at present in force.

4.—This Act shall not affect in any way any right granted to any Company by Statute or under any contract with the Government confirmed by the Legislature.

5.—Section 5 of Act 1, Geo. V., Cap. 71, entitled, "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905," is hereby repealed.

6.—Section 3 of the Act 5, Geo. V., Session 1, Cap. 12, entitled, "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905," is hereby repealed.

7.—This Act shall be held in force and to take effect as from the 21st day of May, 1915, at 9.30 o'clock in the morning.

Statement of Current Account of the Government for the year 1913-14.
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE BUDGET.
DR.

Customs Revenue	\$2,345,549.36	
Light Dues	27,295.75	
Harbour Dues	571.00	
Royalties	92,509.32	
Postal Revenue	\$ 216,425.71	
Telegraph Revenues	96,689.24	
Crown Lands	145,921.29	
Stamp Revenue	18,151.88	
Liquor Licenses	5,096.45	
Fines and Forfeitures	5,221.18	
Broom Department	9,229.57	
Fees Institutions	4,459.29	
Miscellaneous	25,991.22	
Municipal Council	66,312.64	
Carbonear Water Company	1,979.60	
Telegraph Tax	25,467.27	
Bank Tax	12,000.00	
Express Tax	2,000.00	
Insurance Licenses	300.00	
Insurance Assessment	938.85	
		535,015.39
Balance due Bank of Montreal being excess of Expenditure over Revenue for the year		301,849.26
		\$3,920,178.21
Loan 1st George V., Cap. 22	\$ 1,729.92	
Loan 4th George V., Cap. 24	145,574.65	
Surplus Trust	115,769.94	
Loan 4th George 5th, Cap. 23, Railway Loan, 1912	25,668.47	301,732.99
		\$4,221,911.30

CR.

Head	I. Interest, etc., on Public Debt	\$1,115,294.22
	II. Civil Government	276,722.26
	III. Pensions	18,125.42
	IV. Administration of Justice	191,421.84
	V. Legislation	62,896.23
	VI. Education	368,923.66
	VII. Public Charities	429,593.29
	VIII. Light Houses	112,721.58
	IX. Agriculture and Mines	61,231.44
	X. Marine and Fisheries	195,758.47
	XI. Roads, Bridges and Ferries	188,965.67
	XII. Post Office	690,444.84
	XIII. Customs	290,822.51
	XIV. General Contingencies	19,972.03
		\$3,902,996.82

Audit Act. (see 33b.)		17,181.69	
			<hr/>
			\$3,920,178.21
Loan 1st George V., Cap. 32	\$	1,720.03	
Loan 4th George V., Cap. 24		145,574.65	
Surplus Trust		118,769.94	
Loan 4th George V., Cap. 23		35,668.47	301,733.09
			<hr/>
			\$4,221,911.30

M. P. CASHIN,
Minister of Finance.

Examined by me and found correct,

F. C. BERTEAU,
C. A. & G.

Balance Sheet of Treasury Account for the Year 1913-14.

DR.

Imported Copper, Bank of Montreal	\$	495.88	
Bank of Montreal, General Account		120,360.31	
Revenue Expenditure		301,849.36	
Bank of Montreal, Railway Loan, 1914		312,179.59	
Bank of Montreal, Temporary Loan		460,000.00	
Bank of Montreal, Trust Account		517,637.10	
Harbor Grace Water Company, Stock Account		13,700.00	
Public Debt, Sundry Accounts		30,450,765.27	
			<hr/>
			\$32,176,987.51

CR.

Bank of Montreal, Imported Copper	\$	495.88	
Debenture Conversion	\$	32.15	
Loan 1st George 5th Cap. 32		22,014.93	
Loan 4th George 5th Cap. 24		98,313.23	
			<hr/>
			120,360.31
Bank of Montreal, Exchequer Account		301,849.36	
Bank of Montreal, Railway Loan, 1914		312,179.59	
Bank of Montreal, Temporary Loan		460,000.00	
Agricultural Bonus		939.69	
Loan 61 Vic.		10,900.00	
Surplus Trust		6,897.41	
Reserve Fund		500,000.00	
			<hr/>
			517,637.10
Harbour Grace Water Company			13,700.00
Sundry Accounts, Public Debt.			30,450,765.27
			<hr/>
			\$32,176,987.51

M. P. CASHIN,
Minister of Finance.

Examined by me and found correct,

F. C. BERTEAU,
C. A. & G.

Public Debt to June 30th, 1914.

DR.	
Loan at 3 per cent	\$ 1,581,666.66
Loan at 3½ per cent	18,905,548.65
Loan at 4 per cent	9,962,551.96
	\$30,450,767.27
CR.	
Act 54 Vic. Cap. 8, at 3 p.c.	\$1,581,666.66
Act 56 Vic. Cap. 1	\$2,384,960.00
Act 56 Vic. Cap. 2	4,708,800.00
Act 60 Vic. Cap. 4	456,580.00
Act 61-3 Vic. Cap 6 and 4	351,372.22
Act 1 Ed. VII. Cap. 6	2,263,000.00
Act 5 Ed. VII. Cap. 2	1,900,423.22
Act 10 Ed. VII. Cap 27	1,892,322.22
Act 2 Geo. V. Cap. 18	1,946,666.66
at 2½ p.c.	18,905,548.65
Act 46-7 Vic. Cap. 5 and 4	2,500.00
Act 49 Vic. Cap. 15	2,200.00
Act 49 Vic. Cap. 2	60,000.00
Act 50 Vic. Cap. 6	480,000.00
Act 50 Vic. Cap. 7	320,000.00
Act 51 Vic. Cap. 3	50,000.00
Act 51 Vic. Cap. 5	218,000.00
Act 51 Vic. Cap. 5	2,550.00
Act 52 Vic. Cap. 5	408,000.00
Act 56 Vic. Cap. 1	23,261.84
Act 56 Vic. Cap. 4	8,000.00
Act 58 Vic. Cap. 12	2,678,666.66
Act 59 Vic. Cap. 15	4,000.00
Act 60 Vic. Cap. 2	972,322.22
Act 61 Vic. Cap. 10	10,419.92
Act 61-2-3 Vic. Cap. 23	21,854.00
Act 2 Ed. VII. Cap. 28	5,000.00
Act 4 Ed. VII. Cap. 18	1,200.00
Act 5 Ed. VII. Cap. 1	2,858,750.00
Act 9 Ed. VII. Cap. 3	280,000.00
Act 10 Ed. VII. Cap. 7	90,000.00
Act 1 Geo. V. Cap. 22	384,750.00
Act 4 Geo. V. Cap. 23	972,322.22
Act 59 Vic. Cap. 25	9,292.88
at 4 p.c.	9,962,551.96
	\$30,450,767.27

*NOTE: \$698,104.65 paid off by Sinking Fund.
Municipal Dept. \$1,422,294.22.
Harbor Grace Stock, \$112,700.00.

M. P. CASHIN,
Examined by me and found correct,
F. C. BERTEAU,
C. & A. G.
Minister of Finance.

ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES

1915-1916.

HEAD I.—INTEREST ON PUBLIC DEBT.

Estimated amount \$25,000.00

HEAD IV.—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

(a) Supreme Court.

First Bailiff \$ 470.00

Second Bailiff 470.00

\$940.00

HEAD VI.—SCHOOL INSPECTION

Church of England Assistant \$100.00

Methodist Assistant 100.00

\$200.00

HEAD VIII.—LIGHTHOUSES.

NIPPER'S HARBOR.

Special—Concrete foundation to replace original wooden shores \$400.00

LONG ISLAND, N. D. B.

Special—Roof of store to be renewed. Nails, felt and glass for dwelling. Well to be blasted 8 or 10 feet deeper 400.00

BROOKE'S POINT. (JOE BATT'S ARM.)

Special—Small store and new boom 175.00

PUFFIN ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE.

Special—Slate roof and granite building require general repairs 200.00

SHOE COVE POINT.

Special—Cellar required 50.00

DENIER ISLAND.

Special—Mast and boom. Repairs to damaged lanes. 225.00

HAPPY ADVENTURE.

Special—Small house to lantern light frame 100.00

CAPE DONAVISTA LIGHTHOUSE.

Special—Repairs to roof and felting 600.00

GREEN ISLAND LIGHT AND ALARM.

Special—House water supply tank. Outside wood covering needs renewal and landing repaired 250.00

FORT POINT FOG ALARM.

Special—Landing wharf required 250.00

RAGGED ISLAND, TRINITY BAY.

Special—New boom 50.00

RANDOM HEAD.

Special—North end of building requires repairs 400.00

BACCALIEU IS. LIGHTHOUSE.

Special—Roof of old dwelling requires shingles and repairs 500.00

BACCALIEU FOG ALARM.

Special—Iron ladder 100.00

CAPE ST. FRANCIS.

Special—Repairs to tower and material 500.00

BEAR'S COVE HEAD, FERMEUSE.

Special—Lumber for floor, stays to alarm building. concrete blocks and labour 200.00

POWELL'S HEAD.

Special Tramway repairs and fencing 100.00

CAPE PINE.

Special—Landing of inside tower needs renewing. dwelling clapboarded and new sills to kitchen windows 205.00

CAPE ST. MARY'S.		PASS ISLAND LIGHT	
Special—Repairs to station	500.00	HOUSE.	
POINT LATINE.		Special—Dwelling to be in-	
Special—Gallery of tower		spected and special	
leaky, needs over-		report made. Prob-	
hauling and re-		able cost	1,500.00
pairs.	100.00	PASS ISLAND FOG AL-	
LAMALINE.		ARM.	
Special—Addition to dwell-		Special—Purchase of land	100.00
ing and iron tower	2,000.00	CHANNEL HEAD.	
BOAR ISLAND.		Special—Store and porch	
Special—Repairs to station		60'00 " " " " " " " "	
required, cost sub-		of dwelling to be	
ject to special re-		SANDY POINT.	
port, probable cost	500.00	Special—Picket fencing ar-	
ISLE AUX MORTS.		ound lighthouse to	
Special—Small addition to		retain beach.	50.00
sleeping room. Small		DOUBLE ISLAND.	
landing slip.	100.00	Special—New mast and	
BRUNETTE ISLAND.		boom	50.00
Special—South-East corner			
of cave and base-			\$10,975.00
ment need repair,		HEAD IX.—AGRICULTURE AND	
also new porch . . .	100.00	MINES.	
GARNISH.		Salary—Analyst	\$ 1,600.00
Special—Roof of store re-		HEAD X.—MARINE AND FISHER-	
quires covering . . .	40.00	IES.	
BELLEORAM.		Fogo Wharf	\$ 6,000.00
Special Shingling gable end	70.00	Fortune Pier	5,000.00
ST. JACQUES.			\$11,000.00
Special—New boom	50.00	HEAD XII.—POST OFFICE.	
ROCKY POINT, (HAR-		Assistant Postmaster, Bay	
BOR BRETON.)		Roberts	\$480.00
Special—Shingling roof . .	20.00	HEAD XV.—WAR PENSIONS.	
SAGONA.		War Pensions	\$10,000.00
Special—Repairs to water		HEAD XVI.	
tank	40.00	For Prohibition Plebiscite .	\$20,000.00
		Total	\$183,295.00

SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPLY, 1914-15.

HEAD II.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT, \$30,339.41

Premier's Office—	
Contingencies	\$ 1,500.00
Colonial Secretary's Office—	
Census, Births, Marriages and Deaths	\$2,220.00
Consolidation of Laws	3,524.41
Sealing Commission of Enquiry	2,500.00
	<hr/>
	8,224.41
Finance Department—	
Contingencies, Colonial Secretary's Office	\$1,000.00
Contingencies, Government House	500.00
	<hr/>
	1,500
Marine and Fisheries—	
Salaries and Contingencies	3,600.00
Public Works—	
Fuel and Light	\$2,750.00
Insurance and Keepers	1,335.00
Repairs Public Buildings	8,580.00
Amount required to cover outstanding bills	2,200.00
	<hr/>
	14,865.00
Government Engineer's Office	1,150.00
	<hr/>
	\$30,839.41

HEAD IV.—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, \$9,837.50

Colonial Secretary's Office—	
Court Houses and Gaols	\$ 20.00
Police Annuities	187.50
Registration of Jurors	300.00
Constabulary, Uniforms	700.00
Constabulary, Salaries, Cable Service	3,500.00
Constabulary, Conveyance	400.00
Additional Aid Fire Department	300.00
	<hr/>
	5,407.50
Finance Department—	
Supreme Court Contingencies	\$ 750.00
Magistrates Contingencies	1,500.00
	<hr/>
	2,250.00
Public Works—	
Police station, German Prisoners	130.00
Supplies, Maintenance Penitentiary	300.00
Outports, German Prisoners	1,750.00
	<hr/>
	2,180.00
	<hr/>
	\$9,837.50

HEAD V.—LEGISLATION, \$13,174.76.

Finance Department—	
Legislative Council	915.65
House of Assembly	11,421.11
General Legislation	588.00
	<u>112,924.76</u>
Public Works—	
Fuel and Light, Colonial Building	250.00
	<u>112,174.76</u>

HEAD VI.—EDUCATION, \$200.00.

Colonial Secretary's Office—	
Assistant Superintendents Education, two at \$100 each	200.00

HEAD VII.—PUBLIC CHARITIES, \$43,817.50.

Public Charities—	
Able Bodied Poor Relief	120,000.00
Public Works—	
Salaries, etc., Lunatic Asylum	\$ 4,287.50
Salaries etc., General Hospital	17,800.00
Salaries etc., Poor Asylum	1,440.00
Maintenance, Lazaretto	230.00
	<u>23,817.50</u>
	<u>\$43,817.50</u>

HEAD VIII.—LIGHT HOUSES, \$9,450.00.

To cover outstanding bills	\$ 450.00
To cover short vote	9,000.00
	<u>9,450.00</u>

HEAD X.—MARINE AND FISHERIES, \$21,740.00.

Repairs, dockage and supplies, S. S. "Fiona"	\$ 9,000.00
Repairs, dockage and supplies, account Dredge	2,000.00
Lobster Propagation	2,700.00
Increase in Boatman's Salary, omitted in estimates	40.00
Game and Inland Fisheries	6,000.00
	<u>21,740.00</u>

HEAD XII.—CUSTOMS, \$7,000.00.

Refunds, General	7,000.00
------------------------	----------

HEAD XIV.—GENERAL CONTINGENCIES.

Amount required on this account	\$32,061.80
---------------------------------------	-------------

RECAPITULATION.

Head II. Civil Government	\$20,825.41
IV. Justice	9,837.50
V. Legislation	13,174.76
VI. Education	200.00
VII. Charities	43,817.50
VIII. Light Houses	9,450.00
X. Fisheries	21,740.00
XIII. Customs	7,000.00
XIV. Contingencies	32,061.80
	<u>\$168,120.97</u>

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 Tuesday next.

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

HOUSE PROCEEDINGS.

MR. KENT asked leave to move that the Rules for the Proceedings of the House of Assembly be amended by adding thereto the following:—"There shall be a standing committee of the House to be designated the Committee of Public Accounts for the examination of the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by the Legislature to meet the Public Expenditure, and of all other accounts shown; expenses from public moneys for any purpose to consist of seven members who shall be appointed by the Speaker at the commencement of every session and of whom three shall be a quorum."

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution I beg to say its object is to grant to the Legislature more control over public expenditure. I think the absence of a committee of public accounts is one of the reasons for our absence of control over public expenditures. A committee such as this is in existence in every other parliament. They have one in the English parliament. In fact I may say that the rule which I propose is a copy of the Bill which is acted upon at home in the House of Commons. They have a similar rule in the Canadian Parliament in each of the Provincial legislatures. They have it also in the Commonwealth of Australia and in South Africa. I do not wish in moving this rule to have any feeling of partisanship or to aim it in any way

at the Government of the present day. I simply move it in order to obtain a parliamentary control over public moneys. I think it is most desirable and that its necessity is proved by the number of questions sent to the departments which would be quite unnecessary if we had such a Committee.

The Committee will of course, sir, be appointed by you at the beginning of each session. It should consist of men from both sides of the House, so that the public accounts will receive an impartial enquiry. The authority of the Committee will be the same as that of the committees in England with power to summon witnesses from departments or elsewhere in relation to any particular item of account. If the Committee wishes to enquire into any expenditure during the year it can do so and it will report to this House its findings from time to time.

The present system is not a system at all. The public accounts are brought up here at the beginning of each session and tabled but the members of the House have no proper opportunity for investigating them.

The law relating to representation of members in the House of Assembly provides for altering of rules. In order to pass an amendment there must be at least two-thirds of the members of the whole House to vote.

I beg to move the alteration of the rules of the House by the addition of this one.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, I can see no possible objection to the proposal of my hon. friend and as far as those on this side of the House are concerned they accept the spirit in which the motion is made. We have no objection to the very fullest enquiry and investigation by the Committee in relation to public accounts and any enquiry held un-

der the auspices of a committee of this House will be to the advantage of the members. If any account comes here from any department it should come with every explanation and prepared for the fullest enquiry.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

And there being twenty-four members present in their place in the House (exclusive of the Speaker) namely, Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Colonial Secretary, the Minister of Finance and Customs, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crossbie, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister of Public Works and Messrs. Moulton, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Parsons, Devereaux, Downey, Moore, Higgins, LeFevvre, Walsh, Kent, Clift, Lloyd, Clapp, Grimes Abbott, Winsor, Targett, Stone, Halfyard, Coaker.

And the said twenty-eight members being present, it was ordered that the motion do pass, and that the said rules be amended in compliance with the said motion.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and to continue for a further period the Act 5 Geo. V. Sess. I. entitled "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in the Colony," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

Mr. Targett gave notice of question.

RAILWAY LOAN BILL.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow, ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the raising of a sum of money by loan for the extension of

the railway system of the Colony.

PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN BILL.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the raising of a sum of money by loan for the public service of the Colony.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, May 21st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 21st, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker I have been handed petitions which I beg leave to present on behalf of the Horwood Lumber Co., Mr. E. Collishaw, Franklin's Agencies, Bishop, Sons & Co., Dowring Bros., M. S. Sullivan, A. E. Read Co., P. Templeman and Monroe & Co. in relation to the exportation of pit props. In presenting this petition, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I do so at the request of the parties named, but my own views on the matter are that I shall require to be fully convinced by enquiry as to the wisdom of granting this petition. I don't think that the Legislation that was passed last session should be allowed to be used beyond the scope which was given last year, but as these men appear to consider that they have a grievance, I would ask that the subject matter of the petition be enquired into by the Government, with a view to ascertain whether any inquiry is being done or not. I would ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Finance & Customs.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I might say that the matter referred to in the petition is now under consideration of the Government. All allowances will be made in order to give these people what is considered reasonable time.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to lay on the table of the House answer to question asked by the hon. member for Fogo on yesterday in relation to some agricultural matters. The vouchers are originals.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to call attention to the fact—and I should like the Minister of Public Works to be here—that a good many questions have been asked that have not been answered. I appreciate the fact that an effort is being made by a good many of the Departments to supply answers, but some departments are not like others in this respect. I had a question on the order paper of May 7th, and have not yet received a reply. It seems to be important, and I would like the Speaker to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to that matter.

MR. COAKER.—With regard to the answering of questions, I might say that I am very thankful to the Minister of Marine & Fisheries and to the Colonial Secretary for the manner in which they have replied to questions which have been asked them, but there are Departments which we find it very difficult to get information from. I want to say that if on Tuesday the information that we have asked for is not tabled I shall give notice of moving an address to the Government asking to have the information produced.

The Speaker notified the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council stating that they had passed the Act entitled "An

Act respecting the Establishment of a Permanent Marine Disaster Fund" with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Twillingate what are the questions to which he refers as not having been answered?

MR. COAKER.—I will get you a list if you wish.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Thank you very much.

On motion, the Council's amendments to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing what was the extra work done by the Customs Officer at Greenspond in the year 1913-14, for which he received the amount of \$49.98 per quarter.

MR. CLAPP asked the Minister of Public Works why the motor boat plying between Woody Point and Norris Point is not running, and why a ferry row boat has been reinstated, and if it is the intention of the Government to continue same or not.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—The answer to that is being prepared.

Question No. 2 was ordered to stand over as the Minister of Public Works was not in the House.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary what action the Government has taken in reference to the improvement at the railway stations at Northern Bight, Long Harbor Crossing and Bay Bulls Arm.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

In reference to this matter I may say that last year, immediately after the House closed, I laid it in the hands of the Government Engineer with a request for a report. I have to-day asked him for the report, and he hopes to have it ready by Tuesday.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amount of able bodied poor relief given out by Relieving Officer or others at each settlement in the District of Trinity from January 1st, 1915, to date.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That statement is in course of preparation.

MR. CLAPP asked the Minister of Public Works if a motor boat was plying between Woody Point and Norris Point in 1913, and by whom was the gasoline supplied. Further, whether the motor boat was running in 1914 or not, and was the supply of said gasoline to run said boat refused by the Government or any department of the Government in that year or not. And by whose order was the supply of gasoline given, and by whom supplied.

Question 5 was ordered to stand over, as the Minister of Public Works was not in the House.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a copy of all moneys paid out for able bodied poor relief by Poor Commissioners and others in the Districts of Hr. Grace and Hr. Main, giving the amounts paid out at each settlement from Jan. 1st, 1915, to date.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That reply is being prepared.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing whether a lightkeeper has been appointed at New Perlican in the District of Trinity. If so, give

the name of the man appointed. If an appointment is to be made will the recommendations of the members for the district be accepted.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—In reply to the hon. member I beg to inform him that all the applications for that lighthouse are now in the hands of the Government for consideration. I think I know the reason why the hon. member asks whether any appointment has been made. There is an application amongst the number which has gone to the Government, and I have no doubt he would like to know whether that application has been recommended. If he will let the matter stand for a little while he will find out. I think that every person who knows anything about that application is in its favour.

BANK FISHERY BILL.

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

PACKING CO. BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act confirming an Agreement between the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland-American Packing Co."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD.—Is it correct that the only alteration is that in Clause 5?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is the only one.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill without amendment.

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

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting certain retiring allowances."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of committee.

MR. COAKER.—May I ask what proportion of the salary is the pension. Is it two-thirds in every case?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Yes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reported that the Committee had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the same without amendment.

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

PRODUCTS CORPORATION AGREEMENT BILL.

On the motion for the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to confirm an Agreement entered into by the Government of the Colony with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited," Mr. Kent moved, and Mr. Coaker seconded, the following amendment:

"That in view of the extensive power to control the development of the natural resources of the Colony within the extensive drainage areas covered by the concessions granted in perpetuity to the Company under the agreement forming the schedule to the Act and of the unlimited time for which the exemption from taxation is

given and the absence of any sufficient safeguards in the agreement to protect private rights and vested interests and also of the absence of sufficient information regarding the subject matters comprised in and effected by the said agreement and other matters, it will be in the best interests of the Colony that the consideration of the agreement and its ratification by this House be deferred until the session of the Legislature to be held in the year 1916 and that in the meantime the Government take all necessary steps to acquire full and accurate information regarding the areas, powers, concessions, rights, and privileges proposed to be granted to the Company and of the effect of their being so granted."

Whereupon the House divided; and there appeared for the amendment: Messrs Kent, Lloyd, Clapp, Grimes, Abbott, Winsor, Targett, Stone, Halfyard, Coaker, Morine (11); and against it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Moulton, Moore, Morris, Parsons, Currie, Devereaux, LeFeuvre, Downey, Walsh, (16); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for the second reading was put; and there appeared for the motion: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Moulton, Moore, Morris, Parsons, Currie, Devereaux, LeFeuvre, Downey, Walsh, (16); and against it: Messrs. Kent, Lloyd, Clapp, Grimes, Abbott, Winsor, Targett, Stone, Halfyard, Coaker, Morine (11); so it passed in the affirmative; and was ordered accordingly.

It was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time, and 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 Tuesday next, May 25th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

MR. COAKER.—I want to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a representation which I have received of the condition of the S.S. *Enphrates*. She is said to be unseaworthy. I just wish to request that a commission be sent to report on the matter.

MR. LLOYD.—A day or two ago, the Colonial Secretary tabled a statement of the amount paid for public messages to Halifax. That service might be improved very greatly. In saying this, I am in no way finding fault with the work done; \$250 is distributed between two persons, each getting \$125. We cannot expect much for that sum. The messages could be shortened with advantage, and made more concise. In that way, money might be saved.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker after the outbreak of the war, I sent to the post office to inquire if there had been any additional charge for the public message; and I was told that up to that time they had not received a bill for any messages. I found out on applying to the cable authorities that there was a bill for 21 months for \$630. I do not know how that was made up. It was apparently a guess on their part. A Mr. Wier of Halifax, gets \$260 for the compiling of the messages and that is all. The Eastern Press Association gets the messages first, then Halifax, then the "Halifax Herald," and then it comes to us. That is exclusive of any charge over our own line. Now the messages at present cost about

\$1220; and we get \$300 from each of the newspapers. That is \$1500 received against \$1220 expended. Now I agree with the hon. member that we are paying Mr. Wier very little for the work that he has to do, which has been greatly increased by the war; and also that some arrangements should be made to improve the service. At present the messages are sent haphazard. I will take the matter up with Mr. Wier and see if the messages could be made more concise. If we reduce the number of words, we can hand the difference of the cost over to Mr. Wier. That is the case as it stands. I will see what I can do in the matter.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of boiling down the messages, but of eliminating the repetition which is so prevalent in our messages.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I think that the fault is with the fact that the work is divided between the two editors; when repetition is sure to result.

MR. LLOYD.—That cannot be, because one is the editor of the morning paper and the other of the evening paper.

MR. COAKER.—I might say that the Government is making \$300 profit out of the newspapers. Now, we do not object to that, but we want you to spend the same amount of money now spent by the Government, on an up-to-date service. These men at Halifax ought to be paid a fair salary, we should then get a better service. The matter should be put in the hands of the Colonial Secretary, and I believe that he will give us satisfaction.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, I have known Mr. Wier personally for a long time. He is the Editor of the Evening Mail. The news that we do not get is largely due to his desire not to go beyond any limit that might be

set. I follow the Canadian papers and I notice that there is not much difference in their messages and ours. I should like to see some arrangements made with Mr. Wier, whereby some improvements could be made.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker I should just like to say that, although there have been mistakes made by Mr. Wier, we cannot complain, on account of the absurdly small sum we pay him. But whatever improvements we can make, shall be made.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 25th, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns of all expenses in connection with fire patrol from George's Brook to Southern Bay, B.B., showing in detail, how much money was paid on account of fire, and the names of persons to whom the money was paid during the years 1912, 1914 and 1915, to date.

Also asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing whether the Government intends to grant the petition of the electors of Brooklyn, B. H., re the matter of removing Post Office from the extreme end of that place to the central part of it; if so, when?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The first part of that question should be referred to the Department of Agriculture and Mines. The answer to the second part I now table.

I beg leave to table the correspondence asked for by Dr. Lloyd in reference to railway stations.

MR. LLOYD.—The Premier promis-

ed to table his instructions in reference to the state of the railway.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the reply to the question asked by Mr. Targett in reference to poor relief, and another reply to questions asked by Mr. Stone.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador Coast" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow. **PACKING CO. AGREEMENT BILL.**

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act confirming an Agreement between the Government of the Colony and the Newfoundland-American Packing Company" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

MARINE DISASTERS FUND BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the amendments made by the Council in and

upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the establishment of a Permanent Marine Disasters Fund" were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD.—I wish to remind the Minister that on Thursday it was stated that the resolutions were to be printed and distributed on Friday. Then it was decided to send them around on Saturday but that was not done. I don't think we ought to go into Committee to-day. I do not know if it is the intention to pass this measure as it stands. It seems to me that we are rushing matters on one or two points that ought to be given careful consideration. Now in section 24 we find: "It shall be lawful for all clergymen and duly qualified druggists doing business in this Colony to import wine for sacramental purposes." Now what I want to get at is this is it the intention to have the provision with reference to druggists in that section at all. So far as I can make out from the rest of the Act there is no provision made for the sale of sacramental wine by druggists. I do not think the Bill has been examined as a whole to see how the sections fit one with another. There is another point. What is the penalty for a druggist failing to keep his books. And also as far as I can see I

do not think there is any penalty on a druggist for selling intoxicants. There is a penalty on medical practitioners but none on druggists. I think you ought to raise the Committee and give an opportunity of looking into these things.

MR. HIGGINS.—If the hon. member will refer to the section which defines "intoxicating liquors" he will see that sacramental wine is not an intoxicating liquor.

MR. LLOYD.—Then there is no object in section 24.

MR. HIGGINS.—There is no object because to-day anyone can import it.

MR. LLOYD.—There is another point; about the fine. It seems there is no fine for sale of intoxicants by druggists.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—With a view to making one or two amendments I would move that the Committee rise and report progress.

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.

GRAND BANK WATER CO. BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Grand Bank Water Company."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill with some amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and to continue for a further period the Act 5, Geo. V., Sess. 1, entitled "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in the Colony" was read a second time.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to move the second reading of this bill.

It will be remembered I think that the Act passed here last session contained legislation for only one year. Under Section 11 of that Act it is provided that that Act shall continue in force for one year from the date thereof. It is therefore now necessary that the duration of that Act should be continued. To explain this I shall read this section of last year's Act.

(Rt. Hon. Premier quotes Act.)

Section 2 amends Section 2 of this Act by adding at the end of this section the following words: "Or the officer commanding the Volunteer force on active service." It will be found that the appointing of officers vests in His Excellency the Governor under last year's act and it is now proposed to add these words at the end of the section. Up to the present time although the troops are commanded by officers on the other side all appointments have been made here by His Excellency the Governor as Colonel, but it may be found necessary that that authority should be conferred on the officer in command when our contingent goes to the front and when there might be no opportunity of communicating with His Excellency here.

Section 3 of the Act amends Section 5 of last year's Act by striking out the words "but not exceeding one year." I may as well quote this section 5 of

last year's Act to explain more clearly what is meant by this amendment.

(Rt. Hon. Premier quotes Sec. 5.)

Section 4 of this Act merely points out that these amendments shall be held to have been in force and to have taken effect from the date of last year's Act. I may say these amendments come to me recommended by the Patriotic Association, and His Excellency the Governor, who has been specially charged in relation to the enlisting of men with various duties therewith connected, and I have no doubt that these amendments have received every thought and care before being recommended to this Legislature. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to admit this measure with some exceptions which I shall propose at the Committee stage. The exceptions will be to Section 4. That section is an absolute breach of faith with the men who have enlisted and ought not to be there. I do not know what object it can have unless it be to force those to remain who enlisted under very different terms. I do not think any practicable object can be obtained by it because I think every man will be willing to carry out the requirements as to remaining or re-enlisting for service but this Legislature ought not to be a party to a breach of faith of this kind.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That matter will be considered in Committee.

The bill was then read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the

Whole to consider certain resolutions re the exportation of timber

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that last year we passed an act in the War session allowing the exportation of timber from Newfoundland and Labrador. There was a certain reason why we should allow the exportation of timber from Newfoundland after the outbreak of the war, and there was a great demand in the Old Country for pit props, and it was surprising on enquiry to find that that industry was so little known in Newfoundland as amounting to so much as it did. We were asked to allow the exportation of pit props and we passed an act for one year allowing them to be cut on the three mile limit in Newfoundland and exported free of duty. The same thing applies to Labrador. When we passed that Act a great number of people were under the impression that the war would be over by that time, but we find ourselves no nearer the end of the war to-day. In fact within six or eight months after the passing of that Act we had a request from the British Government to extend the limit of cutting pit props and after due consideration they were allowed to be exported up to December 1915. That Act only allows people to export pit props for one year and it is only after grave consideration that the Government proposes to bring down this bill to allow the exportation of pit props and pulp wood from Labrador as you will see by this Act for a period of ten years. The pit prop industry to very many seems a small industry—one hardly worth recognizing—but when we come to enquire into the matter we find that the value of this wood imported into the British Isles last year amounted to about three

times as much as our codfishery. They were valued at £4,450,000.00, and to that amount may be added the amount cut in the United Kingdom itself, something like £800,000. When we come to consider these figures we are struck by the enormous amount that this industry is worth. Just imagine if we could get this industry—an industry which is carried on in Russia, Sweden, Norway, France, Portugal and Spain, valued at £4,450,000. Now it strikes us that the time has arrived when Newfoundland should be prepared to get its share of this industry, and that is one of the reasons why to-day we bring down this amendment to last year's act, giving permission for the exportation of pit props from Labrador for ten years. It will induce outside capitalists to come in and take hold of the many timber areas on that coast and must no doubt develop great wealth and be of great help to the fishermen. I have here a report of some gentlemen who were sent out last year to enquire into this industry in Newfoundland. There were four gentlemen from the Board of Trade in London, and one representative of the pit owners. They came here in September and held extensive enquiries around the coast and then went to Canada and from there returned to England, and made a report as a result of these enquiries. Last year after the passing of this Act, and when it was fit that pit props were to be exported from Newfoundland, reliable information was obtained as to quality and quantity of the pit props. People were surprised to find the number of requirements that were necessary for our pit props. When pit props were sent over from Newfoundland and as far as the timber and other requirements are concerned they were found to be strong and to come up to everything that was required. I find from the report sent

out by the Board of Trade that these gentlemen who were here say that Newfoundland pit props compare very favourably with those of any other part of the world. The reason why the Government are making an extension of ten years in this bill is to give people a chance to go down and take hold of the properties on Labrador and go into the industry in a large way. Surely if the United Kingdom can take pit props to the value of £5,600,000, there is no reason whatever why Newfoundland should not get her part of that trade. Russia exported to England 1,538,714 cords. Sweden 359,998; Norway 114,777; Germany 28,925; France 984,331; Portugal, 315,528; Spain 103,123, other foreign countries 5,391, making a total of 3,451,328 cords, valued at £4,445,966, and in addition to this it was estimated according to this report that 709,000 tons of timber were cut for pit props. If these countries can afford to let their unmanufactured wood out of the country into the United Kingdom is it unreasonable to come in here and pass an Act to allow them to be exported from Labrador. Take the Labrador to-day, and if we were to develop this industry we would see a future for the individuals who live there and a future for the labouring classes of this country. There is no reason why men would not go down there for eight months of the year if they could get continuous work for \$1.50 and \$2.00 a day. There is no reason why we should not allow them to go down and cut for export all that wood that is going to waste. It has not been the policy of Governments in the past to do this but I am glad to say that it is the policy of this Government to do it. I always believed in it in the past. I could never see any reason why we did not cut the forests of Labrador and utilise them when they would give labour to our people. The time

has arrived when we should utilize those larger areas and allow certain companies who are prepared to go down and to develop them. There is one aspect of this matter which may interfere with these forests being developed, but perhaps that can be got over at a later date. I find from this report that the freight from Russia, Sweden, Norway, Germany, France and Spain is 100% less than from Newfoundland or Labrador. That would be a serious drawback which might, however, be overcome in the future. It is only now that we are waking up to find out that there is something on the Labrador that we can employ our people at. The principal thing to-day is to find employment for our people. In St. John's to-day there is nothing of any kind, no industry, at which employment can be given, and apart from Bell Island, there seems to be no hope for the immediate future. If we were in the position that two or three thousand of our people could be employed it would be a great boom. A dollar at cutting pit props is of more value than the possibility of earning it at the codfishery. It is a dollar certain, whereas the other is very uncertain. As far as Newfoundland is concerned, objection will be made to cutting pit props. This bill protects the whole of the three mile limit, and the bill itself shows that it is not our intention to allow pit props to be exported, after the termination of the war, from Newfoundland. This bill gives permission to export pit props from Newfoundland for one year from the date of its passage. While that may be a help to the Empire at this time I do not think that very much will be developed in that way. Some time must pass before an industry of this kind can be established, and they cannot do very much within twelve months. A number of pit props may be cut by

planters and fishermen and several cargoes may be sent away but the amount cut while this law is in force is not going to be very large. There is quite a lot of valuable information in the report of the Board of Trade of England and I will table the communication made to the Government and the report itself for the information of the House. There are several sections in the report dealing with the question of employment for the fishermen and other matters, all of which are of great interest. The report also deals with the timber itself and also says that there is always an unlimited supply of timber in the Island, and that over 100,000 cords of pit props could be taken out during the winter months in the three principal sections of the Island, which they described in the report. That would mean 300,000 cords of pit props could be taken from the woods during the year. That would be worth one and a half million dollars. I take it that if we can get this industry going, even for a year it will give a considerable amount of employment and bring quite a lot of money into the country. We heard last year in this House the cry that the fishery was a failure, and that the people were going to starve, and we were asked by members of the House what we were going to do to relieve them. The relief appears to be at hand in this industry, and if the report of these gentlemen is true there ought to be no difficulty, even in Newfoundland to supply enough employment during the coming year for those who are out of work.

Then as regards shipping facilities, there are all in favor of Newfoundland.

(Quoted tabled report at length.)

It will be seen from this that the main disadvantage for Newfoundland is due to the fact that the vessels would have to return in ballast, and

it is consequently harder to get ships to go with cargoes but one way.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this matter now before the House will be the means of giving lots of employment to our people. There is a large supply here, and it could keep the men engaged during the winter. This would mean a revenue of about \$2,000 from this industry on our hands, Newfoundland is not likely to starve in the future. We have them here, why should we not dispose of them? It is time that some of our unused industries be developed. The small tax of one dollar a cord would still permit our props to be exported more cheaply than they can be had from other places, and at the same time bring employment to our fishermen during the winter season. Any information on this question that is desired by this committee, and can be supplied by my department, will be gladly supplied.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two observations on this matter now before the chair; even at the risk of looking at this matter from a party standpoint. It has been the policy of every government to preserve our timber supplies and to prohibit the exportation of the same, and I do not know that any reason has arisen why this should now be changed, and why this policy of years should be departed from. Before being asked to consider this matter I would ask that the Minister table all the information he has at hand, including the letter from the British Government in this connection, and the report, extracts from which he has just quoted so exhaustively.

Hon. Minister of Finance tabled this.

MR. CLIFT.—Is there any communication re France?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—

No.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.

—France comes in under this correspondence.

MR. CLIFT.—I would like to have all the information that can be got in this connection. I may say that at the present time, I am not at all inclined to support this resolution, but after having an opportunity of reading the report and hearing whatever arguments which may be further produced, I may be inclined to alter my views. At the present time I am strongly opposed to the export of pit props or any other raw material which might be manufactured in this country. Of course their export in 1914 was a different matter. The conditions were different then. We were led to believe that these pit props were a necessity to England, and consequently permitted their export without any questioning. If this is still the case I for one have no objection to the exportation being continued as long as that necessity may last.

I notice that these resolutions provide that the exportation be continued for a further period of 10 years. I think that before going into this fully we should have some opportunity of examining the reports tabled, and also the conditions on the Labrador. I mean the conditions with regard to the timber areas now existing in that territory. I understand that there are a great many areas of timber land leased by the Government for the purposes of cutting wood for manufacturing purposes, and that there are a great many of new applications for the same purposes. I would like to have information as to whether it is the intention of the Government to allow these people to use this land for a pit-prop industry. I would also like to know if the same will apply to those who hold licenses on the La-

brador, or who have applied for same. I think it would be well for the Minister to table the names of all who have timber limits on the Labrador, as well as the several other matters I have asked for.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman: Although the Minister read a lot of extracts I did not notice any reference to our wood being tested. If there is such a report I should like to see it. I hope that this will be furnished to this House. If it is in the possession of the Government I would ask them to table it. The hon. member will remember that this matter has already been discussed by those on that side of the House, and that we have not had the same information as they. It will necessarily fall to them to give us all the information that they can give us on this question, so as to allow us to discuss this matter intelligently. The whole truth of the matter is that several people have timber licenses on the Labrador, under certain conditions. They have failed to live up to these, and accordingly are seeking a means of making this property a benefit to them. They are doing this by having their obligations overruled. I hope that the Government will supply all the information asked for at once so that we may continue this subject.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman: I have just listened to the remarks of my learned friend, Dr. Lloyd, the member for Trinity, in reference to this matter now before the House, this matter regarding pit-props. This is, of course, a part of the timber of this country. He lays great stress upon the way that this bill is brought in, and says if I interpret him correctly that the Government side have had opportunity to discuss this matter at their party meetings; and have had all information before them on those occasions.

As one who is interested in the welfare of this country, and in the people who sent me here to represent them, I consider that I could not let this bill go without saying something in reference to it. I have heard quite a lot of talk in this House, from both sides, on our timber areas of Labrador—the Hamilton Inlet, Grand Falls, Melville Lake and Northwest River, and all the rest of it. It is quite true that there are timber limits on the Labrador, and what has been said of them by the different gentlemen in this House may also be quite true, but I would like to ask the House how many fishermen of this country have got limits down on the Labrador? And yet we come here and say, with such grave faces, that they must be reserved for the fishermen. I have not taken the trouble to find out from the Crown Lands Department how many timber limits are owned on the Labrador, and by whom they are owned, but if this Bill does not go through in a day or two I shall take that trouble; in the meantime I want to say that I don't think that many of them are held by fishermen. I was here last fall when we passed a Bill to allow pit props to be exported on account of the war—to help out Great Britain and her friends in their need, and we did right in doing that. Now, our people have suffered this winter for the want of labor. Bell Island has been closed down. There are only two or three hundred men on Bell Island which the companies have been prepared to look after, and whatever work has been going they have got it. That destroyed the means of livelihood for half the labor in Conception Bay. Sydney was closed down, and our men had to return with half the money that they earned other years and with very little to spend on food for the winter. Very few of our people go to Grand Falls or Bishop's Falls to work, knowing that there

are plenty of people down north who know much more about lumbering than they do. Therefore, the Government have had to come to the assistance of men in Conception Bay who never in their lives before asked any Government to help them. And why? Because we have not been able to give them work. Many of the men were satisfied last fall to go to the Labrador and cut pitprops or anything else which was wanted, if they were guaranteed a winter's work at a living wage; and something might have been done for them last fall when this Bill was up. I have cruised the Labrador Coast from Chateau to Cape Chidley and with the exception of firewood, stage stuff, and an occasional spar that the fishermen cut off these limits, I have never seen any benefit that they have derived from it. Since Cabot first sighted Cape Bonavista that is the only benefit which our fishermen have derived from the timber limits of Labrador, and they never will derive any benefit from them unless they get a chance to work down there. We say: Why don't people come here and build mills on the Labrador? Well, why don't the men of money in Newfoundland go down there and build mills and spend their money, if they have such faith in it, and give our men who need it some employment? With the exception of one company, I think, we have never heard the sound of a sawmill on Labrador. Now, what are we saving this timber for? Are we going to save it and allow our people to starve when we have got that God-given wealth down there. Why, I suppose during the last fifteen years the Government have had to feed the 3,000 people that are on the Labrador to the tune of eight or nine thousand dollars a year. This is not taking into consideration the people of Newfoundland, but the natives of Labra-

for to whom the Government has had to send down food every year for the past fifteen or twenty years. Men from the United States and Great Britain have come here, have gone to the Agriculture and Mines Department and taken out timber limits, and have promised to operate down there, but they have not done it. Personally, I am about getting tired of it. And then we hear that we must be very careful in what we are doing. Great Britain today, as has already been stated, is fighting for her existence, and for the existence of this little Colony and her other dominions all over the seas, and some of her people have asked to be allowed to come here and buy from us. They don't ask to be given something for nothing; they are prepared to pay for what they get. Up to the present the people who need this timber for use in their mines in Scotland and Wales have been getting it from Norway and Sweden and other countries in Europe, but nobody ever saw a Newfoundland vessel bringing a load of pitprops or any other kind of wood in them. This war has opened our eyes to a business which we might have got quite a lot of in the past. We should have had customers over there long ago, and some of our people here employed in this work. What have the people who have acquired control of our timber been doing with it? They have monopolised it, held it up, watching a chance to sell it to somebody else and make money out of it in that way, and in the meanwhile our people are in want because of lack of employment, because the fishermen and the laborers of this country are not lazy—they are prepared to work if they can get the work to do. During the last week fifty or sixty men from my district have come to me looking for supplies or work. I have gone from one end of the

town to the other, and with the exception of two men on Water Street, I was not able to get a barrel of flour for God's sake for these men; and then when I come up here I am told that we should still keep the dollars and cents out of this country. I have seen forest fires on the Labrador which have destroyed thousands of feet of timber, and I never heard anybody get up here and protest against allowing wealth to go to ruin in that way. The fishermen know that this timber is down there, and they want to get something out of it; and they know that if somebody does not cut pitprops, or build pulp mills or saw-mills down there that they will never get anything out of it, because some day the whole of it may be burnt down. The next question is, Mr. Chairman, who are we going to get to come in here and spend money in the erection of mills and other machinery on the Labrador and develop the resources down there. I was in London a few months ago and quite a number of the men who are interested in limits down there and who were in the city at the time, came to me and asked me what the Labrador was like, and if I thought that it was advisable to put money in it. I say, yes; the timber is there; and I believe that if you put money into it that it would pay. But, I said, you cannot expect Labrador to be like Bermuda, the Garden of Flowers, because it is not, but there are millions of feet of timber there for anybody who cares to work it. The time has come, Mr. Chairman, when we should encourage men who are prepared to come in here and spend money in buying pitprops from the Labrador or utilizing the resources that are down there in any other way. I agree with what has been said that we should safeguard the way in which it is

done, and that we should derive something from it in the way of taxation on every cord of wood that goes out, but we should encourage these men and not put any stumbling blocks in their way. If these companies on the other side are sincere in their desire to buy from us and we get them here, I think that by placing a dollar a cord on this timber the revenue would derive a great benefit from it, and I believe our own people will derive a great benefit from it. I have talked with quite a number of men, not only from my own district but from other districts as well and have asked their opinions upon this subject, and they say: We want labor, and we don't care who gives us that labor as long as we get it. That is the sentiment, and the time has come when the young men of this country are not prepared to put up with the conditions which have existed in the past. They are going to Canada and the United States to seek a livelihood. Timber is permitted to be exported from Canada to the United States, and why not allow it to be exported from this country? It is time for us to have a share in these pit props and other things in this country which are needed in the United Kingdom. Unless something is done in this line there will not be enough employment in Newfoundland for our people, and has the Government made up its mind to feed those who cannot secure employment. Mr. friend, Dr. Lloyd, over there, has asked for more information in connection with this Bill. I hope he will get it as quickly as possible, if it is to be got, so that the passage of the Bill will not be delayed. If these men who are talking of buying our pit props are in earnest, let them get down there and get busy and give our people work. I am as much opposed as anybody in this House to anything

that I think is detrimental to the interests of the majority of the people, and anything that I believe to be in the interests of the people I am prepared to support, and I believe this is going to be in the interests of the people. If some of the members of this House had been in my office during the last fortnight and had talked to the men who came there looking for employment, I think that the impression which would be left on them would be the same as was left on me, and to which I have tried to give expression. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of this bill, not for my own personal interests, because I have none in the matter, but in the interests of the people whom I have the honour to represent; and if there is any pit props going to be cut down there, I will try to get as many of my men to work at them as anybody else in this House.

The Chairmen left the Chair at 4.20 p.m.

The Chairman resumed the chair at eight o'clock.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, before recess I was about to rise, but had no intentions of speaking on the subject before the chair. I intended to ask the Minister to have the Committee rise and also to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs to table the extent of the timber areas on Labrador. He ought to inform the House as to the people who own those areas surrounding Hamilton Inlet. I think that the request of Dr. Lloyd was most courteous and fair and ought to be granted. We have been opposed to granting any concessions for the exportation of timber. Particularly are the F.P.U. opposed to it, and we want to give it due consideration. If the Minister would have the Committee rise we would appreciate it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman I have no objection whatever to the proposal of my hon. friend, but all the information is now before the House. We are prepared to give whatever information is required.

DR. LLOYD.—Before the Committee rises, Mr. Chairman I want to refer to a rumour that was abroad, in reference to some private tests made by those interested in the exportation of timber, for their own benefit. What I asked was, if the Government had possession of the results of tests carried out by commissioners not by private parties, interested in timber. I was told of the result of that test by one of the parties that were interested in it. A matter of that kind is of great importance.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman I may say in reference to the timber that fir is practically useless while spruce is more useful. There is no report of any other test in the hands of the Government.

DR. LLOYD.—Just what does this test mean. Does it mean a test by sight or practical test of the strength of the timber?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It means a test of its strength.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman I wonder if the hon. member will tell us who put the rumours around. Is it possible that there are some of those men interested in the timber themselves telling the outside world that our timber is no good? The quicker that such men were put out of Newfoundland, the better.

DR. LLOYD.—Well, now, that is exactly what I want to get. I want to go into the matter. I am in a position to state what I have already affirmed, namely, that if we had the

Board of Trade report laid before this House it would be an absolute and clear proof of the value of our material.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, what has this to do with the matter at all. If those people want to buy I don't see why we should not sell. In the past they have been getting this from the Continent now they cannot get it there and they come here. If we can sell, there is no reason why we should not.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I think what Dr. Lloyd is asking for is quite right. Possibly some of those people who are interested in pit props don't want anybody else to come here, and they are putting this rumor around, which is detrimental to the country's interests. We will look into the matter.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

PRODUCTS CORPORATION CONTRACT BILL

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the confirmation of a contract with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman I would like to ask whether the Premier is in a position to let us know what the object of the clause in the agreement relating to patents is, and whether he has yet succeeded in ob-

taining a modification of the terms of that clause?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am looking into that matter.

MR. COAKER.—In reference to Clause 6. Is that word "Labrador" to be allowed to go? Are these people to have rights all over the Labrador, wherever they choose to go. Mr. Howley, the counsel for some of these companies, has drawn attention to the fact that that concession will have to be amended. Is anything going to be done?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The words are defined. There was a slight amendment suggested by the hon. member for Bonavista (Mr. Morine) the last day. I have inserted it in Section 7. He suggested taking out the words "At any time within twenty years from the enactment hereof" and putting in at the bottom of the section the words: "Provided that the Government shall not be under obligation to grant any such lands at any time after the expiration of a period of twenty years from the passing of this Act." Then he asked for a further amendment in the same section limiting the right to take land for flogage rights. That has also been assented to.

MR. GRIMES.—To this last Section I beg to move an amendment to read as follows: "This agreement is subject to approval and confirmation by the Legislature of the Colony when after having submitted it to a referendum a majority of the voters have declared in its favor." A suggestion of a similar nature was offered a few days ago by Mr Coaker, when discussing this measure and I desire to embody it into an amendment in order that the voice of the people will be heard and their will be the governing power in the passing of this measure through the Legislature. The

Government has received no mandate from the people to confer such enormous concessions to the Newfoundland Products Co., concessions of such magnitude as to cause alarm throughout the country giving rise to many protests from persons of all shades of politics. When we remember the names given as the Directors of this Company—the Messrs. Reids—that they are the directors of the Reid Newfoundland Company and already control the whole Railway system of the country, many of the steamships, the dock, tramways and Electric Light Co., own nearly two million acres of land, employ thousands of men; and find that they are anxious to extend their monopoly still further and have thousands more placed under their domination, it should lead us to ask the question "where are we and whither tending? Who will be the future rulers of the country? The Reids with the Government as its servant or will anarchy and ruin prevail. The danger is there if this measure goes through in its present form and the only way to avoid it is to throw it out altogether or submit it to a referendum and let the people decide the question. Sir, the concessions asked for are too great. Exemption from taxation for all time. Giving extensive water-powers without getting a red cent in return while in every other country on short term leases rentals are being received varying from twenty cents to one dollar and fifty cents per horse power. Canada, the United States, Australia, all are object lessons. It is true the Premier has stated we get something in return, i.e. employment for our people at a rate of wages higher than the prevailing rates of to-day. Well if he has faith in the Company's word and the Company really intends doing so why re-

fuse the proposal that a minimum wage of \$2.00 per day be made part of the agreement. But the Premier has also stated that if these conditions were insisted upon the Company would throw the whole thing up. An evidence of its insincerity. Such conditions are necessary in dealing with the Heids for we know they have reduced wages considerably of late, have more than once refused to pay the prevailing rate of wages on its Dock and steamers have laid off hundreds of its workmen and placed hundreds more on short time when on the whole they were getting good returns from their undertakings in the Colony. To take care to protect the interests of workmen on the same equality with that of the company's would make them throw it up says the Premier. Well, in that case we should not be sorry the least bit that we refused to sell our birthright for a mess of pottage. Water powers are becoming valuable the world over. Governments everywhere are either operating the water power themselves or else leasing it on short terms for rentals varying from twenty cents to one dollar and fifty per horse power. If the Company threw it up it will not find elsewhere the opportunities it is seeking from the hands of this Legislature. There are other capitalists around and who would we doubt be willing to meet some of the conditions that we believe to be necessary. At any rate it will not harm us to wait and see. I would also strongly endorse the position taken by Mr. Kent when he says that all contracts entered into by the Government with a private corporation are evil in their nature, conferring as they do special privileges for a few at the expense of the many. How many of our own people starting a business gain exemption from taxation for all time? None. Let there be an

Mr. Kent says, a general law enacted which shall apply to all alike.

I have asked Mr. Chairman that the "Wilson Contract" be submitted to a referendum, and if endorsed by the people that the Legislature will then give effect to its proposals. I am well aware that hon. gentlemen of this House have already stated their objection to the Referendum, and that Mr. Morine opposes it on the ground that we reduce ourselves to mere delegates instead of filling the higher position of representatives as intended. I cannot agree with him. The relation of principal and agent shows that the principal usually restricts the delegated powers of the agent to prevent the consummation by the agent of any act or series of acts in opposition to his will. The principal does not abdicate in appointing a representative but retains as absolute control as practicable over all official acts. This is the relation that is supposed to exist between the people and their elected representatives in any system of popular Government. Unfortunately for our country, representatives have not so viewed their relation to their masters, the people. On the other hand, they have so acted as to lead many to believe that once elected during their four years' term they are free to exercise unrestrictedly the governing power belonging to the people. His commitments as it were, have abdicated for a fixed term and he is free to do whatever damage to them his own interests or his own individual opinions may lead him to do, and it is their will many times, and not the people's that is made effective. The Premier a few days ago when discussing the Prohibition bill, declared he was in favour of the bill being submitted to a referendum, because it interfered with the private rights and liberties of a section of the people, and the Legislature would not be justified in restricting or doing

away with these rights and liberties without the expressed will of the people, given through a plebiscite. With him I concurred. But if it is a right and proper course to pursue in connection with Prohibition, is it not equally so in the present Willson bill. Are we not interfering with the rights and liberties of the people in refusing to allow them the last word on a measure which gives great private interests enormously valuable privileges and creates an octopus whose tentacles will embrace within its cruel grasp the fairest portion of our Island home? I would therefore move the amendment as already stated.

MR. WALSH—The policy of the People's Party when they were inaugurated in 1908 was to develop all the natural resources of the country. This contract is only the natural outcome of that policy. After listening very attentively to the speakers on this question and only after careful consideration of the various arguments that have been put forward I have decided to vote for this measure as it now stands and I think that after this bill passes a new day will dawn for Newfoundland. If we consider the amount of money to be expended in Newfoundland in construction work—an expenditure of eighteen million dollars, we will realize what an amount of good that will be to the working people of Newfoundland, and I fail to see why any member should oppose the measure. With such an industry as this, it is quite sure that the laboring question will be solved once and for all. Year after year our men have been compelled to emigrate to foreign countries, like Canada and the States, and look for work. I do not attempt to give any expression or opinion on the technical points of the contract but from the point of view of the working man I think I am cap-

able of expressing an opinion as a working-man, because I think I am the only member of this House who has taken part in every kind of labour in Newfoundland and the States. From the point of view of the working man I think it will be the very best thing that could possibly happen to have this plant erected at Bay of Islands and have this money expended in the country. If you employ 1,000 people at \$1.50 a day you will find that many of those who have gone away in the past will be glad to return to Newfoundland to work in their own country. With regard to the opposition put up by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, who questions whether you will be able to induce a good class of men to come here to work, I venture to say that if you went over to Cape Breton and told them that it was possible to get \$2.00 a day you would have no trouble in getting 5,000 men to come back to Newfoundland and labour in this country. There is hardly a family in any part of the Island that in the past some member of it has not had to emigrate from this country in years gone by. I stand here to-night as the only representative of a large family who were compelled to emigrate to look for employment. My father is buried under a foreign soil; my brothers are labouring in a foreign country and they, like many others, would be glad to return to this country, if there is an assured employment in sight. I think with the passing of this contract a new era will dawn for Newfoundland. If we look at Grand Falls we will see what a very useful source of employment it has been and of what value it has been to the country. Men after fishing during the summer months have gone to Grand Falls and Bishops Falls for four months of the year and have earned enough to

keep them in independence. This industry will be four times as large as that of Grand Falls. They are spending \$18,000,000.00 on construction, whereas the Harmsworths only spend three or four millions, and I do not see how any member can possibly raise an objection to such a corporation coming here. I have during the last few days looked up some information in connection with the manufacture of fertilisers and I see that there is a factory at Niagara Falls which cost ten millions and which in the last year has doubled its output and expenditure. This should, I think be a positive guarantee that this industry will be a paying concern. Once an industry like this is in operation it will bring in some amount of capital into the country. Looking at the thing from an impartial standpoint, if we had passed the amendments as proposed by members of the Opposition the only effect they could have would be to strangle the industry in its infancy. That is the way in which any patriotic Newfoundlander would look upon it. We should all help it out to the best of our ability, and do our best to introduce industries likely to be of beneficial interest to the country. While it may be all right for hon. members to make suggestions it is hardly fair to expect us to adopt all and every of the amendments which they propose. One or two of the amendments made in the early stage of the debate have, I think, improved the bill, but with those in it I think that if the contract passes as it now stands, it will be the most beneficial contract that this Legislature has ever passed.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, just a word or two in reply. The hon. members seems to reflect upon hon. members on this side of the House and upon their patriotism as Newfoundlanders. What I have to say,

Sir, is that I believe that I am as patriotic as any members on that side of the House and I feel free to vote against this measure as if I was afterwards going to heaven. I say that this contract will rise up against every member that voted in favour of it. I say that seriously, because I think there are too many real objections to the measure, and in saying it I am just as patriotic as any one in this House, and any member on this side who has suggested anything, any amendment to the measure, has done it with the best intentions in the world, and with the hope that they would get the Government to provide for their objections to the contract. From the very first I felt that I would like to see an industry of this kind started on the Humber, and I had no objection whatever to an industry and a contract granting rights and privileges like that granted to Reid or Harmsworth, so that we might utilize the advantages of the country, and turn out a first class industry, and, if possible make it a success as great as in either Canada or elsewhere; but I do object to the exemption of this company from taxation forever. I object to the admission of all their material forever without taxation, and I object to the manner in which you have treated the labour question. It was suggested that we should put in the contract a clause to provide that no labourer should be paid less than twenty cents an hour. I believe if you had put in that it would have done a great thing for Newfoundlanders. You would have had more Newfoundlanders return from the States as was spoken of by the learned member for Placentia. If you had fixed \$2.00 a day as the price of labour it would be a great good in the interests of labour, but you have not done that and when you start out on this work on the other side of the Is-

land this Company will get labour as cheap as possible. I never saw a corporation yet that was at all philanthropic in regard to labour. They will get labour as cheap as possible. You have not provided anything in your Bill to safeguard yourself in that way. The labour will be got as cheap as it can be got. The only thing that we can do is to get together and form a union as is done in every other part of the world because it is very clear that we can never expect to obtain anything unless we get together with a unity of purpose. That is how we will have to act in regard to this. The other day there was reference made to the passage of a measure in 1910 for the establishment of an industry at Deer Lake. This industry was struck on the head by local interests in Newfoundland saying that they wanted \$1,500,000 before they would allow the industry to be established. Who was the man that demanded that blood money? Have you taken any trouble to find out who struck this matter on the head. Was it the poor men of Newfoundland? You will find on enquiry that it was the very man to whom you are now giving these concessions. The same thing was done on the Gander. There would have been on the Gander to-day an industry as big as that at Grand Falls if it were not for this man. What have these men done since they came to the country? Have they established an industry? Have they cleared an acre of land? Have they given a day's labour? Now, of course, they are going to work miracles. Well, I hope they will, I hope they will employ 5,000 men, but I have my doubts. I have much doubt as to what they are going to do for the poor man. They will do a great deal for themselves. I believe in the establishment of all the industries possible, but I want certain safeguards.

I do not see the necessity of taking away from future legislatures the right of taxation. I do not want to see you hand over bound hand and foot the legislature of this Island. But you want to give these people these water powers which for years to come will be the only assets that the Colony has. I hope you are not making a mistake, but so far as my vote goes it is against this measure. If you had accepted the amendments as proposed, or at least the most important, you would have had a perfect measure. As it stands now we on this side must vote against it. But so far as our intentions are concerned there can be no doubt that all we wanted to see was a perfect measure for the country and for the people. In offering these amendments we were as patriotic as any member of the House.

On the amendment being put it was lost.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill with some amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the General Hospital," with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the amendment was read.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is merely a transposition of some words in the tenth section. It was consider-

ed by the Upper House that the thing was not exactly clear.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill authorising the Governor in Council to raise a temporary loan in certain cases.

RT. HON. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend 4 George V., Cap. 6, entitled: "An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate Limited."

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. CLIFT gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lloyd gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Grimes gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow at 3 o'clock. The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 26th, 1915.

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

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled Returns of the Reid Newfoundland Company 1913-14.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. Stone gave Notice of Question.

MR. CLIFT asked the RT. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House a statement showing all licenses now existent to cut timber on Labrador, giving the date of the issue of each; also, a statement of all allocations now on file in the Department of Agriculture and Mines or under consideration of His Excellency the Governor in Council.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— I beg to table the desired information.

MR. LLOYD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries why most of

the paint required for lighthouses is purchased from Companies manufacturing outside the Colony; and if it is the intention of the Department to continue the same policy next year.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The answer to this is being prepared.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement of the quantity and the value of all printing paper and cardboard—as used in printing offices—and imported into the Colony during the present year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—This is in course of preparation.

GRAND BANK WATER CO. BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of RT. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: 'An Act respecting the Grand Bank Water Company,' was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION CONTRACT BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of RT. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled: "An Act Respecting the General Hospital," were read a second

time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I presume that the time is now arrived when we ought to take up the discussion of the proposals of the Minister of Finance and Customs with regard to the revenue. In the past few years Mr. Kent's criticism, it will be acknowledged, has been fair, impartial and illuminative, and not characterized by any merely Opposition view; and we can only regret his absence today. This year we naturally consider the disposal of this year's revenue in the light the Minister has already enlarged upon, as it was only to be expected that he would, and we appreciate the fact that the finances of the past year, the current year, and the forthcoming year are very largely influenced by the war, which has naturally considerably dislocated the trade of the Colony. While I propose in the few remarks that I shall make, to deal with that aspect of the matter, and while I recognize that while the Revenue of last year has been mainly influenced by the war, I shall endeavour to point out other causes of which we should take due regard, because all the conditions that will affect the revenue in the forthcoming years should receive the most minute and careful consideration at our hands.

The Government through its mouth-piece, the Premier, has already told us that it is estimated that, at the

end of the current year, June 30th next, the expenditure will exceed the revenue by the sum of seven hundred and fifteen thousand dollars. Now, that in itself is an important factor of which we should take due notice, for if we limit our view of that aspect of the matter we shall understand neither the difficulty the Government has been facing the past year, nor those difficulties which lie before us this coming year. In considering this sum of seven hundred and fifteen thousand dollars, which is the estimated deficit, it must be remembered that that deficit is a net amount due after taking into consideration the revenue which it is hoped will be attributable to the Budget proposals of 1914, and that therefore we must take into consideration what additional revenues have been gathered in on account of the extra taxation that has been placed on imports and exports since the Minister made his Budget proposal of March last year. I propose to direct the attention of this House to these matters.

We have first of all the fact that the Minister intends to meet the deficit by a loan of nearly half a million dollars, and, secondly, we must remember the fact that that deficit is being lessened by taking some one hundred and ninety-eight thousand dollars from the cash reserve, making in all seven hundred and fifteen thousand dollars. Then, you come to the additional revenue by which that deficit has been brought to the least possible amount. By the courtesy of the Minister, I have before me a statement furnished by his Department in the early part of the session as to the revenue received on account of the customs tariff proposed on September 7th, and giving the amount of revenue collected on those tariffs up to March 31st. This statement shows that \$230,257 was collected on that account. Now that left three months of the current

year, during which revenues of a smaller nature would be coming in. Now, I assume the Department will have benefitted by September taxation, judging from this statement to the extent of one hundred and sixty eight thousand dollars by June 30th, so that there is some four hundred thousand that will be collected by June 30th from last September's taxation. Now, the meaning of that is this, if that taxation had not been proposed in September the deficit, instead of being seven hundred and fifteen thousand dollars would be one million, one hundred and fifteen thousand dollars.

Now, that does not take into consideration the whole of the taxes imposed in September last. There were taxes imposed on various commercial documents and stamp duties, etc. I stand subject to correction, but if I remember rightly the Minister gave the House to understand that that taxation would be good for twenty thousand dollars. I presume that this twenty thousand dollars thus imposed has been a contributing factor in keeping down the deficit to seven hundred and fifteen thousand dollars. It must further be remembered that last Thursday additional taxation was imposed on such revenue as is now being collected, and will be collected on this year's account up to June 30th next. Now, judging from the normal revenue that taxation should be good for at least twenty thousand dollars, and it will then be seen that unless we take into consideration the revenue that has been derived from extra taxation on this year's account, which has been imposed since last Budget Speech, the deficit would be, but for that taxation, in the neighbourhood of one million, two hundred thousand dollars. I mention these facts, partly founded on actual figures furnished by the Departments, to show the difficulties with which the Government have been faced during the current

year, and further to emphasize the fact that the main factor in causing this deficit has been the war, and that that war is continuing with little likelihood of being through by the time we are called upon to consider the Budget of next year. These are the facts as they stand, and we must bear them in mind as lucidly as we can when they are under discussion. Moreover, while we are considering the financial difficulties resulting upon this war, we must remember that it is not the sole factor or cause in making up this deficit; there are other contributing causes to which it is fair and proper that we should give due consideration. Now, to get at these factors we must necessarily go back and examine the circumstances of preceding years. The Minister has already enlarged upon two factors outside of which I do not propose to go in my arguments now. The Minister has spoken of circumstances which have had an adverse effect on the revenue of the preceding year, the first of which was the general depression of trade, world wide in extent, the second the policy of the Government in preceding years, the policy of the Government as set forth in this House in the Session preceding the last general election.

Now, I propose to make a few remarks on the question of the general depression of trade by him referred to. The Government and the Minister of Finance were alive to this factor fourteen months ago when he made his Budget Speech in 1914. At this time he spoke of the world wide depression existing outside this Colony, but which he said at that time was not felt at all in Newfoundland. He evidently anticipated no such depression here, for at that time the Government led us to believe that this world wide depression had practically no influence in Newfoundland. We were told that business operations

were going on the same as ever, and within the bounds of Newfoundland that depression had no effect. Now, is it not singular, after such a statement as this, that last Thursday the Minister should have enlarged upon this as the great contributing factor in the deficit of this year? He even asserted that the deficit of last year was largely due to this depression in Newfoundland, but it must also be observed that when dealing with this matter he quoted largely from outside sources. He told us the Canadian Minister's view on the depression as it was in Canada, and also referred to its influence in the United States, but there was no reference, except a bare, cold statement, to any such depression in Newfoundland. Now, that was somewhat strange, because if that was a contributing factor, he could have told us more facts without having to quote outside opinion. I will even venture to dispute the accuracy of the Minister when he assumed this to be a cause in such a large measure of the deficit of last year, and I would point out that I bring into testimony his own speech, the facts and figures furnished by his own Department. If the House will have reference to the Minister's speech and more particularly that part of it which relates to the Colony's trade, it will be seen that he quoted the imports, exports, and total trade for the years beginning 1909, to the end of June 30th, 1914. Now, the remarkable fact about that quotation is, that it disproves the Minister's contention, for if he will have reference to the exports of that year, he will find that by June 30th, 1914, the exports of that year were bigger than were ever known in the history of the Colony. That is the purchasing power; the exports, which of course are all our produce, were actually greater than any other year in the history of the Colony; therefore we cannot assume that the depres-

sion in trade made itself felt at all at that time, for we had more purchasing power that year than ever before. Therefore I claim that in considering this matter we can very properly dispense with that contention that depression in trade had anything to do with the revenue of that year. The real cause, I contend, was the policy of the Government in the preceding year, a policy which dislocated the revenue, a policy which was throwing some four hundred thousand dollars worth of revenue on the free list; and I am borne out by the attitude of the Government in previous years, and the attitude of the Minister himself when he pointed out that the throwing of such an amount on the free list would have a serious effect on the dislocation of our trade. If this thing ever was to be done it could only have been done by stages, and the result of the experiment closely watched from year to year. It was in pursuance of a promise made at election time that the Government took what they considered to be an heroic measure in placing such a large amount on the free list, and we have been suffering from the evil consequences of that Act ever since.

But if we lend our attention more to that aspect of the matter we shall not fully realise the extent of the evil consequence of the Election Budget. We shall better realise it if we go back to the last Budget day and consider the aspect of matters as furnished to the House at that time. You will remember, Sir, that at that time the Minister estimated the revenue was short some \$150,000.00, but he fully expected to pay up that on June 30th. With the additional taxation that he was then imposing, the shortage would be fully paid up and the surplus would be shown at the end of the year. That expectation was disappointed, the shortage shown early in March of

\$150,000.00 grew into a deficit of \$301,000.00, so that the extra taxation imposed in March, 1914, had not even the effect of keeping the shortage at the level at which it was in March. Extra taxation was imposed and the shortage continued to increase. Naturally in order to get at the effect of the taking off of the duties in 1913 we must look at the actual deficit and how that deficit was kept down to the amount that it was, because we must keep in mind that \$301,000 of a shortage would have been greater but for the extra taxation imposed in March last. We must, therefore, find out how much was collected from March until June 30th, that helped to keep the balance down to \$301,000.00. If we get down to that you will be able to consider the full effect of the election budget. The figures which the Minister furnished me with last Thursday show that the tariff imposed in March 1914, added to the Revenue between March and June 30th, \$114,000.00, but for that \$114,000 of extra taxation the shortage of last year would have been \$416,000.00.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—You are not allowing for the increased expenditure.

MR. LLOYD.—No, because when the Minister was furnishing this balance he made allowance for the additional expenditure. But even so, if I had allowed for extra expenditure, I would look to the Leader of the Government to show me how it could be altered because the expenditure having been made it would have to be paid out of the Revenue and it contributed to the shortage. I have not made allowance for extra expenditure because every year the Minister has made short estimates knowing full well that extra expenditure was not provided for, and he went into extra expenditure with his eyes open, fully open, and he is the one to account

for it. The position is this, that by the extra taxation imposed last March the contribution to the revenue amounted to \$114,000 by June 30th, and if it were not for that the shortage would have been \$415,000.00. What is the meaning of all this? The meaning of it is that instead of the revenue rebounding, as the Minister and the Government led the House to expect from their statement in 1913, so as to make up the \$420,000.00 which they had taken off, the revenue was actually less by a greater amount than the taxation which they took off. The revenue showed no buoyancy but actually there was a great depression by an amount greater than was taken off. That is a factor that was not influenced by the war. A factor to which the war was not a contributing cause, because war was not dreamt of in those days; but although the war was not dreamt of in those days the evil effects of the 1913 financing was being felt during the then current year, and is being felt now and is a contributing cause to the deficit. Now, Sir, having pointed that out what is the moral? The deficit on June 30th, 1914, has been met in two ways—one, by the increase of taxation in March, 1914, and the other by a recourse to the cash reserve; and what is the result of the financing of that year? In the Budget of 1914 there was a deficit on current account, not on account of any money contributed to the war, because that was covered by a loan. There was a deficit on running account of \$1,200,000.00. That deficit of \$1,200,000.00 has been met in three ways. It has been met by taking the balance of the cash reserve, by the extra taxation of last September, and by the extra taxation of Thursday last. It has been met, but not met wholly. It has been met partially, and we are still faced with the notice of a loan act by the Government calling

for \$500,000.00; but we must bear in mind an adverse balance of \$1,200,000. How shall we stand next year? That is what we must face. We face it in two ways. First the taxation of September last continues. Secondly, the new taxation of Thursday last continues. Now we must find out how much the new taxation of September last and of Thursday last will help to reduce that \$1,200.00 adverse balance; because we are faced with a war year and how are we going to meet that? Although we cannot say with decision yet we can make some estimate. The revenue imposed last September up to March 31st, brought in \$232,000, that is for seven months. Suppose we double that for the whole year. The September Budget is calculated to bring in just about \$400,000. I think I am taking an outside estimate; if the Minister can have it higher I will accept anything reasonable, but I am taking \$400,000 for the next year. Then we have the taxation imposed last Thursday. What will be the effect for next year? It is a war year, but suppose it was not a war year. Suppose we take the benefit of a normal year and estimate that revenue at eleven per cent. Let us take the list of importations for the year ending June 30th, 1914, which was a normal year, and that will give us an outside estimate. If we calculate that, my estimate for a normal year of the tariff imposed last Thursday is \$100,000. It is bound to bring in less. The Minister himself has not allowed for that amount, according to his estimate given last Thursday. Then we have an extra revenue for next year of \$400,000, and with a shortage, calculated on the basis of the current year, of \$1,200,000. It is no wonder, Sir, that the Minister departed from the usual custom in dealing with the Budget matters last Thursday. It is no wonder that

he says so little about the forthcoming year. I would assure the Minister that I am not doing this to disparage him or the Government. I am only doing this so that we may realize, so that I may help all to realize, the difficulties with which we are faced, so that we can look the facts straight in the face. We all sympathize with the Government. We sympathize with ourselves because we will have to help to meet the bill. But the fact remains that calculated on the basis of similar expenditure, this additional taxation even if we take the best advantage of that taxation, we are faced with the position that the revenue proposed up to the present time is not calculated to prevent a large deficit. It is calculated on the basis that at the end of the next year you will be in a position similar to that in which you are to-day and you will have to meet that deficit by a loan. That is what I am leading up to. Why has not the Government stated that this is its policy? I would not blame them for saying it. I am not saying that is an unreasonable policy, but it is a fact that we shall have to find money by loan next year to meet a deficit and we should take note of the fact. We should state it boldly so that we may know where we are. We should not enjoy a Fool's Paradise.

Now, Sir, the position of the Government, then, is this: That they have not brought in a budget that has made an attempt to make enough revenue for next year to cope with the expenditure. They have said nothing about it and that is the remarkable feature that these estimates remain so high. Any forecast as to next year is absent from the Budget Speech.

I would like to have a word or two on the revenue proposals themselves.

I have already pointed out that the policy of the Government is to make a sampling of taxation. I call it a sampling of new taxation, because even if calculated on a normal year it does not bring in more than \$100,000; that will leave us with a big deficit next year. Now why this silence? Why have not the Government faced the situation out by telling us frankly that they are prepared for a deficit on a war year? Or that they will meet the situation by a recourse to the revenue which they took off in 1913? I think that is the "nigger in the wood-pile." Having in 1913 made a step that has led the Minister where he is to-day, the Government has not the courage to reverse that policy. They have rather looked to calculated expediency. The Government has to parallel this case by showing that there was a deficit in the Bond Administration of \$170,000. Suppose it was true; I would like to know if the Minister has been evading his present deficit on the same basis because he has not been fortunate in his forecast recently. I say recently because the Minister was fortunate at other times; at times when he had no control over the revenue when it simply fell in on him, but he was not fortunate in 1913. In that year the taking off of that taxation was to be met by a buoyant revenue, and it was short \$400,000. In the next year the dislocation was to be met by a new taxation but instead of the additional taxation meeting the deficit there was \$300,000 of a shortage. Last year he was also equally out but I do not blame him for that because the war came in and brought in a factor over which he had no control. But these new taxes are objectionable; in the first place because they are not calculated to bring in any revenue worth while. In a war year the Minister will be very fortunate if he gets \$60,000 out of it, and

that may be gathered from his speech last Thursday. It is objectionable because it will reverse a policy on which the Government has spent money. It sets to work and handicaps agriculture after having established societies and commissioners to stimulate the industry. It is objectionable because it handicaps the fisheries, the staple industry of the Colony, and the handicap is not worth while because we are not getting any return out of it.

Now, Sir, I draw my remarks to a close. I have not, I think, said anything in any way to disparage the Minister, but I have simply thrown out these few observations upon the aspects of the case as they have appealed to me and I hope they will help to clear up the situation.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, just a word of two in reply. I must admit that the hon. member has let me down very easily. His remarks are not as strong as one would have expected from such a critic as himself. He is one of the principal critics in the House and when he undertakes to criticise budgets one would have expected, if anything, a more stringent criticism than has been given this afternoon. He admits from the start that the war has had considerable to do with the finances of this Colony. I am with him there, but before going into that he stated that the financial position last year was not due to the war. My reply to that is this: that two years ago depression was apparent all over the world; not alone in Newfoundland but in Canada and the States. We must all look for bad years. From the beginning of their term the present Government have had prosperous times. During the first four or five years the revenues were very high, and it was not to be expected but that we should meet with

some reverses; but this much we must admit that the present Government has done its best to meet the situation. While they received large revenues and surpluses in the past they have given them back to the people in improvements—light-houses, fog-alarms, roads, bridges, education. Coming down to the deficit last year of \$300,000, while the learned Doctor this afternoon pointed out that our exports were right up to the hilt—the highest in the history of the country—he has nicely avoided the question of imports. Since the war began the imports have dropped very considerably, more particularly the import of food stuffs. Everyone in this House knows that an enormous amount of revenue is received from importations and since the outbreak of the war I think you will find that while people have as much money as they had before the war they have stopped purchasing imported articles. You will find, I think, that after the war is over there will be as much money in the banks as before, but while the war lasts the importation will be very small and the revenue will be comparatively short.

Last year was a very bad year for all financial work and the fact that this Colony's current revenue failed to reach all her obligations by such a small amount speaks well for her. Everything was demoralised on account of the war. Last year, Canada had a surplus of about \$30,000,000. This year it is expected that she will be this amount short. Yet she is the most flourishing of all the British dominions. In fact it is my opinion that every British colony all the world over will have a shortage in revenue as a result of this war. The learned Doctor does not hope for improvement even when we get back to normal conditions. I am very hopeful that when this war is over, and nor-

mal trade sets in, that Newfoundland will be able to flourish without any increased taxation. If you will calculate carefully you will find that our revenue during the past few years under normal conditions has paid four and a half million dollars. I make bold to say that even if the war does hold on another year, that at the end of that time, if our people have a good season Newfoundland's financial condition will be good; her trade will not be demoralised as has been suggested.

If the war is over, and her industries are working as usual her Bell Island industries, her Grand Falls and other industries, I fail to see, as the hon. member has foreseen, any reason why we should have a deficit.

He also said that the sole cause of our financial difficulties was not the war, I do not agree with him. Did we not have, from the year 1909, a series of surpluses, amounting in all to about \$1,000,000? Our reserve was increasing at the rate of \$250,000 per year, and what should prevent us from taking off duties to cover that amount as per our promise of 1908-1909. Even if we did make a mistake, who reaped the benefit? Did not the people? If we made a mistake the people and they only benefitted.

I take it that even if we did not take off the taxes in 1913, we still would not have enough to straighten out our accounts. That was not the cause of this embarrassment. The cost of living here to-day is small compared with what it was ten or twelve years ago. The country has progressed wonderfully. Why should it go back now? We have been accused of making estimates for next year which we dare not hope will be realised. This is untrue. Under present conditions it is well nigh impossible to estimate a year's expenditure in advance. If the war continues, I for one cannot.

Moreover I do not know who can. I have heard criticisms on certain items in the budget; but these items are but the same as have been put there by other Governments.

The hon. gentleman has also stated that in 1913 we showed bad finance and were reaping the result. We showed bad finance by returning to the Colony money which was theirs. Then he also stated that the taxation that was going to be levied for the coming year would not bring in \$69,000. I think the hon. gentleman could not have read the resolutions carefully, because one item alone in that will cover that.

MR. LLOYD.—What was that?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Kerosene oil and gasoline. Practically that will be received from Kerosene oil alone. Kerosene oil will bring in to the revenue \$85,000; Gasoline about \$15,000 or \$20,000. These two alone will double what the hon. member estimates the whole at. It will be something like \$120,000. Also according to the resolutions one-quarter of a million will be raised by taxation of what is now on the free list.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two observations on the matter now before the chair. It is not to criticise the taxation that has been imposed. That has already been dealt with. What I want is to point out to the Minister that I think his best way to treat the present situation would have been to have had more regard to the expenditure than to the taxation. He admits in his statement that sixteen months or two years ago a depression was manifest not only in this country but also in the maritime provinces. In fact in the whole world there was a general depression. He naturally might have considered that that depression would come here, and instead of looking

around and seeing what he could tax, he might have tried to reduce his expenditure. I think that if he had gone over the several items of the Estimates which were passed by this House last week he would have found himself able to curtail the revenue some three or four or even five thousand dollars without effecting the efficiency of the public services in any way. I have referred to this matter before. I have said that he might have cut out several things which could have easily been dispensed with, and I am convinced that the proper way to deal with the present situation is to reduce expenditure rather than increase taxation. There are items of expenditure that might have been reduced. It is admitted that at the end of June there will be a large deficit and that in order to meet that deficit, it will be necessary to borrow money. It is admitted that at the end of June 1914 there must be a further and greater deficit than there was in 1913, and yet the Government has made no effort to reduce the enormous expenditure that this country has to pay for its public services.

No one could foresee the conditions arising out of the war; no one could foresee the war; but we have been in Session twice since the war began. We were in Session in September, 1914, and we are again now, and our expenditure is just the same as if there was no war in existence. We will of necessity be called upon to pay large sums of money in connection with the war, and there necessarily must be great depression in our trade, and a decrease in our revenue, and the only way left to get money is by reducing the expenditure and not increasing the taxation. This is my view of the financial situation, and the way it ought to be met, and I hope that the Government will see if they

cannot curtail somewhat the great expenditure made on her present public services. I am not going to point out—it would be needless to point out—directions in which the money could have been saved. I am not going to point out votes that might have been done away with. The Minister knows them as well as I do. It is more necessary for us to shoulder our obligations than to carry on our public services at such a cost. We can do away with a considerable number of obligations by reducing our public services, and that would be a better way of meeting the situation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

Just a word or two, Mr. Chairman. I have listened to what has been said here, but I think that generally speaking, the positions laid down would not be reasonable ones for the Government to take. Take the position mentioned by my hon. friend, Mr. Clift, the member for Twillingate. He thinks that the estimates could have been reduced by \$5,000 if they had been gone through carefully. Well, I might tell my hon. friend, that these estimates were all carefully gone through, and while some \$34,000 was saved on the public services, that was the best that could be done, and the greatest amount that could be cut off. You can cut off little bits here and there, but the result is so small as to be worthless. I personally think that taxation is the best way to deal with the present situation. You are giving the public a better and more expensive service, and in that way the extra money is just going to themselves.

The suggestion of the member for Twillingate that expenditure be curtailed at this season of the year is not as practical as he has made it out to be. He who to-day does this without necessity is his country's worst enemy; in the same way that a mer-

chant would be who being able yet refuses to supply our men for the fishery. I am sure that my hon. friend will now agree with me that curtailment is not the best way of dealing with situations such as the present.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will only look at the Estimates which we have passed, you will find that nearly all the large votes are votes which cannot be curtailed. In the first place, we voted one-quarter of the whole amount for interest on the public debt. That cannot be reduced. Then there is nearly another million under contracts, for coastal steamers and services of that sort. As an illustration, we pay \$75,000 a year to the Bowrings under our contract, probably about \$300,000 a year to the Reids for mail steamers, and for trains. You cannot curtail these votes. We vote \$300,000 for the schools, and it is hardly worth our while to begin on the school teachers, either by reducing their salaries or closing the schools. Then I wonder if anyone on either side of the House would like to say, at a time when everyone is asking for larger grants for roads and bridges, that we should reduce the present vote for that purpose.

MR. CLIFT—Yes, I would, if necessary, and education too.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

I am glad that the hon. member has the courage of his convictions in that respect, but I say that would be heroic at a time when our people were poor and unable to pay taxation; but my point is this, that never in the history of the Colony were the people better off; and even if there are a few hundred, or it may be thousand, that are looking for supplies today, whilst they have all our sympathy, we must condemn those whose narrow-minded policy keeps these people on shore. I don't agree, Mr. Chairman, with the policy of cutting the salaries of the teachers and closing the

public schools, and, I think my friend on the other side, if he will give that matter a little reflection, will be satisfied that that is not the policy to work under. We voted over half a million for the Postal Department—I think somewhere in the neighborhood of seven or eight hundred thousand dollars; and whilst a reduction is proposed in the salaries of those underpaid officials, at the same time petition after petition is presented to the House for increases in salaries for these very people. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is not by reduction that the present deficit can be met. I can assure the House that not once or twice or three times was this matter carefully gone into. Every vote was carefully considered before it was brought down here, and the estimates were prepared with the full knowledge and belief that any curtailment would result in an impairment of the public service, and would be of very little advantage as regards a shortening of expenditure. Now, my friend, Dr. Lloyd, the hon. member for Trinity, confined his remarks to a different aspect, and argued along different lines, and with the exception that I differ with him as to his conclusions, and as to his motives that he suggested, I cannot find any fault with his criticism; but the Doctor rarely fails to hark back to the policy of the Government in 1913, when they took off the duties. That, he says, was a mistake, and having made the mistake we have not the courage to come in and repair the error. Now, I don't agree with him there. That policy of taking off the duties was the well-considered policy of the Government. We had gone to the country on it, and it was one of the matters in 1908 and 1909 that was solemnly pledged to the country that we would reduce taxation on the items mentioned, and year after year in this House the very parties who

are now objecting so strongly to the taking off of these duties made speech after speech in favour of their being taken off; and I think if you will refer to the Journals you will find that not alone was the late leader of the party, Sir Robert Bond, and I think I am quite correct when I say the present leader, Mr. Kent, in favor of that policy, but they were in a hurry to have that policy carried out and proposed resolutions here along those lines. The position which the Government had to take then was this, that the time had not arrived; that we were not warranted in taking the duties off then, because we were under other obligations and other promises that had to be carried out before we would be in a position to remove these duties. Now, what are the facts? At the risk of being tiresome and tedious I have to ask the House to remember—and I am not speaking in any sense of complaint or with any desire to bring up old sores—that when we came in in 1909 we were confronted with a deficit of \$190,000, that had to be met by a loan bill—a debt entirely contracted by our predecessors. The next year we had a surplus of \$420,000, or in that neighbourhood. The next year we had another large surplus, and the following year another; and then, when we had made provision for all our public services, had provided for the interest on all our loans, and had increased the public service something like \$1,000,000 in five years and were well within our means, there appeared to be no risk whatever in taking these duties off. It has been pointed out here that that led to the deficit of \$301,000. Now, if you will look at the figures before the Committee it will be found that the deficit from the Customs that year only amounted to about \$200,000; so that at the very worst, the Finance Minister in his estimate, although he

took off \$400,000, was only short \$200,000 as regards Customs duties. These are the figures as stated in the Budget. And what happened in the meantime to bring the shortage up to \$300,000? Well, that has already been pointed out. The general depression all over the continent reacted on Newfoundland. Before the war began at all we felt that depression. Bell Island closed down, and we not alone lost the revenue that would have come to the Colony if people were employed there, but we lost the direct revenue coming from that Island and from the ore that they would be shipping. So that everything points to the fact that the Government was fully justified in putting these articles on the free list. Now, it has been asserted here over and over again that that was an election dodge that was resorted to last year merely because there was an election coming on. Now, I don't think it is fair to make that insinuation, and to question our motives in relation to a public matter like this. I am very sorry indeed that that aspect of it should be taken seriously by my friends on the other side. It was not an election dodge; it was simply carrying out a policy and a pledge made to the people four years before, and which would have been carried out the very first year we were in office only that there were other services crying out for attention. In that four years we added \$100,000 a year to education, \$60,000 to Old Age Pensions, and put up 50 or 60 new lighthouses and fog alarms all over the country; we built telegraph lines from one end of the country to the other in the district of St. Barbe; we laid cables in Fogo and Placentia and Burin and other places. If anyone will fairly and dispassionately examine the public accounts with a view of finding where that \$800,000 surplus went, he will find

that every dollar of it was spent in the way that he would spend it himself if he had the expenditure of that amount. And what would have been our financial position to-day if there had been no war? If the Colony had assumed its normal condition, what would be our financial position to-day? We paid the shortage of \$300,000 out of the nest egg that was down in the Bank of Montreal. It was as well for us to pay it out of the Bank of Montreal as to pay it from duties on tea and sugar and pork. These duties were taken off to fulfill a solemn pledge, and to relieve the most deserving class in the community. If we have had to put them back partially, if we have had to put on new duties, it has been because of a condition of things over which we could have no control and for which we are not responsible. Now, I look upon the present position of the Colony as being far from embarrassing or in any way serious. We had a shortage on the 30th June last which has been paid out of the \$500,000 that was put in the Bank of Montreal for that purpose. We have been putting that fund there for the last ten or fifteen years, and the object and purpose of putting it there was to meet a rainy day. That squared the year 1913-14. Now we are threatened with a further deficit of \$750,000, due very largely, if not entirely, to war conditions. We have something like \$200,000 to meet that, which will leave a deficit of over \$500,000, which we will have to borrow in order to pay. The Legislature will be asked to pass a bill to meet that. I hope that in the very near future our revenue will be of such an abundant character that we will be able to pay off every cent of that. We could have done it easily in the years to which I have referred. We could not alone have paid off \$500,000 between the years 1909

and 1913, but we could have paid off \$800,000, and there is no reason in the world why the years that will follow the war should not bring us abundant, overflowing revenue to pay for the short revenues which we have to-day. Our Importers are only importing that which it is absolutely necessary that they should have. They are endeavouring to get clear of old stocks that have been lying on their shelves, in some cases for years. That is No. 1 reason. No. 2 is that a certain class in the community are practising economy, taking advantage of present conditions in order to put money away. That is why we have short revenues. We are not short in our exports. Last year, with the exception of the lobster fishery, we had a very fair fishery, and we got a higher price for our fish than ever before; and I am quite sure that the exports for 1914-15 will also surprise those who may have any doubt on that point. Now, my friend, Dr. Lloyd, in criticising the Budget this afternoon was rather of opinion that there would be a still further and larger deficit the coming year, which begins on the 1st July, 1915. I think in that respect his figures are slightly over. In the first place, he entirely overlooked, as was pointed out by the Minister, something like \$100,000 in relation to the item of kerosene oil, and the other items referred to. Further, as regards the 10 per cent, he only estimates \$100,000, while the Minister estimates \$150,000; so that is \$150,000 which can be fairly added to the estimate made by the hon. member. Now, under normal conditions, we would not require any of this additional revenue. The estimate here of \$715,170 is the estimate of Mr. LeMessurier as the amount which would be collected over and above the revenue as it existed in normal times. That is the estimate given by him to me something like two months ago. Well,

now, if you add to that the increase under the present tariff, I think you have a fair margin to go on; and if we have any fair importation at all during the coming year, beginning on the 1st July, 1915, I think we may safely say that the estimates of the Finance Minister in that respect will be borne out. There is no desire whatever, and there never has been any desire or any intention to keep back from the House or from the country the fullest information in relation to this matter. We have had to put on these taxes to meet an unique, extraordinary and unusual case, and I am quite satisfied that with a little patience, with a little self-reliance, and with hope and confidence in the future, that the Colony will come out of the present conditions of affairs as it has come out on other occasions. We must remember this, that previous to the war, and previous to the general depression which has been referred to here this evening, this Colony was never in a better position; the people were never better off, never more comfortable, and you have only got to look at the statistics to see that; you have only got to take the value of the earning power of the people ten or fifteen years ago and compare it with their earning power to-day. Divide the population of the country when it was 200,000 into the earning power of that day and see what were the per capita earnings of the people, judged by the imports and exports, and divide 240,000 to-day into \$15,000,000 of imports and \$16,000,000 of exports, and you will see the condition of the people. I remember that it was considered a splendid boast in this House when it could be stated that the average earnings of the people had come up to about \$200 per family. But that day has passed by, and we now want something better than \$200 a family or \$300 a family, or even \$400 or \$500 a

family. It is not what the people are taxed but what they are earning that counts. A man cares very little whether he pays in \$5 or \$10 if he has got the means of paying it. It is along these lines, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to think. There are many ways in which the present financial difficulty might be met, but the Government are satisfied, after giving every consideration to the matter, that the course which they have adopted and which they will pursue is the wisest course and the best course; and that any course which would have meant the cutting down of the public service, which would have affected every one and every industry in the country would not be in pursuance of the purpose and object which we have in view, namely, to deal with the crisis through which we are passing in such a way that it will inflict the least possible injury on every one in the community.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of prolonging the debate, but I want to make a correction in reference to what the Premier has just stated. I admit that I have not taken into consideration the statements of the minister in reference to kerosene oil. But I do not admit that I left out of consideration anything like \$100,000. I merely said that in taking into consideration my estimates I did not include that because it was too small. Let me prove my point. First of all, let us suppose that the Minister of Finance, receives the benefit of that taxation. In his own speech he quoted from the Assistant Collector of Customs who estimates that the value of kerosene oil September last, was \$65,800. Suppose it is \$66,000. Suppose there is no drawback at all. How the Assistant Collector makes up that, I do not know or whether it is the net duty. Suppose you put on the drawback, what does it amount to? We

have a means of estimating that, when it is taken in normal year. But in a normal year you only get \$12,000 and not the \$70,000 or \$80,000 that the Minister is talking about. The total duty before the drawback is paid comes to \$77,000 in a normal year; and Mr. LeMessurier estimates \$60,000 it will only amount to \$12,000, not \$70,000 or \$80,000. The other point that I want to make is in reference to gasolene. I made no allowance for a drawback in gasolene. What does it amount to? The amount of gasolene consumed on June 30th, 1914, amounted to 185,000 gallons. Suppose that the total duty was reckoned at 6 per cent. of that. So that even if every cent was paid back out of the revenue from gasolene, it could not come to more than \$10,000. I take that to be a fair estimate. Suppose that \$13,000 was the drawback on gasoline, it would only amount to \$20,000 and that is only one fifth of \$100,000. I must point out that if there is \$20,000 not taken into consideration, I was exceptionally liberal in reckoning the rest. If the gasolene is excluded, it does not effect the main argument.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, last year we paid out all the drawback received on kerosene oil I have not the figures here, but will furnish them if any hon. member desires to see them. As gasolene is going out of business and kerosene is taking its place, we cannot estimate the kerosene at less than 2,000,000 gals. Last year it amounted to 1,500,000 gals., and this year the gasolene is gradually disappearing. You cannot estimate the kerosene importation this year. Take last year's estimates; the kerosene oil amounted to \$84,623.95, and the amount collected in revenue was \$15,000. I do not think that there is any trouble about these figures

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I accept those figures; but I have already

allowed on account of kerosene only \$64,000, and I have already given him that. I am allowing that you receive two third more than that. I am taking into consideration a revenue from kerosene oil at \$64,000. The drawback for gasoline is \$10,000. That only makes a drawback of \$40,000 all told.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the remarks of the Premier or the Minister, as regards the prospect for the coming year. I would rather be able to believe that we would have \$50,000 at the end of the present year, than a deficit. To begin with, we are going to lose a large proportion of the lobster fishery which will not be worth more than \$20,000 this year. Then we have lost a large amount of money on herring, on account of the ice. Green Bay has lost \$50,000 worth of herring alone. I believe that when the books are made up there will be a deficiency, but I hope that it will not be as bad as Dr. Lloyd pointed out. But you need not look for any increase, even if the war ends in a few months, within 18 months from now. The people have \$250,000 less than in a normal year. The higher price came after all the fishermen had sold their fish. It was the merchant who made the profit, not the fishermen. Then the large shortage in labour amounted to \$200,000. There is no labour this year on the railway.

I do not expect that on the whole this summer the people will get more than \$6.50 for their fish, but approaching the fall they will probably get \$7.50. Oil will be worth \$120 or \$125 instead of \$75 as last year, but they need not expect any large price for their early fish. Conditions during the coming year may not be too good but they will be no worse than they were during 1914-15.

Now Mr. Clift said this afternoon

that we should retrench; but instead of retrenching you are imposing an additional taxation of \$250,000; and you are going to take it directly out of the pockets of the fishermen and the workingmen; because this extra taxation is going to come from them. You are putting a tax of eleven per cent on motor engines, and of course you will make it more difficult for the fishermen to buy these engines. It is hard enough now for a fisherman to get an engine and you are making it harder. It is monstrous for you to do this and you never did a worse thing than put a tax on motor engines. Instead of helping and encouraging them to get these engines, and instead of giving them loans if necessary to procure them you now turn round and put this eleven per cent tax on them and render it almost impossible for them to get them. Now I say to the Government put taxes on in some other direction, or cut out some of your useless expenditures, but do not put this tax on motor engines and crude oil used by the fishermen.

We should be endeavouring to give these men every facility, and trying to provide them with anything that would make their work easier instead of hindering them by taxation. Talk about encouraging industries. You encourage capitalists and concerns like the Ropewalk by allowing them to get in raw material duty free, and pay enormous dividends and build up enormous businesses, and you impose this tax on poor fishermen, and hamper an industry, that is bigger than all the others. I do not see how you have the heart to do these things. There must be some other way of meeting the present situation without taxing this \$250,000 from the poor fishermen in addition to all you look from them last year in the way of taxes on flour and beef and pork, which amounted to about \$750,000. Now you have also put a tax on all agricultural imple-

ments and cattle feed etc., and you expect to make thirty or forty thousand dollars from that source. Talk about an agricultural policy and encouraging agriculture; why you are making it impossible for a farmer to make a living at all. Then you are putting a tax on molasses. You expect to get \$30,000 from that source. Of course the consequence will be that the fishermen will have to pay about fourteen cents a gallon more for his molasses. Of course all these taxes that were now being put on would defeat their own object; because the people would only be able to buy the barest necessities, and then only in small quantities, and the revenue would consequently suffer. Then as regards the tax on salt; it was most unfair. One half the business men had been able to get in their salt duty free and the rest would have to pay the tax. You could not have given the smaller man much consideration or you would not have done that. Of course you cannot intend going to the country again or you would not be doing these things. It has been stated the exports were large last year and that the fishermen did well. It is true that the exports were large; but the money did not go to the fishermen. They did not get the prices for their fish that they should have got. The ones that made the money were the merchants. The merchants that handled that fish last year made a clear million dollars as the result of the increased price of fish and yet these are the very men that are to-day refusing to give supplies to the fishermen. Why does not the Minister of Finance take the matter up and issue supplies to the fishermen. Let them give security to the Treasury. Why not do something never done before. All around us are happening things like never happened before. Our people are leaving the country in large numbers to look for work abroad. I

heard that one hundred and fifty men left Conception Bay last night to get work in Sydney. If the merchants will not supply the fishermen many more will have to leave the country, and we cannot afford to have this happening. We need these men to keep the country up.

I wish I could agree with the Minister as to what he says in relation to the condition of the country, and what the revenue is going to be next year; but I am afraid that he will find on June 30th 1916 he is going to have a million dollars deficiency instead of finding everything square. Our affairs were in a pretty bad condition even before the war, and they will be in a much worse condition now that the war is on. If you would cut down expenditures and encourage the fishermen instead of hampering them by these taxes there might be a hope of improving our position. We will not be able to get any money for twelve months to spend on railway construction, and even that will be quite a loss. Even if we did not have this war we would have had an upheaval in our trade conditions, because economic conditions in this country are not what they should be. The business men of Water Street are no more capable of running the business of the country than I am of being President of the United States. The whole system will have to be turned over from the top to the bottom, or we do not know where it will end. There are only a few men on the street who know how their business are being run and whether they are making money or not. Our present system will never bring stable prosperity to the country.

I have some further remarks to make in connection with these Resolutions, but I shall make them at a later stage. I would now suggest to the Government that they reconsider what has been done in connection

with the Resolutions; and they might take up the suggestion that we have made and see if they cannot do something to encourage the fishing industry just as they have protected the Tobacco Factory and the Standard factory. We have protected the Nail factory, the Clothing factory, the Rope-walk and now you are taxing the industry that has to maintain the whole lot of them. Now, I ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and the members representing the Government on the other side of the House to get together and take off those taxes, and instead of trying to prevent our fishermen from getting motor engines try and devise some means to assist them in purchasing them.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Just one or two words in reply to the honourable gentleman. I do not agree with him at all when he says that this tax on motor boats and crude oil will come hard on the poorer fishermen. The fishermen that are able to buy and run motor engines are of a class of men that are more or less independent, and about seventy five per cent of them have small bank accounts. Now I know what I am talking about for quite a number of fishermen in my district have motor engines, and each and everyone of these men are fairly well-off fishermen with small bank accounts; and if they can purchase these engines and increase their earnings there is no reason why under present conditions we should not come into this House and put a small tax on these men. It is not a tax on the poor fishermen. As I have just said the men that use these engines and this crude oil are the well-to-do fishermen who are increasing their earnings by this means, and it is only right that they should pay a small tax.

If he can increase his present catch fifty per cent, surely it is not unjust to put a ten per cent on his engine and five and a half cents on crude oil. This class of man has not been bearing his fair share of taxation in the past, and we have now imposed this tax on engines and crude oil.

MR COAKER—In reply I would just say a word about the fishermen who own motor engines. Now I can quite see that the men who bought the first motor engines that were used in our fishery were independent men of the class the Minister speaks about, men who could afford to purchase their engines outright. But that condition has changed. The men who have been buying them the last few years are not the same. They are men who buy an engine, paying probably one third of the purchase price down and the remaining two third is to be paid in three years. We cannot sell an engine on terms longer than two years, but I think some engines are being sold on longer terms. There is a great effort being made by the fishermen in the northern districts to get motor engines. Every fisherman that has a bit of money or can borrow it is anxious to get enough to pay the first instalment on one of these engines. The honourable gentleman may be right about his own district, but his remarks do not apply to the northern districts.

The Chairman vacated the chair at 6.30, and resumed it again at 8 o'clock.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks relative to this resolution. I think that the Government may somewhat be excused on the ground that they were desirous of keeping taxation as low as possible at this particular period of time, but it must be borne in mind that the policy of the Government in the year 1908 was one of expenditure

and that this policy of itself lays itself open to the criticism of members on this side. The question which most affects the country at this moment is the one of employment, for to-day we have men all over the Island seeking employment wherever they can obtain it. Still to keep the old ship afloat I think the Government ought to be able to find some means of getting revenue other than by taxing the fishermen to the utmost, and for these reasons we object to extra taxation. It is very unfair; it is the last straw that breaks the camel's back, and in the opinion of many of the fishermen the Government never intends to go back to risk re-election, because if they did they would devise some means of raising revenue more consistent with their policy. If I were a leader of the Government and wanted to issue a manifesto I would turn up the back files and look at the manifesto for Sir Edward Morris for 1908, and peruse the words which he used when criticising the Government that was going out and showing up their shortcomings, where he deals with the misdeeds of past Governments and makes promises as to the development of our natural resources,—coal, peat, and other industries, and the finding of new markets for our fish and other promises of a like nature which he makes. His statements would be as good to-night against himself as they were at the time they were printed. What has transpired during the past week or two is a direct contradiction of the intentions laid down by the Premier. What has he done for the conservation of our natural resources? As far as I can see, nothing beyond that bill which was brought down a short while ago. Quite the opposite,—he is throwing away wholesale, and on that ground I find that the Government has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. From the

remarks of the Premier this evening, one would be led to believe that the country was in a very flourishing condition—the people are prosperous, happy, and contented; but when he wanted to get that contract confirmed by the Legislature the one excuse offered was the condition of the country and the need of finding employment. Our natural resources may be good, they may keep, but we want them, and to develop them now is to save the country. That was his argument. I cannot see the consistency of his remarks on these occasions. First we are in destitute circumstances, and then we are in quite a happy and prosperous condition. The policy of the present Government has brought this country to the condition that we find it in now, and still, no doubt, the Premier will say that everything he promised has been performed, everything the Government said they would do has been fulfilled. Take the question of coal and peat: What has been done with that? It is no nearer being developed than when the Premier came in. Our peat is lying in the bogs, and the attempt to utilize it has failed. A promise was also made with regard to the St. John's Municipal Act and the adoption of amendments to compel absentee landlords to contribute their share of taxation. That has never been done. Then we were to have small cottage hospitals. I cannot see them anywhere. Bait freezers were to be established—no one can find them. The adoption of cold storage. Well we had a bill before the Legislature the other day giving a company certain rights so that they could carry out a cold storage business in this country and when an amendment was brought in by this side of the House in the interest of the fishermen to compel this Company to store a cer-

tain amount of frozen bait the Government refused to accept it. The policy of the Government seems to be to fight shy of cold storage in the matter of bait. They have gone right back on their policy; but it is unnecessary to go any further into these matters to show where the Government has failed. In 1913 the great cry was "Reduction of Taxation." It was the crowning act of the Morris Government that they had reduced taxation. They did, but what was the result? We are told that the people benefitted directly. They benefitted for a short while, but when we had to return to these taxes again they found they had to put them on heavier than ever. But who benefitted most by this reduction of taxation? Not the fishermen, nor the consumers, but the men who sold the goods. They benefitted by that, and they benefitted by the extra taxation also. That is a well known fact to everyone. Not only did the price go up on goods that were imported after the taxes were put on but a great deal of the goods that were imported previous to the putting on of the taxes were marked up and the men who brought in the goods made the profit while the consumer had to pay. So that in the first year we find fifty per cent. added to the original taxation. That is what has happened to the country by the taking off of the taxes previous to the General election. It was a failure. It was bad financing, and it dislocated trade. Some one has said that in 1913 the reduction of taxation was an election dodge. I think it was a very good election dodge. It certainly did the trick. Then there was a promise in regard to a Lunatic Asylum. The old Asylum was to be taken down and a new one put in its place. It has not been done yet. I read the report of the Grand Jury on this Institution. Its condition is worse than ever. They

say in fact that it is not fit for human beings to live in. In 1913 the people of St. John's were led to believe that we were going to have a new Lunatic Asylum and a new Poor Asylum and that we were going to have continuation or night schools. This was contained in the Speech from the Throne and Mr. Kent in one of his speeches laid great stress upon their necessity. Where are the continuation or night schools? The Education grants have been increased. It would be a disgrace to the Government if they were not, but the teachers' salaries have not been increased. They are poorer to-day than they were in 1913. They are getting the same salary while the cost of living has gone up. There has been an increase in the grant, and therefore the children have benefitted to a certain extent, but the teachers have not benefitted. At the time in his reply Mr. Kent said that he failed to see what the Colonial Secretary meant in reference to education; and the Premier replied saying: "I cannot see what the hon. member expects, but I cannot have it in more definite terms than by saying that the Government intends to take up the continuation or night schools and deal with it as fully as possible, and establish these schools so that the people all over the country will be able to go to night schools in relation to navigation and any particular branch of study which they wish to take up." The Leader of the Opposition at that time in his remarks on the reduction of taxation said: "When I think of the many obligations facing the country and see the country on the eve of a General Election and when I see these enormous reductions of taxation I cannot but be absolutely certain that you will have to replace these taxes by other duties." It has been shown that Mr. Kent was right. It was bad finan-

cing on the part of the Government. Another statement made by a gentleman who once led this House—Sir Robert Bond—in 1910 was, "Before the Government can carry out this policy they will find the country itself at the mercy of the Bank of Montreal with the revenue hypothecated at five or six per cent. interest." These were statements given by men on the borrowing and spending policy of the Government before there was any thought of war at all, and at the end of the Fiscal Year 1914, we find ourselves with a deficit of \$302,000, before the war was dreamt of at all. Can we expect anything else, when the policy of the Government has been nothing but borrowing and spending and borrowing? The only policy of the Minister of Finance has been to borrow, borrow, borrow, and then put on additional taxation. Time and again they have been told that they should follow the policy of retrenchment and economy, but unfortunately the words "retrenchment and economy" are not found in the vocabulary of that party. I should be sorry to think that there was anything of a personal interest in the remarks of any members who backed up the policy of expenditure rather than retrenchment but we must certainly do a lot of thinking in these days. It is a pity that the Minister did not take the warning given him by Sir Robert Bond and Mr. Kent. They ought to take some other means than what they have done to meet the situation. The Minister's excuse, and that of his party, throughout the whole term of their office has been that these expenditures could not be helped. They must spend this money to meet the increased necessities of the country and to build up the public service which they undertook. There might be some excuse for increased expenditure when they had surplus revenues

but in these years when we are facing a deficit it certainly is not right. They have increased the expenditure this year by an amount almost as much as they did last year. How can they expect the country to support this increased expenditure? The Government has run a career of unparalleled extravagance so that the fate of the country is ruin. What will be the result of this policy of borrowing and additional taxation I fail to see. At the present time the whole country is feeling the pinch of the war. The Government has determined to continue the Agricultural grant of \$20,000. That is a sum of money that might have been saved this year. The only way to get out of this hole and to help the country is by retrenching, properly retrenching, but the policy of this Government is not retrenchment. It is to look after its own friends. They must find salaries for commissioners. They must make soft jobs for their friends either in the House or outside. There are deductions made by the people outside of this House, outside of politics, who have been considering the condition of the country. Everything is taxed and now you will have to increase taxation on the fishermen. You are piling on the taxation on the head of everyone, so that the cost of living has become almost unbearable, and in spite of it all you still refuse to reduce your expenditure, and to carry out any retrenchment in any possible way.

I know that the people of this country will be told that the war is the cause of the present condition of affairs, but I would leave out this altogether and go back to the time when there was no war. There we find their policy of Government was wrong. The estimates were out. Taxation had to be increased to carry out their policy. It is alright for the Government officials who enjoy nice salaries

and are sure of their pay to cry out that the times are good, and that everything is alright but there is to them a silver lining in that cry. Their policy is get out of the scrape as best you can, and that is their endeavor. That is their demoralising policy. That is the policy preached to the people. We will get back if we can; we'll get out of this if we can.

The policy of this Government is a matter of graft; a demoralising policy, and the people will soon awake from the sleep and slumber they had been privileged to enjoy under past Governments. As soon as the money is gone the people will see that they are no good at all. They are no good unless they have lots of money. If they cannot get all the money they want it is the member's fault. "You are no good" they say, "other members got money for us by can't you." That is the policy that has been practiced by members. The enormous expenditure is for the good of individuals and not for the country as a whole.

I would say to the Minister of Finance "Cut off that duty on motor engines," because I assure you time has changed the conditions of the fisherman. A fisherman must have a motor in his boat now as much as he needs a trap for the cod fishery. Perhaps a year or so ago a man who had a motor in his boat was looked upon as a man of means, but this is not the case now. Motors have changed now from a luxury to a necessity, and a man who tries to catch fish now without a motor against those who have a motor, is like a one-handed man against two-handed men. Therefore I think that every encouragement should be given them to get motors without forcing them to deny themselves on account of the duty. All fishermen are now getting motors, and I know that all the members here will bear me out

when I say that the most unpopular thing the Government can do is to place a duty on motors, such as this bill provides. If it is at all possible, cut it out, and also cut out that tax on kerosene oil. Both are absolutely necessary to the people. Cut out that tax on school books. They are also a necessity. I know that that would be as great a hardship as the rest. School fees are very low in some schools. Some children have to pay but 25 cents per quarter or one dollar per year but school books are things which must be bought year after year. The same books will not do for more than one year. Talk of a Government fostering education, and here you charge duty on school books. Many children have stayed away from school not because of fees, but because of books. You by doing this are making it harder for them to attend. A paternal Government doing everything to increase the education of the people. This tax is equally objectionable to the one on motor engines. Cut that out too.

On account, therefore, of these inclusions in the Bill, Mr. Chairman, I cannot for one moment think of giving it my support.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister, when speaking about this matter, made some reference to those shop-keepers who stocked dry goods. He made the statement that most of the stores in the city and outside the city had not been importing much during the past year, but tried to get clear of their old stock, and consequently personally benefitted. Now, Sir, I do not see eye to eye with the Premier in that remark, and would ask for an explanation.

In the first place, Sir, the price of goods has gone up considerably since the war began, and is still going up. No importer who has had any experience in the price of goods is going to

import as much now as he used before the war. How does he know but that the war will soon end and the price fall. He would lose perhaps forty per cent. You may depend upon it that he will be very careful about the quantity of goods stocked while the prices are as high as they are at present. He will only order what he cannot do without. This does not bear out the argument of the Premier when he expects a large quantity of dry goods to be imported in the present year.

I notice while the Premier was speaking that he laid special emphasis on the fact that since 1904 the earning power of the people had greatly increased, thus giving to his Government the credit. Now Sir, looking at our exports of 1904 we find that they amount in value to \$10,570,000. Dividing into this the population we get an average of \$45. The exports for the past year, 1913-14 amount to about \$15,000,000 which divided by the population gives an average of \$62 per year. This shows that it is quite true that the earning power of the people is increased, but what value is it when you consider the increased cost of living. Take flour for example: In 1904 flour was \$6 per barrel. To-day it is \$8.00 or \$8.50. What benefit can be derived when you pay the extra to keep alive. What is the good of it now that woollen goods has advanced 40%, and now that taxation is being increased year by year at the present rate.

Another thing I want to point out is this: The Minister of Finance points out that the man who has money in the bank pays taxes, while the poor man pays very little. Now I take a contrary view to him and do not think he was serious when he made it. He knows of course that his speeches will be read in the papers,

and hopes thereby that his term in office will be lengthened.

Now you take a man with an income of \$400 per year and this I think is the average poor man's salary. As the Minister has himself said he must spend all of it to get along at all. Now out of this salary he pays about \$130 to the revenue. Now take the man who gets \$4,000 per year, and lots are getting that. He spends \$2,000 of that and has another \$2,000 to put in the bank. He pays to the revenue \$666.50. He does not pay in proportion to the poor man getting \$400. He spends 17% to the revenue, while the poor man gives more. There is thus no foundation in fact to the statement of the Minister as the figures of any country will show you. It is a well known fact that every man pays to the country according to his income.

You take a man getting more than \$4,000. Some are getting \$15,000, \$20,000 and \$25,000. These people do not spend one-third of this. Such men pay to the revenue but 14 per cent., while the poor as I have shown pay 33%. Thus you can see that while the poor man has to pay 33% the rich or well to do has to pay but 14 or 17%.

Now, Sir, it is the same in every country outside of Newfoundland with respect to the poorer classes. I do not like dwelling on this point, but I am compelled to do so in view of the taxation that is being made in this country to-day. The Minister of Finance has said that the well-to-do man pays the taxes—the man with money in the bank. What amount is paid in pork and other stuff used chiefly at the fishery. What is collected from pork? \$2000 per year taxes are received from these articles. Then there is kerosene oil. He says that only the man with money in the bank uses oil. He must have been dreaming, when

he said that. He says the rich men pay the taxes and at the same time proposes to tax Kerosene oil to the extent of \$34,000, and this every man uses, especially the poor. All the fishermen must use oil. The people in the city use electric light, and will pay none of that. Then there is cattle feed. There is going to be \$17,000 revenue from that. This too will come chiefly from the outports. There are people there living from hand to mouth who will have to pay the Government \$16,000 or \$17,000 per year, while the others get free from this duty. All this shows quite plainly that the Minister was joking when he said the people with money in the bank paid taxes.

If the Ministers on the other side of the House are sincere let them show their sincerity by applying this taxation in a different way to the present. If the Minister is sincere he will ask leave to withdraw this portion of his budget and will so even up taxation that poor and rich may share alike and so do away with the present system of having the poor man pay 33% and the rich man 17%. If he would do this he would be showing his sincerity in a practical manner.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, I have not been following the debate upon this subject, being otherwise engaged, and therefore I intend to make only a few remarks, more for the purpose of putting myself on record than anything else, and with reference to the financial proposals which these Resolutions contain I intend to say nothing for the simple reason that it does not appear to me to be in the interest of the country at the present time to say very much. It might do more harm outside than good inside. In fact the financial proposals of the Government have been brought down, supply has been voted; if anything

could have been done the opportunity for doing it has gone by; and these Resolutions are only for creating the ways and means of raising the sums already brought down; therefore it would serve no good purpose to enter into a discussion of the general financial condition of the Colony, and it might do a great deal of harm. I will only say as I said on the vote for supply that I think the true policy of the Government should have been to cut the expenditure of the Colony with no uncertain hand, and to have practised economy in every direction rather than to spend so much of the public money and try and raise it from the same people amongst whom most of it is to be spent. But the Government have chosen to go on spending on the principle that the money they are spending goes into the pockets of the people, and then in order to obtain the money they are spending they put their hand into the other pocket of the same people and take out the amount, without reckoning, of course, on what always happens in that process and that is that a portion of this money is always lost. But, Sir, that has been decided upon, we are to make these expenditures, and we are now come to the question of raising the money. The question to which I wish to direct myself briefly is whether the proposals now made for raising the revenue are the wisest, and it appears to me that they are not. First, I think that a number of things which have been selected are manifestly things which should not be taxed. They seem to me to be taxes placed upon industry, taxes which will tend to prevent industry instead of encouraging it. Take for instance the tax on agricultural implements and upon animals and upon articles that farmers use, such as fertilizers, etc. That seems to be a direct tax, not merely upon the individual but upon the livelihood of the individual and

upon the raw material he uses in the production of this livelihood. That principle of taxing raw material brought into the country for the promotion of industries has been accepted as a wrong one by all Governments and no responsible legislature would think of changing that policy. Next you turn and put a tax upon motor engines and things of that kind which the fishermen use in their prosecution of their industry. Now it is nonsense to say that articles of this kind are not used by the poorer people and that they consequently will not have to pay the tax. All taxes in the long run have to be paid by the producers of wealth. It does not matter who pays in the first place. All taxes are ultimately paid by the producing class. All taxes in this country no matter who pays them first, are in the last analysis paid by the man who hauls the fish out of the water or takes the natural produce out of the earth. We hear a lot of talk about the rich men of the country paying the taxation but where do they get the wealth to pay the taxation. The rich men of the country get their revenue from the industrial workers of the country and if they pay taxation largely it is due to the fact that they live luxuriously on the wealth and dividends which are provided by the producers that is, poor men of the country and therefore it is that all taxes of this kind which are taxes upon productive activity are taxes placed upon the poor. We hear about the amount of taxes that the professional men pay, the doctor, the lawyer and the clergyman, but where do they get the money to pay for their taxes. We are not producers ourselves. At the most we are mere gatherers of wealth made by other people; the taxes we pay are merely a small amount of the wealth that we take from others, because we are not producers ourselves

and are merely gatherers of wealth produced by the industrial classes. That is true of every professional man, because all wealth comes from the sea, or from the soil and the producer is the man who turns it into wealth, who draws it out from its source and the rest of us are merely tax gatherers for the Government. That is all. This class of people will not be bothered by increased taxation because they will simply put more taxation upon the producers. There is nothing more absurd than to talk about the rich people of this country paying the taxation of the country. Everyone of them has merely been the gatherer of wealth earned by other people and the more they have, the more they have taken from others. Now I may say that if I had been framing these Resolutions I would have moved along altogether different lines. I would have proceeded on the assumption that more revenue could have been produced by removing the duty on certain articles instead of putting on additional duty. There are a whole series of articles being produced in this country upon which the duty is so high as to be prohibitive. They are protected in order to encourage manufacturers and they provide a certain amount of labour. Incidentally for every ten cents for which they provide labour they provide ninety cents for the capitalists to keep for themselves. Now then I say that in a time of this kind we ought to consider the fishermen and the labouring classes and if there is any men we should protect in this country it ought to be the fishermen and I think and suggest that upon such articles as butterine, clothing, boots and shoes and articles of that kind we could collect much more revenue by reducing the duties and by giving the consumer cheaper goods. The amount to which this could be

done of course would depend upon a careful examination into the standing of each of these industries, but I fail to see any justification for the heavy protective duty that is at present upon these articles. We have heard from one gentleman upon the other side of the House that the present condition is a temporary one. Well, if that is so, why put on these extortionate duties upon things which have been free by the common consent of Governments of this country for many years. It would be better to have this deficit for a short time. You say you can borrow money, then why not borrow it for six months or a year. I would not advocate that as a permanent policy, but as you contend that this present financial situation is a temporary and an extraordinary one, why not make a change in the permanent policy and raise a short loan to meet the situation.

Then I read the other day in one of the newspapers an article upon the enormous revenue we are going to collect from the export duty on pit props. I think it said we are going to collect a million dollars from this source. If this is so why put this tax upon motor engines and fishing implements and upon the agricultural industry. Again we were told in the Governor's speech what wonderful prosperity we were going to have this year in the fisheries. Why bother about these extra duties if that be the case and we are also told that we are going to have a return of prosperity when these regrettable circumstances in which the Empire is now placed have passed away. Then what is the need for this extraordinary taxation. We have also been told that we can borrow money without trouble. Then why make these changes in our Revenue Bill. The simple reason is, Sir, that the Minister does not believe half these things. He does not believe

them himself and he does not expect anyone else to believe them.

If he believes what he says that these conditions are merely temporary, why not meet them by reducing expenditure as was done in 1894. At that time when the country was in a bad financial condition, the Whiteway Government came in and cut the expenditure in two in many cases and in that way met the situation. You adopt precisely the opposite view and instead of reducing your expenditure you come down here and introduce these most unfair, unnecessary and unpopular resolutions.

For these reasons I shall vote when the proper time comes, if not to-day, then on a future date, on this matter, against the Resolutions, as they are proposed.

I recognize that something must be done, but I think the things you propose are unwise and as I have already stated most of the things that you propose to tax are essential things which should not be taxed at all.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Chairman, I intend to say a few words upon the Resolution for the purpose of putting myself on record. Now, Sir, many of these things which we have before us in the Resolutions I consider most unfair. Many of the statements of the Minister and of the Hon. Prime Minister we consider are not correct. For instance, we were told this evening that 75% of our men had bank accounts.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I said 75% of the men purchasing engines.

MR. WINSOR.—Every man who is fishing to-day wants to have an engine. I do not know where the Government gets their information but I know that their information is most inaccurate as far as the laboring classes and the fishermen are concerned. They make one statement to-day and

another one to-morrow and altogether they are anything but consistent.

We were told many times by the Minister that the fishermen were the backbone of the country. Now if that is so, why not look after their interests and why try to hamper them by putting this tax on motor engines and motor oil. Now there was a great ado made the other day about the passing of the Products Bill and a lot was said about encouraging capitalists. Now, Sir, why not do something to encourage our fishermen. The fishery is a greater industry than any capitalist can bring into this country. This tax on motor engines and motor oils ought certainly be stricken out of the resolutions. Our fishermen ought to be encouraged and helped to purchase motor engines. Every person who goes fishing to-day needs a motor engine. If they cannot get engines they will not go. Some of the schooners were laid up for most of the summer last year and the reason was because they did not have engines. Take the position of a man with two or three sons. If he cannot get an engine his sons will not go fishing with him and will leave him and go seek employment somewhere else. Our fishermen are no longer prepared to put up with unnecessary labour and unnecessary hardship in the fisheries when by the installation of motor engines a great deal of it will be removed. The fishermen in our district are all endeavouring to get engines. I know cases on our shore where people have loaned their friends money to pay the first instalment on engines and those who have had engines and have seen the benefit of them are all anxious to help their fellow fishermen to get them. The man who has a motor engine can go out to his traps in the morning and overhaul them and does not have to work half as hard as the man who has not got an engine. Instead of en-

couraging greater numbers to get these engines the Government by this additional taxation, are hindering the fishermen. I think the Government ought to consider this and see if something else cannot be done to raise the revenue. A carpenter cannot work without his tools and this motor engine is a new tool which has come into the fishing business and every fisherman is finding the necessity of having one and should be encouraged to obtain them instead of being hindered by the Government.

I do not intend to allude very much to the taxation on agriculture. I do not think that the agricultural policy of the Government since they came into power has done much good. I believe that they have given a few animals to some farmers and now they are going to tax them. It seems to me that the present Government is trying to put a tax upon everything and their whole policy is to collect taxes from the people and spend them and it is because of that policy that we find ourselves in the position that we are in to-day. I think that if the Government were run in a business like manner they would find lots of places where they could cut down expenditure. I think the Minister can find lots of ways of getting out of the present financial situation by reducing our expenditure and if he would go into the matter fully and if all put our shoulders together I think that by a policy of retrenchment we could meet this situation without putting on any of these taxes at all. I think the present policy will do more to discourage our fishermen than anything we have ever had before. I think that if the Minister would take advice from this side of the House he would see that there is another way of meeting the present conditions than the manner he proposes.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Chairman I

have followed with interest the remarks of the various speakers with regard to these resolutions. All through the session the members on the other side of the House used to say how much they were in favour of the fishermen. But still they find fault with whatever is said on this side of the House on any subject in relation to the fishermen. I am as much interested in the fishermen of Newfoundland as any man inside these walls. I want to say a few words with regard to taxation. It seems to me like a crime to tax the poor toilers. The toilers are the bone and sinew of this country and we ought to do what we can to help them in the fishing industry. It seems to me that instead of trying to encourage them the present Government is trying to kill them. That is my honest opinion. I may be wrong, but I do not think that I am. There have been improvements in nearly everything in this world the last century, unless it is one thing and that is Legislative matters. I know that the Prime Minister promised to take taxation off, but it was only for a moment. The trouble is that before we knew anything about the war there was taxation. He also tells us that the country is in very good circumstances. If you are going to tax the fishermen further, it means that you are going to put a burden on them greater than they can bear.

I know of men trying to buy engines, not out of their own money, because they have not got it, but by borrowing it. It is hard for men to prosecute the fishery without engines. Someone said that they were going to tax the points of the compass. Even school books are taxed. For men who have 5 or 6 children going to school, it is no fun to have their books taxed. As far as I am concerned, I believe that it is wrong. It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman to keep the

House very long, but I want to show that I am interested in the toilers of the country. I am not interested in the rich because they can look after themselves, but in the toiler who toils all day and then has taxes put on him.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Chairman, it is an unpleasant duty to have to impose a tax; nevertheless it becomes incumbent sometimes as a duty. It is a duty to the country, to the poor man and to the rich. Why is it that in England the working man is working 16 hours out of 24? Why is it that he is working overtime, because it is a simple duty. A duty to the Empire, and to his country. What I have heard here on this discussion has been merely controversy without an ennobling feature. We stand today at an epoch-making period; and we ought to be prepared to do what has never been done before. It has been thrown across this House that we have been harsh to the fishermen. Read the history of the country and every man will say that we have done everything that was possible in order that the fishermen should be looked after. The taxes placed on the people are there because we must preserve this outpost of the British Empire, so that the people may reap prosperity when these troublesome times are over. That is all that the Government is trying to do. You must remember there is such a thing as false economy. If the Premier and the Executive Government of this country lose their courage during the war, this country will be in more danger than ever before. The fishermen of this country are loyal and ready with self sacrifice and the fulfilment of their duty. It must be remembered that the times are abnormal but I hope that when the war is over affairs will assume their natural aspect. I think it is unfair for

us to thus complain when we consider the times in which we find ourselves. It is not fair to the fishermen of this country. The standard of ethics is higher than that. We should not trouble ourselves in times such as these, as to the price of this and that.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the House, but I wish to make some reference to the resolutions now before the chair. I think it only right and proper for me to express my opinion, especially as this is so connected with the fishermen. I think that in various departments there has been lots of room for entrenchment. For instance there is the case of the Government analyst, who receives a salary of \$1,600. Is there no way of curtailing these amounts? Now we have before us, resolutions calling for increase in taxation. I say that I cannot possibly support these resolutions because I believe that taxation on the kerosene oil of the fishermen, is absurd. It is not always men who can afford them, who are getting motor engines. Because a man has increased his earnings by means of motor boats, it is no reason why he should be called upon to pay that increase in taxation. Then there is no justification for the Government to impose taxes upon motor engines. Without the fishermen it is a question whether the Legislature would be here at all to-day. These resolutions are calling for \$250,000 to be raised from the fishermen of the country.

I do not know what the idea is now for raising this taxation, whether it is done to meet a deficit or not; but if we are faced with a deficit it is certainly the fault of the administrator; because to-day we find them spending money in all directions and now we are faced with a proposition of this kind. Under these conditions I can-

not possibly support the Resolutions when the time comes. I would like to place myself on record as saying I cannot possibly support it unless it is improved upon and I think that if the Minister of Finance will consider that our fishermen ought to be encouraged the very least he can do is to try and have this amended somewhat and take motor engines and crude oil off the list.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, one of the most pronounced features of the debate to-night has been this tax on motor engines, and most of the speakers who have placed their views before the House have shown that to place this tax on motor engines at the present time would mean nothing more or less than crippling the fisheries. Now I suppose that the Government have not considered that placing a tax on motor engines at the present time means keeping the poorer fishermen without engines and discriminating in favour of the richer men who have engines. It simply means that the poor man must starve and the rich man become richer. The richer men who have already got engines which came in duty free can go down on the Labrador and go out on the outside grounds and catch fish where the ordinary hook and line men cannot reach, and can go on the outside grounds and place their trawls and prevent the fish from coming close to the shore and the man without a motor has to starve. He had an equal chance before but he cannot compete with a man who has a motor boat and he will have to stay ashore. The more independent men have already got engines and now you are preventing the poorer men who are trying to secure engines from doing so. They cannot afford to pay this ten per cent. tax, and it simply means they will not get the engines. I don't suppose that any fishermen will be

foolish enough to pay that tax, because I shall tell them to wait a year or two for their engine and before then we will take off that tax. Instead of encouraging these fishermen you are doing everything possible to hinder them, and it will simply mean that the poor man will become poorer still.

Now it has been argued that because a workman must pay duty on his tools a fisherman should also pay duty on his engine. Now there is nothing at all in that argument. A planter's outfit costs anything from two to four thousand dollars. He cannot be a planter unless he has that. He must have boats and traps and gear; whereas a workman can start out on twenty-five or thirty dollars. I do not think that argument is a fair one at all. Then again if we do not catch fish in Newfoundland who is going to employ the workingman, even though he pays duty on his tools. Who is going to build houses and wharves and stores, who is going to give employment to the carpenter and the sailmaker and other classes of workingmen if you do not have the fisherman to catch the fish. Who is going to keep the country up? Suppose you take the fishermen out of this country for twelve months where would you be? How would you be able to pay your bills? Why you are taxing an industry that is the greatest of all our industries. I say to you now if you pass these Resolutions it will only be because you have made up your minds that you are never coming back to this House again. I doubt if even a man like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is a strong man in his district will ever come back if these Resolutions are put through.

I have heard the statements made by the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, Mr. Devereaux to-night. In

fact I have heard these same statements time and again. He has stated that the fishermen have had lots of benefits conferred upon them by the present Government. Have not the fishermen been given the duty on molasses, on tea, on salt and lines and twines, and on this and on that. You would almost wonder to yourself what do they pay duty on anything? If all this is correct, and if the fishermen get such a wonderful price for fish how is it that all hands have not gone fishing. They have no taxes to pay. I have heard it said also that they are working for three or four months for a few hours a day and for the other eight or nine months they do nothing. If it is so easy to live, with no duty to pay and with so little to do how is it that no more people have gone fishing? It is a wonder that all the bookkeepers and clerks and workmen have not gone into this profitable occupation that the fishermen are now engaged in. But, Sir, the fisherman has had his trials all through. As our friends have stated to-night he has often to get up at one or two in the morning and work till twelve o'clock at night. Of course that is not often done. But the independent man does not get all his wealth from the fishery, and he does not spend eight or nine months of the year in idleness. Go into his home on a winter's night and you will see him up at ten o'clock knitting twine. Every independent planter North spends his winter nights knitting twine to put into his trap for next year. This man works continuously the whole year through. The man who is no good or who is a lazy man does not do this, and the fisherman who is very poor is very often a lazy man and not industrious and a great deal of his adversity is due to his own neglect. I believe every workingman in Newfoundland would be independent if he

worked continuously, I have watched them for the last twenty-five or thirty years. I went down north and found men without boots or shoes, but they were determined to work up and today some of them have as much as \$10,000 in the bank. No one gave it to them. The fairies did not bring it they were determined to get on and worked night and day; and now because they have worked so hard and have been so industrious and have gathered a few dollars you put on this tax and say they are the right ones to be taxed because they have money in bank. Take care or you will find very few who will be anxious to be industrious and make money. You should be doing all you can to help on people to become independent and save money, and build up the business of the country. Think of all you have taken out of their earnings the last year in the way of taxes on flour and tea and butter. I tell you that a lot of money to pay these taxes will have to come out of trunks and boxes and banks. It is not being earned. And the longer the war keeps on the more apparent will this become. Cannot you do something to encourage them. Their calling is a precarious one. Men engaged in the fisheries risk their lives day after day. Should we not do something to encourage our young men to engage in the fishery? The older men are in it already and will probably remain; but what about our young men if you do not encourage them? As my friend, Mr. Abbott says, he has a couple of sons and if they cannot get an engine they are not going to stay here. They will probably go to the Canadian North West or Sydney this fall. The news of this tax will travel around the north and they will know that all these extra taxes will have to be paid, and that \$250,000 more a year will have to come out of their pockets, when by a

little economy you could have dispensed with all these taxes. You do not know what you are doing. You do not realize the effect of it on the country. It would be no trouble my friends for a man with five hundred rifles to go north and turn this country into a bed of revolution in forty-eight hours, not only amongst the fishermen but with everyone else. You do not know the state you have got the country in. It is no good for anyone to give you any advice. You will not take it. I had a great deal of faith in a good many men belonging to the Government, that they would do anything in their power to aid the fishermen and aid the country. But I have seen so much going on in this House the last ten days that I am now convinced that any man who is a friend of the fishermen could not be a member of the Morris Government. I have lost all faith in them. This pit prop proposition which came before the House yesterday has shown me the depths to which a man can go, especially when you find a party turning down their Leader's proposition. This measure is not a war measure at all. If it was the party would have accepted the propositions made by the Premier. These things have made me lose any little confidence I have had in you. I know you will not amend these Resolutions. No matter what I say. They will not make me any richer or poorer; but there are a great many men it will effect, men who will know that with a little economy in expenditure on your part these taxes would not be necessary, the same men that you taxed seven hundred thousand dollars last year. Since last September these people have had to pay in taxation the following amounts:

On Sugar	\$155,000
On Tobacco	100,000
On Butter	40,000

On Tea	42,000
On Liquor	125,000
On Flour	100,000
On Kero Oil and Gasoline	76,000
On Beef and Pork	52,000

Or about \$790,000 in all.

come in and asked for these taxes in September and said that they were necessary on account of the war we did not hesitate to give them to you. We would not hesitate now if you had come in and asked for these taxes and shown us that they were necessary to carry on the affairs of the country. But you could not do this, because we all know you could have saved this money and very few men through the country would have suffered. The fishermen of this country must be prepared to struggle along and send their sons to be soldiers in the trenches and sailors on board the warships and their fathers and brothers left behind must pay this enormous tax in order to keep things going in Newfoundland because of your extravagant expenditures.

You know the promises you made before the election of reducing taxation. When you made these promises you knew the consequences, that you were going to get into financial trouble. Of course, the only reason you did it was because it was election year. You did not say anything to the people at that election about the enormous bills you owed the contractors or you did not say anything about the pit prop business, that you were going to allow these people to go down to the Labrador and export pit props for ten years. When this pit prop bill came in first, we believed that it was an honest attempt to meet requirements brought about by the War. We knew these pit props were wanted in England and we prepared not to oppose the Bill. But now you are extending this for a period of ten years in order that timber grabbers and speculators may get

wealthy. The consequence will be that a few men will get rich at the expense of the whole country. As a consequence of your taxes the fishermen this year will have to pay \$2.50 a barrel more for flour than last year. They will have to pay 80 cents a hog-head more for salt; fourteen cents a gallon more for molasses, ten cents a pound more for tea, four cents a pound on sugar, two cents on butter, seventy cents a bag on hard bread, two cents a pound on tobacco. Is that not enough of taxes for one year? In spite of that you insist on taking this additional \$250,000 from the people. Then you are taxing Agricultural implements. The Commissioners of Agriculture ought to have sufficient influence with the Government to prevent you doing anything to injure the interests of Agriculture. You have spent \$250,000 the last six years in promoting agriculture and establishing stations all over the country. Now what are you endeavouring to do to that industry? I would like to know who is responsible for these Resolutions. I do not believe it is the Premier. I believe he has too much sense. There are a certain number on the other side of the House who do not care where the money comes from so that they have it to spend. These are the fellows back of these Resolutions.

MR. LLOYD—I beg to propose the amendment, "That all the resolutions relating to taxation on fishery or agricultural appliances be read this day 6 months."

The amendment being put was lost on division.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

On motion this report was received.

On the motion for the adoption of the report, Mr. Lloyd moved, and Mr. Coaker seconded the following amendment:—

"That all the resolutions relating to taxation on fishery or agriculture, and cancelling the draw-backs on kerosene oil and gasoline be read six months hence."

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared for the amendment Messrs. Lloyd, Clapp, Coaker, Halfyard, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes (8); and against it Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Devereux, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, Le Feuvre, Currie, Higgins, Geo. Kennedy, Walsh (17); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for the adoption of the report was put; and there appeared in favor of it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Devereux, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, Le Feuvre, Currie, Higgins, Geo. Kennedy, Walsh (17); and against it Messrs. Lloyd, Clapp, Coaker, Halfyard, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes (8); so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

REVENUE BILL.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend The Revenue Act, 1905" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PROHIBITION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture, and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Bill with some amendments.

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

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and to continue for a further period the Act 5, George V, Session 1, entitled "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in the Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

TRAIN FERRY SYNDICATE BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 4 George V, Cap. 6, entitled "An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Limited" was read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend the Act 5 George V,

Session 1, Cap. 10, entitled "An Act Respecting Municipal Affairs" and for other purposes in connection with the St. John's Municipal Council," with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to incorporate the Patriotic Fund" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendment was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled: "An Act to regulate the employment of Men engaged in Logging" with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Friday next move the suspension of the Rules of the House in relation to all matters now before the House or to come before the House.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, May 27th., at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, MAY 27th, 1915.

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

REPORTS.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled Report of the Violation of the German Army of the Rights of nations, and the laws and Customs of War in Belgium.

QUESTION.

Mr. Parsons gave notice of question.

PETITIONS.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Colliers in reference to repair to a wharf at that place. Owing to the pressure of ice and storms the wharf has suffered considerably and it needs repairs. I trust the matter will receive the attention which it deserves. I have also a petition from the people of Kelligrews asking for a sum of money to repair a road leading from the main line of road down to the water side, a distance of about half a mile. I trust that a small amount will be allocated for that purpose.

MR. Kent—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from William J. Ellis, Michael J. Kennedy and other contractors in St. John's, and persons interested with building trade, asking that they be incorporated under the name of the Newfoundland Builders Association. The petition sets forth that the purposes of the incorporation are to promote a good undertaking amongst the members of the body and a uniformity in the Customs and usage of the business and also to create a healthy tone in the building trade and to supply accurate information in regard to transactions.

I may say that the Association which asks to be established is established in nearly every other city. There is

one in Montreal, one in Boston, and in other cities.

I would ask Sir, that this petition be referred to a select Committee.

It is ordered that this petition be received and referred to a select Committee consisting of Mr. Kent, Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Higgins, Hon. Mr. Emerson, Hon. Colonial Secretary.

MR. TARGETT—I would call the attention of the Government to the petition of Mr. Alex. Penney, of Champneys to the Government, re application for mail courier. It was referred to the Post Master General.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I will be in a position to inform the hon. member to-morrow. This was passed over to the Post Office Dept.

Hon Colonial Secretary tabled the following notification from the Secretary of State for the Colonies:—

"No. 421.

From Secretary of State, (recd. 27th May, 1915.)

May 27.—His Majesty the King has been pleased to confer on me seals of the Colonial Office.

A. BONAR LAW."

I beg to table despatch from Mr. Bonar Law announcing his appointment as Secretary of State for Colonies.

Mr. Stone asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing (1) From whom the Postal Telegraph purchased wire, what quantity purchased during the fiscal year 1913-14, and up to the end of April, 1915; (2) What gauge wire is used, and how much per hundred pounds does the Postal pay for it landed in St. John's; (3) How much per thousand (count) does the Postal pay for painted oak brackets, what quantity supplied during 1913-14, and up to the end of April, 1915, and from whom purchased.

The answer was tabled.

PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and to continue in force for a further period the Act 5, George V., Session 1, "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in the Colony" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend the Act 5, George V. Session 1, Cap. 10, entitled "An Act respecting Municipal Affairs and for other purposes in connection with the St. John's Municipal Council" were read a second time.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that when this bill was before the House, it was suggested that the election of the Board take place in June instead of in December as provided by the bill. It was contended that it would be unfair to have another election without their having an opportunity to make their suggestions law if they seemed worthy of this. This was the view of the Upper House, and they sent it down as an

amendment. There are a few other amendments, but they are not of vital interest. One is an error. 137 was on the bill instead of 136. One section on the bill as it went up referred to the necessity of a payment of \$500 by people from outside who were filling contracts in this country. They have made a slight exception which is not material. I may say with regard to the important amendment, that after the third reading here, I asked the Legislative Council to amend it accordingly. In spite of this change I am still personally in favor of the other, the original bill, but have no doubt but that this will be very satisfactory.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I think as I said before when this matter was before the House that these amendments improve the bill. As I said then you ought to keep this commission in power until they have made the report asked for, and until the Government has acted on that report. If you dismiss them in December, they will have no authority to approach this legislature when it meets again.

The amendments were concurred in and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

PATRIOTIC FUND BILL.

Pursuant to order and no motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to incorporate the Patriotic Fund" were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

LOGGING BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself

into Committee of the Whole to consider the Legislative Council's amendments to the Logging Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. Coaker—Mr. Chairman, with regard to these amendments, there are some I cannot agree with. Some clauses have been so altered that their whole effect would be nullified if the bill passed as they left it. They have so altered Section 7 as to spoil its object. What we want is to do away with temporary camps. They have altered the whole bill to such an extent that it will be necessary to revise the whole again. Little amendments they have put in here and there mar the whole thing, and these must be carefully considered.

They have the right to put paper there, if they wish. These amendments are going to injure this section considerably. Then they go on and alter the flooring. In our section, as it was sent up, it was stated that floors should be constructed of board; they say "Board or logs sawn flat on the face" That is the old style, which has been going on for 25 or 30 years. We want to do away with that. We want the men to be comfortable. We don't want to have holes and spaces in the floors in which all sorts of filth can accumulate, and that is the result of having logs. There will be spaces which will be filled up with the refuse of the camp, and that is what we want to do away with. I think it unfair for the Council to have brought in that amendment. It is not in the interests of the men; it is in the interests of the employer, who is a little bit afraid of having to buy a couple of hundred feet of board to floor a camp. Then in our Bill we asked that in cases where employers operated a hospital, the men should pay 40c. a month, which would go towards the upkeep

of that hospital and they should have the use of it. The Council's amendment does away with that, and says that every logger shall pay forty cents a month whether he is provided with a doctor or not, and it does not make any difference whether there is a hospital attached to headquarters or not. If that is amended so as to read that the forty cents shall be paid only to employers who operate a hospital, we will get over that difficulty. Now, these are the main objections. They are not insurmountable, and we ought to be able to get over them. In all probability we will have to consult with the gentlemen of the other House and see if we cannot get them to meet as halfway. If not, it is just as well to let it stand and go no further.

If we had the Bill in addition to the amendments, the members of the Committee would have a better idea of the changes which have been made.

MR. KENT—In connection with this matter, Mr. Chairman, I think from the remarks of the hon. member for Twillingate that if a committee of this House were to meet a committee of the Upper House to discuss those amendments that a compromise might be effected whereby the principle of the bill would be accepted and a great many improvements in the conditions of the logging industry enacted; on the other hand, I think that if both Houses stand on the bill as it is nothing will be effected. I would therefore suggest that a sub-committee of this House be appointed with a sub-committee of the Upper House, and then an arrangement will probably be reached which will be satisfactory to both parties.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and recommended that a Select Committee be appointed to confer with a select com-

mittee from the Legislative Council on the amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Coaker, Kent, Lloyd, Emerson, Higgins, Moulton, Clapp be appointed, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council asking the co-operation of that Body in the premises.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman: Before the Committee rises I would like to bring before the House the matter of the ferry plying between Woody Point and Norris Point, Bonne Bay. It appears that in 1913 there was a motor boat there for the purpose of conveying passengers to and fro. That motor boat worked up to a certain time of the year. In 1914 the motor boat was taken off and an ordinary row-boat substituted. Now, previous to that I introduced a petition, numerously signed by the people of Bonne Bay and adjacent places, and I was under the impression that this motor boat was there to stay, and that the Government had acceded to the request of the petitioners, and I had no idea that it had been removed until I received a letter from a clergyman at Bonne Bay, Rev. G. H. Maidment, to the effect that it had, and asking me to bring the matter to the attention of the Government. Now, it appears to be an extraordinary thing that this gasoline boat should have been run previous to November, 1913, and that after the election was over the boat was taken off. Now, it must be taken into consideration that Bonne

Bay is a large place and contributes considerable to the revenue of this country. Bonne Bay paid in \$10,128 in 1914, and Fogo paid in \$15,000. Now, why should Bonne Bay be deprived of this ferry when Fogo is allowed to expend \$12,000 on a public wharf. The Premier himself knows, Mr. Chairman, that Bonne Bay has no public building of any consequence; that the post office there, until previous to the election, was a disgrace to the place. I don't know whether the Government intends to reinstate this ferry or not, but apparently, from the reply of the Minister of Public Works, it does not intend to do so. I would ask that this matter be taken into consideration, and that the people in this neighborhood be given the convenience of a motor boat.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: In connection with public matters I beg to draw the attention of the Government to the condition which obtains in two or three places in Fogo district where the people are greatly inconvenienced by not having postal facilities. Early in the session I drew the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the matter. First, in connection with the erection of a telegraph office at Hargrave; I trust that the Government will see its way clear during the summer to put that telegraph office there. It has been repeatedly pointed out that the expense would not be very great, and it would be a very great advantage to the people if they were brought into communication with the outside world by means of the telegraph. I hope that the Colonial Secretary will remember this matter. The wire is there, and the cutting of the poles would entail less expenses than in a great many other places in the Colony, Carmanville, Ladle Cove, Apsey Cove, and these different settlements in that neighbourhood could be connected.

Then a petition was sent in here last year from Cat Harbor, asking that a post office be established at Cat Harbor Point. About half the inhabitants of Cat Harbor live on that point, and they have to travel two miles to a post office to get their letters. A way office would not mean very much expense; it would only be a matter of \$10 or \$15. I hope this matter will receive attention also. There is another matter which was brought to my attention by letter from Apsey Cove to-day. There is a post office at Apsey Cove and the post mistress gets \$10. That post mistress is also the courier between Apsey Cove and Ladle Cove, a distance of two miles. She has to work the post office and travel twice a week to Ladle Cove with the mail. I did not think such a condition of things obtained in the colony. I am sure the Colonial Secretary will enquire into this matter and as a matter of justice will see that the person who is doing this work is properly compensated.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman: During last year's session of the Assembly, members of this side of the House asked and obtained certain information in relation to the expenditures on the construction and maintenance of the postal telegraph lines and cables.

The information elicited by the answers given last year was such as to justify further enquiry and soon after the assembling of the present House I tabled a number of questions bearing on the expenditures under the Department of Postal Telegraphs, some of them were but partially answered, and some of them bore the impress of evasions, particularly where they related to payments made to individuals for alleged services rendered.

The condition of affairs, both as to expenditure and management of the Postal Telegraph Department which the few particulars we have been able

to obtain has disclosed, is such as to challenge more than the passing notice of the Honourable Colonial Secretary who is primarily responsible for the administration of that Department, and of the Executive as a whole, who are morally responsible for the evident mal-administration of that important branch of the public service.

The statements of expenditure under the head of Postal Telegraphs which have been furnished this House constitute a grave scandal and evidence reckless squandering of the public funds by incompetent officials or dishonest public servants' misappropriations.

The scandals and mal-administration of that Department as have been disclosed by the partial statements submitted by the Hon. Colonial Secretary are of such magnitude as to demand the attention of the Executive, and justify this House in asking for an investigation under commission, and unless the Government are prepared to shoulder the responsibility for the scandals and cloak the men responsible for them, they will take such action as the conditions demand and restore confidence in the administration of the Department by its thorough reorganization.

If we take the public accounts according to the Auditor General's statements and the annual report of the Postmaster General, we will get some idea of the enormous cost of this Department.

Taking the period from 1908 inclusive we find that the expenditure on account of Postal Telegraphs reached the enormous total of roundly \$700,000 or an average expenditure under the head of Postal Telegraphs of the sum of \$140,000 per year.

For this vast outlay we have in that period of time built over 900 miles of telegraph lines and laid about 25 knots of local cables. This is estimat-

ed, and likely in excess rather than under the actual mileage, as there are no reliable and accurate statistics to be obtained from the Department of Postal Telegraphs as to the cost, construction, maintenance and operation.

It would be a liberal allowance for building land lines in this country to figure the cost at \$150 per mile, which would account for roundly \$140,000 for the 900 miles of land lines built.

According to the annual report of the Postmaster General there have been 24½ miles of cable laid.

We would be making an exceedingly liberal allowance if we placed the cost of laying local cables (including the purchase price) at \$700 per mile. Allowing every margin and give the maximum length of cable laid at 25 miles at \$700 per mile and the total cost thereof would be \$17,500 for the 25 miles.

Now turning to the expenditure under "maintenance and general staff" in St. John's and the outports, including all the operations in the service, all the clerks from the messengers up, the superintendent and every official employed by the Department, the repairers and extra help—in a word all the expenses of maintenance and operation of the Postal Telegraph we find the total for the five years from 1908 to 1913 inclusive, to be in round numbers \$350,000, or an average of \$70,000 per year. In comparison to the total earnings of the system this is excessive. It really represents for maintenance and operation alone fully 50 per cent. of the total earnings of the whole service as shown in the P. M. G.'s reports. This in itself constitutes a scandal and calls for thorough scrutiny by the Government.

Summarizing the cost under the following headings, which comprise the main expenditure of the system, we

find the following results:—

900 Miles on Land Line....	\$140,000
25 Miles of Cable	17,500
Maintenance and Operation ..	350,000
<hr/>	
Total for five years, 1908 to	
1913	\$507,500

Deduct this amount from the grand total under the general head of telegraph expenditure which I approximated at \$700,000 for the five year period and we find in round numbers the sum of \$192,000 disposed of under the elastic and mysterious heading of "telegraph contingencies," or an average annual expenditure under this head of \$38,000. Can the Hon. Colonial Secretary give the House any explanation as to what became of this annual expenditure on account of telegraph contingencies in the face of the enormous expenditures under the general heads of this Department?

Turning now to individual expenditures, or expenditures under particular headings, we find from the statements tabled in answer to my questions and those of last year that cable laying in this country under the management of the present postal officials holds the world's record for extravagance. For the five year period with which I am dealing the published accounts show that the cost of 25 miles of cable is roundly \$50,000 or an average cost per mile of not less a sum than \$2,000. Yes, \$2,000 per mile to lay Government cables in this country. I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite start in amazement at this statement. I do not believe that this grave scandal has been fully realized by the Colonial Secretary or by the members of the Executive and I will not do them the injustice to say that they have been, up to this moment, cognizant of it, though they ought to be. But I now make the statement that the cost of laying cables in this country during

the five years from 1908 to 1913 was in round figures not less than \$2,000 per mile whereas a liberal estimate for such work would be, I am creditably informed, about \$700 per mile. Further comments from me upon this matter are not necessary to impress upon the Government that there is something rotten in the management of the Postal Telegraph Department.

Why is such scandalous waste of the public funds permitted? And it should not be necessary for me to intimate to the Hon. Colonial Secretary that a clear and unequivocal explanation of this waste is due this House and a thorough and impartial investigation of the Department due the taxpayers of this country whose sweat contributes to the revenue thus recklessly squandered.

Turning now to matters which I regret to say, necessitates the reference to postal officials by name and to men employed by the Department to perform work, we find that there has been a rather loose and, what may, to the average man outside the charmed circle of public offices, appear dishonest manipulation of expenditure in vogue in the Postal Telegraph Department.

I will give the House a few examples of what I refer to.

Last year in answer to a question we were informed that the Superintendent was engaged at postal telegraph cable work outside the city from 1910 to 1913 inclusive 26 weeks and for his personal expenses he was paid an average of \$2.36 per day. By personal expenses is meant board and lodging. For this work we were told that he also received as extra pay \$100, or one month's salary, that is over his regular salary.

We were also told that Mr. Veitch was engaged at same work and that his expenses were \$2.00 per day, and that he received over and above his

salary \$75.00 or one month's pay for this extra work.

In answer to questions for further particulars this session regarding these expenses we have been informed that Mr. Stott and Mr. Veitch received two months pay instead of one as stated last year. Mr. Stott received \$200.00, and Mr. Veitch \$150.00. The answer given last year was therefore not correct in this respect, and there was no apparent reason for withholding the facts unless it was to conceal the extra payment for which there does not appear to be any justification in the face of the fact that these officials' salary and full expenses were paid for the time they were occupied at this work.

If they were paying other officials to perform their duties while they were absent there would be some justification for the Colonial Secretary's liberality towards them. But that was not the case and the work of their Department was being attended to by the regular staff, none of whom, I understand, received any extra remuneration for the extra work thus imposed. And in view of the ease with which the postal officials make such mistakes in their answers to questions asked by this House in regard to postal matters we have no reason for much confidence in the correctness of the answers so far given, and perhaps a little further probing will disclose that still further extra payments have been made to Messrs. Veitch and Stott for the performance of the duties for which they are being paid under regular salary.

Now, I wish to draw the Colonial Secretary's attention to a transaction which calls for elucidation. On the authority of the honourable gentleman we are informed, as stated before, that Mr. Stott's expenses averaged \$2.36 per day for the time he was occupied at cable work from 1910 to 1913 inclusive. We must assume that

he stated the facts. Well, Sir, within that period the Burgeo-Ramea cable was laid. In connection with that work the Government steamer *Fiona* was employed forty-five days. Mr. Stott during that time was boarded on that ship at the expense of the Government, no payment for food was made by Superintendent Stott on board the *Fiona*. No payment for food was made by him to anybody for the time he was on board that ship. I have gone to some trouble to ascertain the facts in this case, because it is one which calls for stringent action on the part of the Government if Superintendent Stott cannot make a better defence than he has thus far been able to do, notwithstanding that the questions bearing on it have been in the possession of the Colonial Secretary since the 16th of April the answers have not been tabled.

We find that Superintendent Stott took his meals on board the *Fiona* for fifty-three days, and that during that time he put away no less than 236 meals, which averages four per day, leaving very little room for dining anywhere else. And for his board and lodging covering that period we find according to the statements tabled in this House, that he put in bills and received from the Department the sum of \$130.00 or over \$2.40 per day.

Mr. Veitch also was engaged with Mr. Stott and he also took his complement of meals on board the *Fiona*, and he also was paid a sum, the exact amount we have not been able to ascertain, for board and lodging.

John Doyle also was with them, and he, too, took his meals at the Government's expense, and he, too, was paid from the Postal Telegraph Department the sum of \$86 for board and lodging.

Mr. Stott and Mr. Veitch cannot, as in the case of Notre Dame Bay cable

expenses, explain away awkward amounts by saying "paid."

We find that these officials dined on board the Fiona to the following extent:—

David Stott, 236 meals, during 53 days—about 4 meals a day.

George Velich, 165 meals, during 30 days—about 6 meals a day.

John Doyle, 228 meals, during 53 days—about 4 meals a day.

And notwithstanding this fact the Government have paid these men at the rate of Two Dollars and over per day for board and lodging. I have been informed that the Colonial Secretary was not aware of this state of affairs, and I make this explanation in justice to him, as otherwise it may appear that he was a consenting party to this steal. But he is now aware of it, and the House and the Country will look to him to see that the offence will be dealt with in a manner that will be satisfactory to all. If this condition of affairs exists to any extent it constitutes a grave scandal, and one which the Government cannot condone. If these men have received payment in the manner and under the circumstances here stated, it cannot be termed by any name other than obtaining money under false pretences, defrauding the revenue by a system of false vouchers. What steps the Colonial Secretary will take I know not. But that he can ignore the matter is beyond belief. The same course was followed in the matter of other cable laying when the Baleine was under charter, and these men also lived on board her at the Government's expense. But enough has been said to justify an enquiry into the management of the Postal Telegraphs.

Another matter to which I wish to draw attention is certain payments made by the postal for work by outsiders. We find that T. J. Kennedy was paid \$124.00 for unloading cable

from one of the Furness steamers. This is really a new departure as all steamship companies have to place cargo on the dock unless specially agreed otherwise, and in practice they do not make such agreements for the handling of freight, but charge sufficient freight per ton or measurement or otherwise for carriage and handling. In what does a cable differ from other freight? Why should there be a special stevedore employed to unload it? Perhaps there is a satisfactory explanation of this. But there cannot be any satisfactory explanation of the payment of \$124.00 for the work of unloading cable which is as easily handled as so much hawser. I have endeavoured to get at the cost of this work, and from all I can learn \$100.00 would be extravagant to pay for it. One well acquainted with stevedoring work informs me that he would do the job for fifty dollars and make a ten dollar bill of it. Yet the Postal paid \$124.00 for that work. Something here demands the attention of the Colonial Secretary.

Then we have C. F. Lester paid the sum of \$200.00 for loading from the Empire wharf into the hold of the Baleine the same cable. One of the Postal telegraph repairers of many years' experience has stated that he could have done the work for fifty dollars and make a week's pay out of it after paying his help at the rate of 20 cents per hour. Yet the Postal pays Mr. Lester \$200 for that job. Will the Colonial Secretary justify this, and if he does not, his duty demands that he shall investigate it.

Then we have \$77.00 paid to a Government operator at Curling in addition to his regular salary, and when particulars are demanded we are told it was for building cable houses. The indecency of this other such transaction calls for searching investigation.

We have been shown that Captain

English of the Fiona was paid \$129 and his crew a full month's salary for the time they were lying on their oars waiting to lay the Rames cable. What justification has the Colonial Secretary to offer for this extraordinary proceeding? It is a positive disgrace, and no circumstances or excuses can justify it.

We have been refused particulars of such payments as the following:—

Mr. Moulton for 'Duchess of Cornwall,' \$200.

Paul Bernard, motor boat, \$225.

Fire of schooners, \$855.00.

Rope and provisions, \$718.87.

John Penny and Sons, \$418.14.

All these amounts charged to Rames cable and particulars withheld from this House notwithstanding repeated requests by me for the same.

Then there are other minor payments which bear the impress of "political jobbery," such for instance, as \$175.00 to Captain Marcell for loss of contract.

And there is another feature of the Postal extravagance. The matter of supplies. Here is one bill charged by Superintendent Stoll to the Postal:— 1 overall jacket, 2 guernseys, 1 oil overcoat, 1 sou'wester, 2 pairs of pig-skin gloves, 3 pairs of towels, 6 cakes of toilet soap. And yet the Government pays \$2.00 per day for the personal expenses of these officials when they go out on extra work. We have here a bill from Mr. Hennebury of Beverton, which is a sample of what the Government is permitting. The payment of \$150.00 for Hennebury's horse is another scandal which the Government has not taken the trouble to investigate. It has been stated here in this House that Hennebury's horse was not engaged at Postal work when it was lost, and yet the Government has permitted the payment of \$150 to this man on a claim of this nature.

Other irregularities I may enumer-

ate of similar character to those referred to, but submit I have disclosed enough to justify an investigation. The supplies department of the Postal is said to be a cloak for abuses of an extensive nature. From investigations I have ascertained that the Government have paid for poles which were tendered for at four inches in the top and which were delivered far below that measurement. It is freely stated by people who are in a position to know whereof they speak that the Government during the past ten years have paid for poles that were never cut off the stump, have paid for poles not up to the specifications contracted for, have paid for the distribution by railway of carloads of poles which the contractors should have paid. I cannot vouch for these statements, but I have asked for information from the Colonial Secretary's Department concerning these very matters, and there has been ample time for the hon. gentleman to table them, but they are withheld. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can say why?

Finally, notwithstanding the enormous expenditure on account of Postal Telegraph, it is undeniable that the service has been disgracefully inefficient. The interruptions which were referred to here a few days ago by Mr. Coaker was but an example of general conditions. The condition of the lines all over the system has been disastrous. Take the record of interruptions for 1916, which show nearly 200 interruptions from January first to November 30th is but an example of general conditions. And what happened in 1916 has happened every year, and it was no better in 1914 than in 1916 notwithstanding the large outlay on account of maintenance. Repairs have been sent to Northern and Western Districts to do work with gangs, only to find insufficient material to do the work, and in some

cases none at all, and men under pay kept idle for weeks. As an instance of this, no later than last Fall a foreman and gang was sent on the St. Anthony branch, and when he reached there he found no poles for the work between West Brook and St. Anthony. Other instances of neglect to place supplies can be given if necessary. In places, repairers have rejected the poles placed for line building.

And for these poles the Government paid full price.

I wish this House to clearly understand that I am not going to make any charge against any of the Postal officials as I don't know whether the information is correct or not. Yet I am inclined to think it is and consider it would be in the interest of the Country if the Government appointed a Commission of Enquiry to look into the matter. The information which I hold in my hand is certainly of such a character that it requires close attention. We also wish that the officials be removed while the investigation is going on.

The whole system is demoralized. Both in the Head Office and in the outside offices conditions exist which are a disgrace to the public service. Drunkenness of responsible officials has been notorious and the subordinates have followed the example of their superiors. What can be expected from a department whose superiors have such a record for intemperance as that of the Postal. What can be expected from a Telegraph Department when the Government will suspend and dismiss its chief officials for drunkenness while in the discharge of their duties and then reinstate them? What can be expected from a Telegraph Department when its chief officials will show the example of besotted drunkenness such as is shown to have been done in the Postal Department in this city? What

can be expected from the department when its responsible officials will lie helplessly drunk in the operating room before the whole staff for four hours at a time while in an adjoining room the superintendent is ruminating behind drawn curtains and locked doors? If the Honourable Colonial Secretary want dates and names I am ready to hand them to him. What can be expected from a public department when such things are permitted and the men guilty of such disgraceful conduct are still retained in the service and responsible for its management.

Large sections of the lines have been down for days and weeks at a time and no real effort made to restore them. Only a few months ago a section of thirteen poles of the Main Line was down East of Come-By-Chance and the Superintendent and his officials to repair it—while the transmission of business was seriously hampered. I would refer the Hon. Colonial Secretary to the Government Engineer for verification of this and to the operator who was then at Come-By-Chance. It is well known that the repairers of the system are allowed to leave their work and go fox trapping and log cutting. Only recently a repairer stationed at Holyrood when called upon to attend to line trouble could not be got. He was in the log woods. Another occasion the same repairer was called upon to take charge of a gang of repair men when the whole system was tied up by a break and he missed the train from St. John's because he was drunk and he was allowed to sleep off his booze in the basement of the Post Office and proceeded on his way to the line work next day instead of being sent about his business and a sober and capable man put in charge of the work. It is notorious that the repairer attached to the city office is general-

ly incapable of doing his work when sent to look after the lines and yet the Government close their eyes to these abuses and the public are called upon to suffer the consequences of such maladministration because of the incapacity and untrustworthiness of responsible officials.

And allow me to inform the Government that the few instances I have mentioned by no means exhausts the catalogue of offences and scandals which we have knowledge of in the Postal Telegraph Department.

The record of the Postal officials while engaged at telegraph work in the outports is most discreditable. They have been guilty of the most reprehensible conduct and gross neglect of duty and reckless extravagance. Ample evidence of this is obtainable. Repairers have had to bodily take some of these men off the repair work in a state of intoxication. When the Superintendent and repairer Tobin were transferring the office at Clarendville they put in three times as long a time at the work as was necessary and while engaged at that work a prominent resident of Clarendville publicly reprovved the Superintendent for his example for being under the influence of liquor most of the time and gave no attention whatever to the work under his supervision. At Britannia Cove he was assisted from a boat engaged at cable work, being incapable through liquor to look after the work. At Lewisporte he and Mr. Veitch gave an exhibition of boxing that was the talk of the settlement for months. No matter what supplies were left behind the supply of liquor has been always provided when these men are out of the city on Postal Telegraph work. The record of Bonne Bay and Wood's Island cable laying is one discreditable to the public service. The Western Star made a reference to it at the time but

was prohibited, so it is stated, from further comments. Operator Read was taken from his office at Curling to accompany Mr. Scott just to keep him company while enjoying himself at Bonne Bay and I am informed by a man who saw what was going on that there was no justification for Read to be taken there and that Read himself said to one of the men engaged that he did not know what he was there for. Any way Read did no work in connection with Bonne Bay cable but Superintendent Scott paid him \$77 extra for doing nothing. The day the Bonne Bay cable was laid Superintendent Scott was not in fit condition of mind or body to intelligently supervise the work and it was done by another person. At one of the Northern telegraph offices Messrs. Veitch and Stott left a part of their liquor supply behind them, consisting of a part of a jar of rum which was forgotten when they were leaving the place. Days have been spent at work which could be done in a few hours and unnecessary journeys have been made over the country by Mr. Veitch and Mr. Scott, generally with repairer John Doyle to do the work for them. And as long as they were making a clear dollar a day over and above their actual expenses they were in no great hurry to finish the jobs. For weeks at a time both the Superintendent and his clerk in charge have been absent from the Head Office on work which could and should be done by one of them with the assistance of the local repairers. They have time and again neglected their public duties to the department for the sake of the rake off they would get by being out of the city on postal work.

And now let me give you a few instances of how these rake offs are engineered. We will take the Colonial Secretary's answer re Scott's personal expenses as laid on the table last

year. It was placed at \$2.35 per day. According to his vouchers (which by the way are never checked by the auditors, if report be correct, he charged the Government over two dollars per day for board and lodging when out of the city, besides all other expenses, and train fares, notwithstanding that he has been given a pass over the railroad because of his official position in the Postal Department.

At Curling the hotel rate, giving the highest, was \$1.50 per day. Stott's and Veitch's charges were \$2 per day in their bills to the Government. Bonne Bay the same. Exploits hotel rate \$1 per day. Messrs. Veitch and Stott put in vouchers for \$2 per day and got paid for it. In answer to a question we are told that some of Mr. Veitch's expenses were on account of John Doyle. Out of his Exploits bill of \$61.65 he paid the sum of \$1.70 for John Doyle. Mr. Stott also explains his exorbitant expenses by saying paid for John Doyle. But John Doyle says they did not pay for him besides there is an amount for John Doyle's expenses, paid to John Doyle for the same job. Just another instance, Mr. Veitch puts in a bill for expenses at line work between Avondale and Holyrood. He gets paid three dollars for cab from Avondale to Holyrood. Other people never pay more than two dollars for the same route, and distance. He gets paid at the rate of \$2 per day for board at Avondale. The highest charge there, we are informed is \$1 per day.

These are merely taken at random to illustrate general conditions under the present management of the postal and the reckless waste of the public funds under the present Government, and the virtual embezzlement of the monies voted for the public service which is being condoned by the Government of this Colony. The Colonial Secretary has failed to

lay on the table answers to questions regarding the Department over which he presides which I am of opinion would disclose a state of affairs which he cannot justify, and show to this House that the postal officials are obtaining money under false pretences by means of false vouchers. The same recklessness that characterizes the responsible officials in the matters dealt with permeates the whole system in other Departments of the Postal. I am informed on good authority (indeed it is public property as every operator in the Postal here is talking about it) that a favorite of Superintendent Stott's in the Head Office has been given over time during last year to the extent of \$400 and that this was done by the manipulation of the service for that purpose, and it is said that this favored official received extra pay while he did not put in his regular time. Surely if these conditions exist there is a very urgent need of a thorough investigation in that Department. From the information obtainable an enquiry into the Supply Department will be an astounding revelation, and the scandals associated with the provisioning and supply of gangs on repair and construction work will surprise even the hon gentlemen opposite. Notwithstanding the big cost of provisioning construction gangs it is said that the laboring men were starved and some of them had to quit work and return to their homes. This was particularly so in Nicholas Wall's gang. And what has become of the enormous quantities of tools which has been charged to the Postal. Is it as report has it that all the friends and relations of those who have had charge of the supply have been kept well supplied. It is publicly stated that officials in the Head Office have sold telegraph instruments, and that several outfits of relays and sounders

have been thus disposed of. One instance of many that is said to have taken place is one of the chief operators sold an operator an outfit from the Postal stock for learning for the sum of \$3.20. And it is also stated that the chief operators occasionally engage operators to take their special duties. The chief draws his full day's pay extra which is twice the rate of the operator and puts half in his own pocket giving the operator the other half. I mention these matters to show the neat methods that are in vogue in the Postal for "making extra pay." Yesterday the Government came in here and asked this House to support resolutions for increased taxation amounting to one quarter of a millicent dollars. This increased taxation will fall heavily on the fishermen and laborer of this Colony. You have added a tax of 10 per cent. on motor engines. This is extending the helping hand to the fishermen of this Country with a vengeance. Instead of this increased taxation you could have in one stroke of the pen saved \$40,000 alone in the Postal Service. I hope, Sir, and sincerely so, that the Minister of Finance and Customs will yet see his way clear to take off the duty imposed during the present session on motor engines and kero oil and gasolene because with the conditions now prevailing this extra burden of taxation is not giving the fishermen of this Colony a square deal.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the very lengthy and carefully prepared speech on the Postal Telegraph Department by the hon. member for Trinity and I feel it is necessary for me to make some pronouncement in the House in respect to the truth or otherwise of these statements. The hon. member in the very early days of the session started out with a great number of questions in reference to

the Postal Telegraph Service. Many of these questions are still unanswered owing to the fact that the Postal Telegraph Officials have something else to do and cannot devote all their time to answering questions for honourable members of this House, and therefore the honourable gentleman has had to wait a considerable time to receive all the information he wanted; but this afternoon I think he has amply displayed to the House that it was only idle to ask information from the source he did, the Colonial Secretary's Department, because evidently he has all the information possible for any man to get in connection with this matter, and I think, Sir, we have heard this afternoon a statement from a very industrious man who since he arrived in town at the opening of the Legislature must have done nothing else but prepare that very comprehensive statement that he was so good to lay before us this afternoon. Now I want to say, so far as I am concerned, since I have been in the Colonial Secretary's Office, that I have no knowledge of any of the offences he has alluded to going on. The questions with regard to cable and other matter dealt with incidents which occurred before my time, I think in the year 1910 or 1911, and I as the head of the Department would therefore have no knowledge of the alleged dishonesty in this connection. Now I also want to state that since I went into that Department—about last September twelve months—I have seen the Superintendent of Telegraphs probably every day, perhaps twice a day and sometimes three or four times, and I have not heard of any of these alleged offences. Further I have never known him to be absent from his duties one hour on account of intemperance.

Now as to the cost of maintenance of the Telegraph system I have laid

all information in respect thereto on the table of this House. I have today the last question which was asked by Mr. Coaker with regard to the cost of construction. I am tabling the answer this afternoon. Now as regards the cost, all the accounts have been furnished. The details are given, and where they are not given they could not be ascertained; and it is only perfect nonsense for a man to get up and say that the cost of laying a mile of cable is so and so, because it is impossible under certain conditions to estimate the cost. The conditions vary a great deal, and the state of the weather, the condition of the water and of the bottom and everything else make it extremely difficult to estimate the cost of laying a cable. As the Premier has stated a half mile in one place may cost as much as ten miles in another.

But this much I can say, that matters are not going on in the Postal Telegraph service as I would wish them to go, and there are two sides to this story. I know where the hon. member got the information he gave us this afternoon. I can put my finger on the source he obtained it from, but I question very much its veracity. I am not in a position to deal with the lengthy statement he delivered this afternoon. I am not in a position to deal with what went on in the Postal Telegraph Department before I went into the office of the Colonial Secretary, but I can say something about it since I have been there. I have seen no drunkenness or know of none. I know of no dishonesty, and I know of no conduct in that Department that would justify me in taking action as regard dismissal, with this exception that I know of insubordination there; and I have been endeavouring to remedy it and get people there to do their duty irrespective of what their feelings are for those associated with them. The trouble in

our public institutions is that some of the officials think that the institutions are there for their purposes, and the last thing they think of is the public service and the proper conduct of their duties. The whole public service is becoming demoralized, and the trouble is caused by people who should be doing their own work and looking after their duties instead of devoting their time and attention and energies in directions they have no right to. Now, I wish to place myself on record in regard to the statements we have heard this afternoon. First, I must ask the hon. gentleman if he is prepared to let me have the documents he has in his possession.

MR. MORINE—Conditionally.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—
Yes.

MR. STONE—I have no objection.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—
Well, then, I will undertake that if I cannot get the Government to conduct an investigation I shall resign my seat. I shall not stand here and allow such statements to be made about these conditions existing in a department under my control, and I hope that when the enquiry takes place the hon. member will be able to show that the statements are true. It is all very well for hon. members on the other side to criticise. It is a very easy thing to tear down, but a very difficult thing to build up; and although I believe myself that there are irregularities in the telegraph Department, yet if you look into the trouble you must look at both sides. It is not right to look at only one side. That is my position, and that position I maintain, and I am very glad the hon. member has now brought this matter forward; because it has been a matter of great concern to me the last twelve months. As a matter of fact I had taken some steps in the direction indicated, and had approach-

ed the Government with a view of trying to find some means whereby this thing could be cleared up. I know there is disunion among the staff, and insubordination, and that the conduct of the Postal Telegraphs is not looked after in the public interest in the way it should be, and I know also it is not one man or two who are responsible; and I am very glad that the hon. member this afternoon has given me an opportunity to declare myself, and I will ask the Government, and I believe they will accede to my request, to investigate the Postal Telegraphs, and leave nothing undone to root out the evils there. Since the House opened, hon. members have asked me a great number of questions about the Post Office and Postal Telegraphs. I can tell the hon. member that the Government realizes that a great many reforms can be brought about in these Departments. Unfortunately the Postmaster-General has been sick for the past three or four months, and he has no Deputy in the Department. Mr. LeMessurier is in charge of one Department, and Mr. Campbell in another, and it is very difficult to come to a decision and get definite information under these conditions. Mr. Woods is getting an old man—past three score and ten—and he cannot be expected to be as active and alive to all the shortcomings of that Department as a younger man would be. Reforms are necessary, and the unfortunate part is this, that since the time of Sir Robert Bond the Postal Telegraphs have not been under the Postmaster-General except to a small degree. Superintendent Stott has had the right to refer to the Colonial Secretary or the Government direct. In my opinion this is a most important procedure. The Postmaster-General should be the head of the Department, and everything should come through him, but unfortunately, as I have said, Mr.

Woods is well up in years and is unable to cope with and meet the present conditions; and as far as I could I have endeavoured to administer the office of the Postal Telegraphs through the Colonial Secretary's Department. But it is impossible to do this thoroughly. It is impossible for a man with his office in the Court House to know what is going on in the Postal Telegraphs. Therefore, I can quite understand that breaches of discipline or other irregularities might occur, but I do not think there can be anything of the comprehensive nature pointed out by the honourable member this afternoon. I am pleased to have an opportunity to impress upon the Government my desire—and I believe the House is unanimous in that desire—that the Government should appoint a Commission of Enquiry into that Department; and I cannot see how the Government can do otherwise than appoint that Commission; and I hope that the hon. gentleman who started so well and so fluently on this subject this afternoon, will put his shoulder to the wheel and assist that Commission in getting at the rights of this trouble that is in existence in at least some degree in that Department. It is a most important Department. It is a Department capable of much greater development than at the present time. It is a Department that has been started and run by the people, and it has a claim upon their patronage. I know as a matter of fact that a great deal of the work that should go to that Department goes to the opposition Company. I know that people along Water Street will not do business with the Postal Telegraph Department.

MR. COAKER—Do you know why?
 HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—
 I do, to a certain extent. I have asked people. I have gone personally to

them and appealed to them, and pointed out that it was their duty as citizens to support their own institution, and they have told me they could not trust the Department. There were men in it they could not trust. I know this condition has existed and I have only been waiting to make a move in the matter; and I am grateful, as I said before, to Mr. Stone for bringing this matter to an issue; and no effort on my part will be spared to bring about a thorough investigation; and I hope that that investigation will bring about the necessary reforms.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Chairman, I think there are several things in connection with this matter that do not need investigation. In the first place I think there will be a very general feeling that no blame attaches to the Colonial Secretary, and I regret that he has spoken this afternoon in a spirit which indicates some anger on his part, which I hope after all is not with the gentleman that brought this matter before the House but it probably is with the fact that such deplorable conditions exist in this service. The next thing I think is that the country owes a debt of gratitude to the member who has brought this matter before the House, and for that industry which the Colonial Secretary refers to and which he has shown since the opening of the House in asking questions about this service. There is nothing more commendable that can be done by any member of this House, than to devote his special attention to a Department of the public service and endeavour to correct any abuses prevailing therein; and if more members of the House followed Mr. Stone's example we would be getting a better service than we are. I think the only answer that can be made to Mr. Stone this evening is the unqualified statement that a commission will be appointed. And

the next thing is that when that Commission is appointed, it will be up to Mr. Stone to render every assistance in his power to help the Commission in its investigations. That any member of the House is to take it upon himself to bring charges against public Departments without standing behind these charges, is a thing not to be considered. If a man brings a charge he becomes responsible for it, and if a Commission is appointed I am sure Mr. Stone will render it every possible assistance. Now there are two or three other things I would like to take notice of. Everybody knows, for instance, that the Postal Telegraphs should be under the direct control of the Postmaster-General; and I think that it is time that Mr. Woods should be superannuated and a younger and more vigorous man put in charge. Now, I invite the Government to bring down within the next twenty-four hours a pension proposal for Mr. Woods, and indicate whom they intend to appoint in his place. They ought surely be able to get a suitable man from amongst their followers. I have no particular interest in any applicant, and I do not know whom they would appoint. It is rumoured that Hon. J. A. Robinson, a member of the Upper House, is in the running for the position. I am sure he is a man who would enjoy the public confidence to a marked extent, because of his well-known honesty, industry and integrity, and I am sure that his appointment would be acceptable to everyone.

Now, there is another point. By common consent of the members of this House it seems desirable to have an investigation into this matter, both on account of the charges made by Mr. Stone and from the admissions made by the Colonial Secretary in his speech this afternoon; and indeed the Colonial Secretary is most strong in

his demand for such an investigation. Now, it is too late in the session to have that investigation conducted by a Committee of this House, even if it were possible to have such a thing. I think the investigation ought to be a judicial investigation, not by the judges of the Supreme Court, because in my opinion that is not the proper way to appoint a Commission, but by some person, preferably a member of the legal profession. Such a man, for instance, as Mr. H. E. Knight, at present acting as Magistrate in conjunction with my friend, Mr. Morris. Such a man as Mr. Knight would be free from any possible charge of partisanship; would be capable of knowing what is evidence and what is not, and his ability is such that his verdict could be accepted with confidence. Such an investigation will be speedy, it will be satisfactory, it will get at the root of the trouble, and when the report is received it will be clean-cut and we will know what the trouble is. Such an investigation would command public confidence, and I am satisfied that much good would result instantaneously. A commission consisting of two or three men who do not know one kind of evidence from another, will only create dissatisfaction, and the whole thing will end by becoming a party question, and I take it this is not a party question. The present Government is not responsible for the Head of the Department; he was appointed long ago. It is not responsible in a marked degree for any of the officials in the Department or for the conditions that are in the Department; but they will certainly be held responsible for them if they allow such a condition of affairs to continue. The only way to restore public confidence in this department is to have a judicial investigation, and if that is not done the Government will have to shoulder the blame and the whole

country will suffer. Nobody desires that. Unfortunately, for one cause or another there has not been public confidence in that Department for a long time, and now is the time to restore that confidence.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Chairman, I just wish to avail myself of the opportunity of saying a few words in reply to the Colonial Secretary. If what he calls the elaborate statement I made this afternoon is not correct, he will bear in mind that when I made it I did not say it was correct. I only said I believed it to be correct. I only said that if it was correct I demanded an investigation on the part of the Colonial Secretary or on the part of the Government. I have not laid any blame on the Colonial Secretary, because I do not believe he knew these things were going on; and even now he is not aware if my statement is correct or not; but I shall be pleased to give him all the information I have in my possession, so that he can get at the position of affairs up there.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member will appreciate the fact that making a charge in this House on hearsay information is rather a dangerous proceeding. It might be misunderstood or misrepresented, and not taken as merely hearsay, but as a statement of fact by an honourable member of this House. It is a serious position, I think, when an honourable member gets up here and states that he heard that a certain public official was drunk, and was not fit to discharge his duties and was unable to perform them. Of course he ought to make it understood distinctly that he was not making that statement as a positive fact. If he only states that as hearsay he ought to say so; because it is very unfair to get up in this House and take away a man's char-

acter without giving him a chance to defend himself.

Now, the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine, made the statement that I was vexed over the matter. I am not. I merely resented a statement that I believed to be exaggerated; and I resented a proceeding that seemed to be aimed particularly at one or two men. I know more of the motives of the parties connected with the information that has been given here this afternoon than perhaps any members of this House are aware of; and I am satisfied that when the investigation is held it will be found that these facts are greatly exaggerated. As I said before, I quite agree with the idea of having an investigation, and I am sure the hon. member for Trinity will keep up to his word and let us have any evidence in his possession, as well as any possible assistance in conducting the investigation.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, I may say, now, that the moment is opportune, that I have heard a great deal about the charges of the charter of these vessels employed on cable work. I presume it refers to a charter from the Company of which I am a shareholder, but I would like to place myself on record as saying that any time there was anything done in relation to this matter I was not in Burgeo, and consequently had nothing to do with it in any way, shape or form. I may say this, from the information I have had from the Company, that the vessel in question was delayed several times owing to stress of weather conditions, and that when that schooner left Ramea in the morning to lay that cable, it was overtaken by bad weather, and they were obliged to cut the cable, which accounts for the amount of rope referred to; from Ramea to Burgeo is about from 100 to 125 fathoms deep, I would assure the hon. gentleman opposite

that neither the Penneys or the Moultons ever received any money dishonestly or unfairly. Personally, as long as I have been in public life I have never asked the Government for a dollar in any way for roads, light-houses or any similar cause; and I wish to record the fact that while these matters were being transacted I was not even in Burgeo. I can assure the hon. gentleman that if there was any wrong doing I had no connection with it. I am aware that the thing looks big in the eyes of the people, and I wish in these remarks merely to exempt myself from any blame that may arise from matters with which I had no connection whatever.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks relative to the subject now under discussion. I may say that I cannot altogether congratulate the Colonial Secretary upon the defence which he has put up with regard to the conditions he now admits prevail in his department. Last year I made in this House strong statements with regard to certain matters in connection with the Postal Telegraph Service. I asked him to give it his fullest attention, because I was aware that matters were in a serious state. I confess I do not know what steps were taken as a result of my suggestions. I was anxious to refrain from going as far as Mr. Stone has gone this afternoon, lest the whole country should be put into a state of alarm and the confidence of the whole country shaken in this institution. What has been done, of course, has not been stated, but I suppose it is very little. During the present session I took occasion to speak upon the same matter again, hoping that he would go further into the matter. However, no explanation came. Perhaps had we been told these things we might not have had

to go as far as we had. I believe these statements made in Mr. Stone's speech this afternoon, and it is no pleasure, I may say, for any man to get up in this House and say all he knows about a Department like this. I may say I know a good deal and I thought that I said enough to show that there was a great deal seriously wrong with this Department, and had anything been said to us that steps were being taken I should have been the first to see that no effort would be taken in the direction we have been forced to go this afternoon. We know what is going on, and we are forced to our duty, if we do not impress these things on the Government sufficiently vividly to make them take steps for the remedy of these things.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state several things in reply to the hon. member who has just sat down, to show that steps have been taken upon the suggestions. For instance, I may say that last spring I wrote to the Postmaster-General in Canada with a view to getting an expert in telegraphy to come down and go over our system and try to put it on an efficient basis. I knew of no other means to get this work done. The Postmaster-General referred me to the Manager of the C.P.R. Telegraphs, because it will be understood that most all the telegraph systems in Canada are pretty well under their control. He was ready to send a man down in the latter part of July, the war came and upset everything and nothing was done, but that was the plan I had conceived to put on an efficient basis the telegraph system of this Colony I may say that this plan can be carried out now. In the state of things at the time it was almost impossible to continue it and the matter dropped temporarily. I intended to lay the correspondence before the Government,

with a view to obtaining their sanction in the matter. I take it from these remarks that the House will understand my position and appreciate the difficulty with which I have been faced in the performance of these matters.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman. it is not my intention, Sir, to discuss matters now occupying our attention. I think it is a good thing that the Colonial Secretary is considering these things, and now that they have come before the notice of the Government, I do not think it is necessary to discuss the details that have been made. I think the member for Trinity. Mr. Stone in bringing forth evidence for his statements made this afternoon in this House, will but strengthen the hands of the Colonial Secretary. The conditions warrant immediate attention. I must confess that I shall be surprised if some of the statements made turned out to be true, but that need not deter us from probing to the bottom the rights of this matter.

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.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions re the exportation of timber.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman. I wish to place myself now on record as

I have not had the opportunity during previous discussions of the matter, as being wholly against these resolutions. I am against these resolutions, both as regards two years extension in the Island and for ten years extension in Labrador. I may say that first as far as the Island is concerned I think no further exportation of pit props ought to be permitted. All the amount of available timber we have now in this Island ought to be kept for the present. While there is a demand from the other side during the war to which we must give some attention it seems to me that it can be met in other ways without the sacrifice we are called upon for here. There are other countries doubtless that can spare it better than we can. I think it is a great mistake to depart from our settled policy with relation to our timber. I think the question of the two years limit is a mistake also. If you are going to allow the exportation at all, to allow it for a limited time is another mistake, because it does not allow for the proper attention which is requisite at this juncture for the preservation of these areas. It does not necessitate the promotion of any industry among the people at all, it would simply lead to a "skinning out" as it were and cutting down and destruction without offering any inducement whatever for the betterment of the people. I think it ought not to be allowed at all, because the mere fact of placing any limit whatever on the time for this exportation with regard to timber will lead to many evils. The people who have obtained property in Labrador obtained it with the condition that it should be manufactured before it was exported, and now with your change of policy, you change the whole state of conditions for them, and raise immensely the value of what really is a mere speculation on their part. They are getting land under one condition,

and holding it under another. It appears to me that you ought to have some way of getting this back into the hands of the country and the people. The country ought to know the difference between the two conditions and realize the conditions which restricted these people. In other words you have allowed these lands to pass to certain parties under certain restrictions, and now you purpose taking these restrictions away. Now, it may be said that we will have an export duty which will immensely benefit the country, but your design was to get the duties from the imported commodities necessary for the promotion of these industries as well as the exports. If we are in such a wretched condition that we must change all the policy of the past for the purpose of getting a little money at present, I can only say that we will but benefit ourselves temporarily, and it seems to me on the other hand that if we are determined upon that policy we are wrong in putting a limitation of ten years. I merely express my personal opinion on this matter. I know no one else's ideas on the subject. I always thought the best thing for us to do when adopting a policy is not to allow the exportation in an unmanufactured state from the Island, a policy which might not be so necessary on the Labrador coast. I have never been convinced that this policy of insisting on the manufacture of the wood upon Labrador was necessary or advisable. The Labrador always seemed to me to be a waste, barren and inhospitable country, difficult of navigation, and not altogether favourable for the progress of industries such as this, although I knew that manufacturers would arise in years to come. It always seemed to me that the only duty we could get from industries on the Labrador would be the export duty. I think if any change of policy is made the country ought

to benefit therefrom. I am opposed personally to this measure. But I am open to conviction with regard to the timber that it is a mistake to limit this time to ten years. It is absurd to put any restrictions upon the time as it will only serve to prove most detrimental to the interests of the people of the country. As it is it barely amounts to your using your Legislative authority to let these who have interest there hold lands upon conditions different to those under which they first obtained them. I may say that did I think that the Government was entirely free in this matter, I would vote for the exportation in an unmanufactured state of the timber on the Labrador, absolutely, but before doing that I would not let a single acre of land go out of your hands, and I would even take steps to acquire what land you could. The people who have invested in land knew that a change of law probably would come, and they took the land on speculation. You could compensate these people for their expenditures up to date. We might do well to learn from the experiences of Ontario with regard to the timber rights, as it is I think that you are merely giving this land away by your change of policy. You say that you can only do it for ten years, and of course from that there can be only one result. I think this is madness and there is nothing in the condition of the country today to warrant your taking steps like these.

The conditions that exist at the present moment are, we must admit, only temporary to a very large extent and when this war is over we all hope that they will pass away altogether, but why in the name of heaven are we recklessly sacrificing everything that the colony possesses in the worst manner that we possibly can. Now I appeal to both sides of this House and all those interested to look at this matter like a common sense man. Let

us look for some other means of getting revenue. Let us give the other side a chance to get pit props but let us save the wood on the Island. Let us go to Labrador and establish something there of a permanent nature, but even in this case if we are going to allow them to establish this industry on the Labrador let us have no limitation of ten years at all. Let there be no time limit, let a future Legislature deal with any limitation they may wish. We cannot lay down a permanent policy for the future, but we can say that so far as we are concerned we have made up our minds that the export of wood from the Labrador is permitted without restriction as to time. I hope that what I have said will not be taken as criticism merely from this side of the House. I submit that we should do something in the interest of the country.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to admit that what my learned friend has said has been done with the very best intentions, and what he has said is naturally free from any design on his part to make any party point by the criticism of this important subject, but at the same time I have to differ from him in his argument on the facts. The policy that he has referred to in relation to timber lands is not a policy but rather an absence of policy. It is quite true that all Governments in the past have not regarded as desirable the export from Newfoundland and Labrador of raw material. It did not require a statute to make that. All Governments have more or less decided that they would not allow timber to leave Newfoundland until it had been manufactured into lumber, pulp or paper or some saleable article.

MR. MORINE—But was there not a statute on the book forbidding the export of wood?

RIGHT HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

TER—Since 1904 there has been a law prohibiting the exportation of unmanufactured wood. That was put in not for the purposes of preventing the exportation of timber so much as to stop the exportation of timber to St. Pierre. That was the object of the law. It had no other object.

MR. MORINE—I cannot agree with you there.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Well, I know about it and I can tell the Honourable member that that was the object of the amendment of that session. I am not going so far as to say that if they had not that notice they would not have brought up that amendment, but at that time there was a special effort being made to carry out the Bait Act as a great number of people in Placentia Bay, Burin and Fortune Bay who brought across unmanufactured wood to St. Pierre violated the Bait Act, and carried on a smuggling business from St. Pierre, and that was why this amendment was passed. There was considerable friction between the Government, the Colonial Office and the French authorities in relation to what was deemed the persecution of the people of St. Pierre, but it had to be done and it was justified, but now we are engaged on an entirely different position. We are today dealing with the timber of the country from another standpoint. In the first place last session we brought in legislation to permit the export of pit props from Newfoundland to Great Britain and we are to-day extending that privilege for a longer period and I am sorry that the learned member for Bonavista does not agree with that extension because I think that we all ought to be prepared to make a sacrifice of this nature in the interest of the Empire and the country. We all should be prepared to take great risks and as far as making any difference to Newfoundland is con-

cerned I think I will be able to give figures that will convince the House that the few hundreds or thousands of pit props that will be cut from Newfoundland during the next year or two will have such a small effect compared with the natural growth of the country that it would not be worth while to prevent it. If all the people in Newfoundland to-day were let loose in Newfoundland cutting the timber year after year all over the Island they would not be able to overtake the natural growth. That is a very broad statement to make but I repeat it. If everyone in Newfoundland to-day were let loose cutting on the public lands all over Newfoundland they would not be able to overtake the natural growth that is going on. A forest in Newfoundland repeats itself in fifty years, and as far as pulp wood is concerned it reproduces in thirty years. Now let us look at this calmly and dispassionately. What happens to-day? What has happened for the last ten years? What has been happening for the last two hundred years? The whole population of the country has been cutting on the three mile limit. Now take these figures. There are fifty thousand families in Newfoundland; forty thousand of these cut all the wood they require for domestic purposes on the three mile limit. If they cut ten cords a year, that would not be a great deal. That would be less than a cord a month. For forty thousand families that would be 400,000 cords a year. Then there would be three or four cords for building operations, fences, wharves, boats, houses, making say 100,000 cords, so that we can safely say that to-day in Newfoundland the people are cutting in the neighbourhood of five hundred thousand cords per year on the three mile limit. That has been going on for two hundred years. The whole Island of Newfoundland has been cutting on the three mile limit, not alone

for domestic purposes, but for all the family and local purposes, and they have been cutting year after year for boats, fences, wharves and other works and they have not been able to exhaust it; and now when we speak of cutting thirty thousand cords more to help the Empire we are told that we are recklessly throwing away everything that the country has of any value. As a matter of fact there is no right given by this Act to cut on the three mile limit anything except burnt wood which if it is not cut down in a few years will be of no value whatever. My friend, the member for Bonavista, would be in favour of a policy of allowing pit props to be exported from Labrador but he says it is too late because now we are doing it after we have allowed the timber limits of Labrador to pass out of our hands, and that we are not getting anything for them. New what are the facts in relation to Labrador? In the first place there are only twenty thousand miles leased down there. I tabled in reply to my friend, Mr. Clift, a statement showing the mileage leased on Labrador and the total amount is twenty thousand square miles.

MR. COAKER—How much has been asked for.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Not very much more. I cannot say off-hand, but there has not been much applied for. The principal argument of Mr. Morine was that it is now too late to adopt this policy. The point I want to make is this, that in Labrador, according to the statement which I have tabled, we have leased twenty-two thousand square miles, and for that we have been getting about fifty thousand dollars a year. I do not know the total amount of rents collected; perhaps we only got \$40,000. The point made by Mr. Morine was that it is too late to adopt this

policy of exporting pit props, and he would have been in favour of that if we had adopted the policy before we had given the limits. My argument is this. That we are now putting on this export a dollar a cord, and the cost of cutting and producing the article down there will not make a very profitable industry for those to whom the limits are leased. Anyone who has read the records, anyone who has any knowledge of what it will cost to put a cord of wood on to the brink of the river and add a dollar to that will find that there is very little money in it for the men who have leases of the land. My learned friend went on further to say that this policy of ten years was a mistake. If we were giving them fifty years or no limit at all and allowed them to go down and cut as they liked that would be a sensible policy. I do not agree with him. In the first place if we did not have a limit of a few years we would never be able to change this policy. In the first place these people would build expensive places and works down there and after a few years would get vested rights which could not be reasonably disturbed, so that if they go down without that limit and begin expensive operations another Government would be very careful about altering or changing the policy. What is the effect of this ten years? In the first place it will afford an opportunity to those who hold these limits to go down there and go into the export of pulp wood and pit props and perhaps manufacture lumber, and remember that under the law to-day they can cut down and send out of the country any amount of these pit props so long as they shave it on the four sides, so that we are merely getting the labour that goes into that part of the work. The change which we are making in the law only loses us the additional la-

hour that would be put into the manufacture of pit props. I admit that the policy for this country and for every country is to keep all the raw material and manufacture it up to the very last point at which it is possible to do so and enhance its value. This is the policy which is followed by nearly every other country. Take the United States. Any wood that goes from here to the United States unmanufactured can go in free, but there is a forty per cent duty if it is manufactured. Our policy ought to be the same as that of the United States and to a certain extent it is, and also that we should encourage the manufacture to the highest point so that we may get all the labour we can out of the article. But how long are we going to wait for this in connection with Labrador wood? Can we wait for another hundred years? If we did nothing might still come of it. Away back in the ninety's, Mr. Dickie who was the pioneer in the exportation of Labrador timber, went down and tried to manufacture all lumber down there, and spent millions of dollars and lost it, and in the last fifteen years nothing has been done in this direction. He spent millions and lost millions down there, and to-day there is not a foot of timber being manufactured on Labrador. The same is true of Newfoundland. Only a few years ago in 1905 we exported from Newfoundland over \$200,000 worth of sawn lumber. The export was over one and a half millions of sawn lumber, valued at \$200,000, and last year there was not a foot of manufactured lumber exported from Newfoundland, and anyone who has read the evidence taken before the Royal Commission last year of Mr. Horwood and of Mr. Jones the Manager at Grand Falls will see what they say in relation to the manufacture of lumber in

this country. If we have been all these years falling in the development of Labrador the knowledge that we have is that none of the English or American or Canadian Companies have yet seen fit to go down there to invest their capital in the country. Is it not reasonable and fair to say that it is not a wild policy to open up Labrador for seven or ten years with a view to learning something about the country. If we open up the country in seven or ten years we will in the first place know all about the kinds of timber that are down there. We will know all about the climatic conditions and whether timber can be worked down there in the winter as it can in Newfoundland and Canada, and we will learn the labour conditions and we will know about the amount of timber on the acreage there. In fact in that ten years we may get such a complete knowledge of the timber industry to induce the establishment of permanent works there, in the way of factories like that at Grand Falls. If you will look at the report that I have referred to of the Royal Commission you will find in the evidence of Mr. Jones of the A. N. D. Co. that he states they have been operating for a number of years at Grand Falls and have not yet been able to make it pay, and he says further that there is very little hope of any other person coming to Newfoundland or Labrador until they have made it pay. They are struggling along to make it pay but they have failed up to the present and it is a black eye for this country and will be a black eye for some time to come until they make it pay. The crowning reason we have to look into is whether we are doing a permanent damage to the country by allowing this export. Are we doing any permanent injury to Labrador by allowing this cutting? As a matter of fact if every stick was

cut to-morrow it would reproduce itself in thirty years. Of course that does not apply to the large sticks of three or four feet in diameter which did not come in that cut, but the timber for pulp wood and for pit props will reproduce itself in twenty five or thirty years. The proper and judicious cutting around the Island is real benefit and advantage to the whole forest because it opens up the forest and lets in light and air. I think that we do not quite appreciate the enormous quantity of timber in Newfoundland and Labrador. I do not think that we realize the immense quantity that falls every year in Newfoundland and is never made any use of.

It being now half past six, the Chairman left the Chair until 8 o'clock.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to the explanation which has been given by the Prime Minister of the proposals now before the Committee. I am sorry that I could not be here the last day the Committee had these resolutions under consideration, but I must say that nothing that the Prime Minister has said appeals to me as a reason why this Act should pass. I think, Sir, that it is a departure to an extent that the circumstances under which it is brought in don't warrant. I am prepared to go as far as any person to meet the requirements of the Empire or of its allies in the present circumstances in Europe. We have a request from the Imperial Government and a request from the Government of the Republic of France in relation to the export of pit props for the purpose of helping them out in the working of their mines during the period of hostilities. I think we ought be prepared to meet those requests reasonably and patriotically and to the full extent to which they are made, but I don't think that

we ought, under the guise of requests of that kind, depart from a custom which has been acted upon heretofore by all governments that have been in power in this country. The question of cutting of timber for export in an unmanufactured state is one of the questions which is receiving the most serious consideration in every country in the world to-day that has timber resources; and I think that in Newfoundland and Labrador, as far as we can gather from the meagre information at our disposal, are resources in this respect equal to if not greater than those of any other country. Now, I think our duty in reference to these resources is to make the very best we can of them in the interests of our own people and with regard to the future welfare of the colony as a whole. The exceptional circumstances arising out of the war may require us to depart from this policy of conservation for a limited time and to a limited extent, but beyond that I don't think we are justified in going.

I do not think that a request from the Imperial government should be taken as an opportunity for extending the right to export timber more extensively than is necessary. The Premier in his remarks, based his argument upon the position that this timber has been there for centuries, and has been cut for fishery and domestic purposes. We have complained here year after year of this indiscriminate cutting. I think it is very necessary here to bear in mind that the cutting is one of a very different nature from that which the Premier referred to in his remarks. What is it that ruined the forest areas of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but indiscriminate cutting? The forest areas there were there for centuries and cut for

the same purposes as the Labrador timber, until the cutting began to be for the same purposes as we are dealing with here to-night. They very soon disappeared. If you allow this cutting to go on for ten years, we will have no forest areas left after that period. In the opening debate on the Address from the Throne, I referred to this matter. This is the cutting from the "Standard of Empire" which I read; it has no reference to the exportation of the manufactured wood—"A campaign is now in progress in the colony for the removal of the prohibition against the export of unmanufactured wood which has always been operative but was temporarily raised last September to admit of the shipping of timber to England for use as pit props in the coal mines there. This, however, was only made effective for the present season, and unless the Legislature at the session now due, extends the Act for a further period, it will be impossible to make use of it after the end of 1915. It is now being argued that not only should the term for which this arrangement is effective, be extended until the close of the war, but that a renewal of the whole colonial policy in this direction which aimed at the stimulation of local manufactures, ought to be undertaken." That shows, Mr. Chairman, that a campaign was needed for the purpose of inducing the Government to allow the exportation of timber for a period which involved a complete reversal of the policy of the government. I hoped that the government would not give into any campaign of this kind. The present bill combined with this information shows that the government has not been strong enough to withstand the force of the campaign. The Act with which we are now dealing, is not in relation to pit props. The only reason to justify that would be to show that

this comes to be of permanent value to the people of this country.

Dealing with the question of the exportation of timber as an abstract principle; it would primarily be against the interests of this country. Newfoundland has its first place with regard to its natural resources. The pulp and paper industry can be established and remunerative. The Harmsworth's have shown a deficit, but if the business did not profit them, they would not be here. I have said that as an abstract principle, we ought to reserve these areas for ourselves. Labrador ought to be reserved in case of establishing an industry there. It has not been established that it is not possible. No effort was made in that direction. Nothing was ever done to prove that it was impossible. If it is not possible then I think it ought to be reserved for Newfoundland. Labrador is a dependency of Newfoundland. Are there any circumstances under which we would be justified in departing from that? I can just conceive that it would be possible; but I do not think that the Act ever begins to meet these circumstances. We should only allow exportation when there is a law providing for the restoration of the forest trees. I understand that the forests of this country renew themselves very rapidly. Pulpwood will renew itself every 35 years and be ready for use. As far as I know, there are no regulations with regard to these matters; no question of preserving the forests. The very same thing as is happening here, has happened in other countries which are searching around for woods. We are allowing these foreigners who cannot get woods in their own countries to come here and destroy ours. I think it is a mistaken idea to allow natural resources to be wasted in this way. It is a mistaken idea to allow them to export in the way that this Legislation

will provide. The present law provides that it shall be prohibited to export unless and until the same has been manufactured into paper, pulp or other saleable products of timber. Other saleable products of timber must be read in conjunction with the words that go before. Any person would read that to mean, other saleable products similar to those previously mentioned. I agree with the exportation of pit props as demanded by the Imperial government. But we ought to stop there. I do not think that there is any need for the cutting of the timber to that extent, and I believe that the requirements of the Imperial government and of France can be met by limiting it to the Labrador. The quantity of timber there, as the Premier said, is very large, and I think we can provide from there all necessary pit props required by the authorities. I think that such a license should be under the control of the Government, and that the government ought to reserve the right to control the license at any time, manner or place as they might think fit. I am sure that the Imperial government would not allow us to carry this out. A license is the same as a grant, and it can only be interfered with by ample compensation. It simply means that these people hold these licenses for ten years and you are powerless to alter them. Once the Legislature allows this to pass it will be impossible for them to go back until the ten years are up. The licenses should be conditional that they are subject to all regulations which may be made by the Governor in Council. Every change that has been made in the Crown Lands Act in reference to alterations of conditions of licenses, has been on condition that the amendment should not effect licenses granted before the passing of this Act. I think that we ought

to hesitate before we pass these resolutions. We are in great danger of destroying our greatest natural resources. I saw it stated that the most valuable natural resources that a country can possess, are water powers and forest areas. We have already given away one of these, now we are about to give away the other. I believe that it is possible to pass a law which would enable the proper export of wood, if you have the regulations of the forest area. At present we have no law to that effect. I believe that the passing of the present act means the destruction of these areas. It has been argued that a number of people have interests in the Labrador areas and because the people have interests there, we ought to take back the areas which these people hold, before making any such amendment in the law. That is a very serious question which the government ought to go slowly in acting upon.

I think, Sir, we ought hesitate before passing these Resolutions. They may, and probably will, have the effect of destroying without any adequate returns one of our great natural resources. I stated here some time ago that the most valuable natural resources that a country can possess at the present time are water powers and forest areas suitable for development, such as we have here. We have abundant water powers; unfortunately, the Act passed the other day has put a great portion of them out of the control of this country. Now, Sir, we are going to destroy another of the most valuable assets which the country can have. I believe, Sir, that it is possible to pass a law which would be ample and proper with reference to the export of pulp wood if you have regulations surrounding it sufficient for the protection of our forest areas, but we have no law

here to that effect. We have nothing here. I believe that the passing of the present Act means the destruction of these areas. I am not in a position to say what the value of pulp wood would be to the owner of these lands, but am told that the tax of one dollar is too small under the circumstances, and I think considering that we are giving them the right to cut on Crown Lands we ought to make that cutting on Crown Lands liable to the rents which the Crown Lands Act provide. I think, Sir, that we should pay a much larger export tax than one dollar. These people who hold licenses at the present time are getting a privilege which their licenses never contemplated. We are giving them rights which make their holding far more valuable than before, and these individuals ought to be made contribute more largely to the revenue of the Colony. Returns of this kind ought to be available under proper conditions to lessen the taxes which have to be borne by our people at the present time. Now that you have decided, as I presume you have, to pass the measure in the present form, you ought at least let us get from it as much as we possibly can in the interest of the people of the country generally. But I must say as I said before, I think the whole measure is wrong in principle. I do not think it should go beyond what has been asked by the Imperial Government. I propose moving an amendment along these lines, that we comply with the request of the Imperial Government, and go no further. I think the whole question of the export of pulp wood is inopportune at the present time, and we should not enter into the consideration of it until we have gone much further. The question of export itself under our conditions would have to be considered in reference to general legislation. Personally I have got no

definite opinion as to whether it would be in the interest of the Colony generally to permit the export of wood from Labrador, providing the proper safeguarding and protection of our forest is placed first and last all the time. Besides pulp and paper we have fifty or sixty or a hundred minor industries that might be developed in this country, which depend upon our forest areas. The future of this country will largely depend upon how we conserve our natural resources, and if we now allow their destruction we will do a gross injustice to the people of the country and its future prosperity. The amendment which I propose to move is as follows:—

(1) It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to grant a license to any person to cut timber for pit props on any Crown Lands on Labrador, and to export the timber cut under such license to any port in the United Kingdom or in the Republic of France for pit props, and to grant a license to any person being the holder of a license to cut timber for pit props on Labrador to export timber cut on any area held under and included in such license to any port in the United Kingdom or in the Republic of France for pit props. All licenses granted hereunder shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) The license shall continue in force until June 30, 1916, or during the duration of the present war, if it be not then terminated, and no longer, provided the licensee shall have the right to export as aforesaid timber cut before June 30, 1916, under the said license at any time up to December 31, 1916, and in the event of war continuing after June 30, 1916, wood cut for the same purposes between June 30, 1916, and the ter-

mination of the war may be exported at any time up to six months after the termination of the said war.

- (2) The licensee shall pay an export duty on any timber exported of more than \$1.00 per cord.
- (3) The license shall be subject to such conditions and regulations as to the time, manner, place and area of cutting timber and for the preservation of the growing trees and of the forest areas as the Governor in Council may from time to time prescribe.
- (4) Before any export entry therefor is granted, the person applying for such export entry shall satisfy the Collector of Customs on oath that the timber for which he is seeking export entry was cut on Labrador, and that it is exported for pit props only, and that all other conditions contained in the Act and in the license have been observed and fulfilled.
- (5) Nothing in the license contained shall authorize the cutting or exporting of timber cut in Newfoundland.

(2). Any person exporting pit-props without a license under this Act or being a holder of such license without entering same for export or without paying the export duties thereon, shall be liable, in addition to the penalties provided by the Crown Lands Act, to a penalty for any such offence of \$500 and an amount equal to double the amount of the duty payable on any pulp wood so exported, to be recovered in a summary manner before a Stipendiary Magistrate.

I would also suggest that the tax be increased. I have no power or authority to move in the House for the

increasing of any tax; but I would suggest that the tax be increased.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply to the hon. member. Now, to sum up in two or three words, the effect of my learned friend's speech is this, that great injury is going to take place on the Labrador—a great damage is going to occur to the forest areas on Labrador by reason of this policy. Now that really is the basis of his whole speech, and that is incorporated in the amendment now proposed, that great danger is going to come to the Labrador timber by reason of this policy. Now, I am going to point out to the House the effect of that, if what my learned friend points out comes true. In the first place no danger is going to come if an industry is not created. If there are no pit props exported from Labrador, then no injury will be done. It is only in the event of an industry growing up in the next ten years, a pit-prop industry, that any damage is going to take place at all. Now I am going to give an estimate of possible development, and the only fear I have to-night is that it is too good to be true, words I used on one occasion in relation to the Fog Free Zone. The only thing to-night is that I am almost afraid to think about it. I can hardly trust myself to speak about it. I am so much afraid it will not become an accomplished fact. Not only do I not fear any danger from this source, but I fear it will not become an accomplished fact. If it does not become an accomplished fact no danger will be done. Now let us assume for the first year we export 100,000 cords; the year after two hundred thousand; the year after three hundred thousand; the next year three hundred and fifty thousand; the next year four hundred thousand, and increasing fifty thousand a year until 1925. You will then be exporting 650,000 cords. In ten

years you will have exported four million cords. Now, four million cords can be cut on a thousand square miles. Now there are twenty thousand square miles leased to-night in a territory five or six times as large as Newfoundland. Now that is the position. Let us examine it a little further. The last year, if this terrible danger, this frightful calamity, comes about, you will be collecting revenue from six hundred and fifty thousand cords at a dollar a cord. Now what does this industry mean to the country? It means \$3,250,000, valuing the wood at \$5.00 a cord. It will mean 5,000 men at work at \$600 a year. That is the position. It will mean 5,000 men at work at two dollars a day to earn that three million dollars.

MR. COAKER.—Are you going to put that two dollars a day in the Bill?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is ridiculous. How can you put it in a Bill like this? However, that will be the position. Unless this industry comes about there can be no cutting. It is only in the event of this huge industry springing up, and increasing from one hundred thousand to six hundred and fifty thousand cords, and spread over the whole twenty-two thousand miles under lease to-night, that any damage can accrue. Now, where is the danger? Where is the risk?

MR. KENT.—I think the argument of the Prime Minister is one of those arguments of his that may appear convincing, but is altogether apart from facts. It is not the reasoning that one would expect from him in dealing with a proposition of this kind. It reminds me of the story of the man who was going to start a henery; who calculated the results if every hen laid a dozen eggs, and if every egg became a chicken, and so on. He would become very wealthy in a short time.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I

invite the hon. member to lay before the House what he thinks is going to happen next year.

MR. KENT.—What I have said is that you have got to protect the trees. You must remember, Sir, that every tree cut is not going to be fit for pit props, and there is going to be much damage done. If men go in on these areas and cut as they like, it is going to work great destruction. That very thing has destroyed the resources of other countries, and if we are not careful it will destroy ours.

MR. COAKER.—The statement of the Prime Minister in reply to the Leader of the Opposition is that if we start to export pulp wood in the form of pit props, in ten years we will have exported four million cords. Now, that is not the danger. The danger is that in the next three years, before your term of office expires you will issue licenses to cut pit props on the Labrador to every one that asks for them. They may not export very much; and when the ten years is up what then? People will come into the House and look for an extension of the term. They will say, look at all these men engaged in this industry. Are you going to turn them out after giving them the right to cut there? Why not give them the right to cut for another twenty years?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Do you believe we are not coming back?

MR. COAKER.—God only knows who is coming back. Personally, I do not believe any Government ought to be in power more than four years. There ought to be a change. When you put a party in the second time, they do not care what they do. They reason that they will not get a third term anyhow; so they do as they please. I believe the Government should change every four years. Now, the Premier said something about wages being two dollars a day. He

said it would be ridiculous to put it in the Bill. It is not ridiculous if he is sincere. Is it more ridiculous than for him to come in here in 1909 and say he would build five branch railways for four millions? And now they have cost over eight millions, and they are not finished yet.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I never made such a statement. You were not here.

MR. COAKER.—I was not here, but I believed the statement, and was deceived by it.

Now, Mr. Kent in the early part of his speech said that he had read a Canadian newspaper, which said that there was a movement now in force in the Colony to remove the prohibition against the export of pulp wood from the Colony. That prohibition was raised in September. Now, we did not know anything about it till it came up here.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That was sent by the correspondent in June.

MR. COAKER.—We did not know it. We had to get it from across the water. We knew nothing about it that that movement was on foot in this country. I wonder how many gentlemen in the House knew about it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I want to say that I knew nothing about the correspondent who sent that news out. I spoke to nobody about it, or nobody spoke to me. I never heard of any movement being on foot to have this prohibition removed.

MR. COAKER.—The correspondent evidently knew what he was talking about. He said the prohibition was going to be removed, and it was. I don't say you knew anything about it. I don't believe you know a fiftieth part of what goes on. But those petitions were sent out. They were sent out with a letter signed by one Noseworthy. I would say there must be

six hundred petitions sent out. They were intended to be sent to this House but there was so much opposition against them that not one of them ever found its way here.

I don't believe that the members of the Government have gone into this matter at all or know what damage they are likely to cause. I am not talking now about a temporary matter during the war. I am talking about the permanent policy for ten years. The whole country is against you in this matter. Of course this would not be done at all only so many of your supporters are interested in these timber limits. What about the application for one thousand miles which was granted to Jardine of Bay Roberts in March. Why was that issued? It was issued because it was expected that this prohibition would be removed. Then there are fifteen applications since June 1915 for large areas of land on Labrador. These were applied for and issued because the removal of this prohibition in the export of pulp-wood was expected. Now I certainly object to any pit props being exported from Newfoundland. Not one more stick for war purposes or any other purposes should be exported. If pit props are to be exported for war purposes let them go down to Labrador and get them. I am certainly in favour of Mr. Kent's amendment that pit props should only be exported from Labrador while the war continues or 12 months after. I am perfectly satisfied with that. But you will never take another stick from Newfoundland with my consent. We should now have three or four industries in Newfoundland as large as Grand Falls and we would if they had been properly encouraged. We should have a Glenwood and Bishop's Falls industries as large and larger than that of Grand Falls. But somebody interfered with them. When these people start

ed at Bishop's Falls they contemplated raising a large amount of money and creating an industry as large or larger than that one at Grand Falls. And what stopped them? The Reid Newfoundland Company. It kept those men hung up for a year and threatened them with lawsuits, and the people who were investing their capital in the enterprise dropped out, and Mr. Reed had to go ahead on his private money and start the industry on a small scale. The English capitalists would not risk their money when there was a possibility of being involved in a lawsuit, and instead of having at Bishop's Falls a larger industry than the one at Grand Falls, it had to be started on a smaller scale.

There is a sufficiency of lumber there and I do not think it is fair play to the people to have these parties coming in and investing their money under these present circumstances. I wonder if it is generally known that these people at Bishop's Falls desire to make St. John's their winter shipping port. As the matter now stands they have to lie up six months' produce at Botwood and wait six months before they can again utilize it. They never intended to make Lewisporte more than the summer port, but they intended, as I have said, to make St. John's their winter port. They were again, however, impeded. They intended, I believe, to establish at Bishop's Falls an industry as large as that at Grand Falls. They would utilize the railway to Fortune Bay and not bring the timber back to be manufactured. You are going to take away all the chances that this Company presented of contributing a large industry. Do you realize what this will mean to the country? If you are here in two years time, you will realize that I am speaking the truth. What I say is this: Keep your timber, and let the pulp be manufactured here, that our people

may benefit by the labour. It is a matter I calculate, of some seventy or seventy-five thousand dollars to the revenue, and there is room for twenty such, can you but find the water supply. You are giving a black eye to the industries at Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls. You may say that they are not now getting dividends, but they are showing the people abroad that they are not losing money. But we, however, must do more than this—we must show they are making some profit. There was never a mill like this that ever paid within five or seven years, but they make money afterwards. I cannot see how you intend with this policy to improve these conditions. You are putting a limit of two years here, and ten on the Labrador, and you know very well that you never expect this war to last anything like ten years. The people of Newfoundland own that timber, and you are now by these Acts depriving them of their own property. They are the ones that have the right to export it. The policy has always been that they could only export the pulp in a manufactured state which of course necessitates the erection of mills, and now they will export this wood, and there is no chance of it being manufactured here. In 1913, previous to the election there came to me a henchman from some of these Companies, and offered me the sum of \$250,000 if I would give this measure my vote. I communicated this to a Council of the F. P. U., and told them what was done. It is a thing that I would never consent to. It means giving these speculators rights that they never expected. Twenty-two thousand square miles of land down there, at fifty cents an acre, which will mean something like seven million for these men. If it is only thirty cents an acre it means five million two hundred thousand. Are you going to rob this country to the extent of five mil-

lion dollars for the sake of eight or ten land-grabbers? What do you mean by it? Get the land back, let the Colony have the land again. If the men honestly deserve it, let them have ample compensation, and I will support you in this. I do not believe that we ought to stand in the way of the country's development as we are doing by this policy. If the produce is needed in New York or London, then let it be manufactured here, or some place near here, and make some attempt at giving our people labour. We need it badly at the present time. I believe in a few years all our financial troubles will have cleared away, and we will not have to send our men to Labrador to get money for their labour. Let it be for two or two and a half or even three years, but do not extend it up to ten years. I wish I could believe that the Premier when he dealt with this question was sincere and conscientious. If the little birds that sometimes tell things in the city are telling the truth, your Party meetings are not always very secret. They have revealed the fact that on this very question you are divided; that is what is said on the street. Some of the men, it is said, wanted to retire.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say this never happened at any party meeting. Our meetings have been characterized by a unanimity that could give no possible rise to a report of this kind. I state this here in the presence of all the people who are at those meetings. I made no proposal that was not unanimously agreed to.

MR. COAKER—I am very pleased to hear this, and I hope the little birds won't tell any more fibs.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I believe, and I hope, that there is no man in Newfoundland who is base enough to be capable of such an act.

Personally I know no man low enough, and that is why it did not happen.

MR. COAKER—I am not going to say any more, but if you go on and talk any more like that I will say a great deal.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say in the presence of everyone in this House that this never happened, and that you are entirely incorrect.

MR. COAKER—Now with reference to the matter we were discussing, there are now about five hundred thousand cords used a year in Newfoundland, and this has been going on for some years, and still the 3-mile limit has not been cut. The Premier tried to convince me that the 3-mile limit was as intact as 25 or 30 years ago.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not think you intended to misquote me; what I said was this: that the population of this country for the past 200 years has been cutting on the 3-mile limit, and it is not cut out yet.

MR. COAKER—There may be a little wood left, but how much will you find in Conception Bay, for instance? I have been over the North of Conception Bay where I know there was a little, but I know that the 3-mile limit is pretty bare on the railroad from here to Port aux Basques. The country is a barren wilderness, and when the railroad went first it was a beautiful forest. I am sure that fully one-half of our fishermen are unable to get the wood that they ought to. They have to go into the woods to get it. I know that is so on the greater part of the south side of Trinity Bay. They have a little wood left in Fogo, I do not think this policy is a good one, merely because there is a 3-mile limit for the people. As a matter of fact they will cut where it

is most easily available and won't leave a picket standing. These men are cursing the day pit props came into the country. I got a letter to-day asking that no pit props be cut. I got a letter asking that no more pit props be cut from the north side of Bonavista Bay. These people are anxious that they should preserve enough wood to serve them with firewood. Several people are sending me similar petitions, and if you were to put it to the vote of the people, seven-eighths would vote against these pit props. You go to these people before the elections and make promises to them, but you do just as you like when the time comes. You forget all you said to them and suit yourselves in the matter. Then the people complain. When I get in power I intend to do everything the people desire. That, and that alone I take it, is what I am there for. That is what you are there for. Let the people be the sovereign power. Let every matter that concerns the people come before them. Then and then only shall we have a legislature that will make the country prosperous. When the F. P. U. came into power the people know that they will get a square deal. I do not say that everything should be submitted to the people, but a thing like the Products Bill ought to be submitted to them, as on them alone responsibility should rest. If we can only prevent this going through, it will be one of the best things for Newfoundland, but I am afraid that if we discuss this question until to-morrow morning we would not get you to move one inch from the policy that you determined upon before you came is here. You are not going to alter your plans now, no matter what I may say. You are going to make it ten years. If you do that thousands of dollars will change hands.

I say that the people do not want

this measure, but the people are not going to be consulted by the men who govern the country now. The country is against this bill and it will bring down upon the heads of the present Government the curse of the whole people. They do not want to have anything to do with it. It is not in the interests of the people that the bill is passed. If the Government would devote some of their energies to the development of the fisheries instead of the passage of a measure such as this they would get a better name than they have in the country to-day.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay this Committee with any lengthy remarks, but I wish to say that I support this bill in its entirety. The Bill itself is divided into two parts. The first dealing with Newfoundland, and the second with Labrador. The term for the exportation of timber from Newfoundland is extended for one year, while it is permitted from Labrador for a period of ten years. This has been charged as a reversal of the policy of the present Government. It has been pointed out the policy (if you can call it a policy) that we have been conducting is more an absence of policy than anything else. We have on Labrador large quantities of timber which have a certain commercial value, and it seems to me to be a ridiculous policy to have this timber tied up year after year when in one or two days a forest fire can make away with millions and millions of feet of it. Why not let us utilize this timber at a time such as this and give employment to the people. In rising to speak in favour of the bill I had also in mind a charge that was flung across the floors of the House that certain members on this side were interested in the passage of the bill. That charge was made by the member for Twillingate,

and it is only fair to us that he should name the man who is interested by the bill going through.

MR. COAKER—Are you interested in it?

HON. MR. EMERSON—Speaking for myself I can say that I have no interest whatever in the measure.

MR. COAKER—Are you not solicitor for a Company that is interested?

HON. MR. EMERSON—That may be, but being a solicitor for a Company that is interested in the bill does not make me in any way interested in its passage. That is a necessary thing in the profession of the law. The honourable member can make statements such as that with impunity in the same way in which he made a statement about me in the last election, libelling me in connection with the International Ore Co., of Bay de Verde, when he spread broadcast the fact that I had signed the Memorandum of Association of that Company. I did not sign that Memorandum of Association. I had nothing whatever to do with it, and my name was put to it without my knowledge or consent.

MR. LLOYD—Why did you not state that at the time?

HON. MR. EMERSON—For the simple reason that it was spread broadcast through the country at the time before I knew anything about it. It was spread by you.

MR. LLOYD—It was not. I never mentioned your name in connection with it at all. I am only sorry that I did not.

HON. MR. EMERSON—What I want to state is that as far as I know no member on this side of the House is in any way interested in the passage of the bill. The charge is as false as the one that was made here to-day that the Premier was turned down at a party meeting when this matter was under discussion. There is not a particle of truth in it and

I do not believe that even the member for Twillingate himself believes it was true.

MR. COAKER—Oh yes I do.

HON. MR. EMERSON—We were told here to-day that there were a lot of petitions drawn up in favour of this measure. I know nothing about the petitions. I never saw them and I hear of them to-night for the first time. It is a curious thing that if there were such a number of petitions going around that we did not have some of them in the House. I never heard of them having been about. I simply wish to put myself straight as far as I am concerned and think it is only fair that when charges are made across the floors of the House, charges of such a serious nature, the persons involved should be named and an enquiry made into the truth of them.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one or two observations on this bill, and in the first place I would like to make reference to the clipping from the "Standard of Empire" produced by the Leader of the Opposition to-night, which referred to a campaign supposed to have been started in this community for the purpose of getting a reversal of the policy as regards the exportation of unmanufactured wood from this Colony and Labrador. The honourable member on a previous occasion produced the same extract, but his remarks on that occasion did not assume any serious aspect, but I think to-night he has made a statement that has assumed serious proportions and one that should not be allowed to pass without proper refutation on the part of members on this side of the House. He made a statement in connection with this matter that the Government was not strong enough to withstand the Company that was started. Now, Sir, I submit that next to the Premier himself I know as much as most peo-

ple in connection with Government matters, and I can say positively that no members of the Government had any knowledge of any Company of any kind whatever formed to undertake this work, or that any such Company was known to the Executive Government when this matter was discussed. When this matter was discussed no one knew this Company to exist. I am sure that the Premier knew of no Company, and I feel safe in saying that no other member of the Executive Government did either, and consequently I say that the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition should not be allowed to pass without contradiction which I think I have fully made at this moment. As regards the remark of the member for Twillingate in stating that members on this side of the House had an interest in the passage of the measure. I do not know who owns the timber lands on the Labrador. I have no interests in any timber on the Labrador and never had any timber lands in the Colony, and I think that I can claim that during my time in this House I have always done my best in the interest of the Colony and in that interest alone, and in making that statement I wish to say that I will not take second place even to Mr. Coaker in that regard. Ever since I occupied a seat in this House I have endeavoured to follow out this policy as far as I was personally concerned. The honourable member then referred to a grant going through the Executive Council just in the same way as other grants that have come up. It was upon a part of the Labrador Coast that was outside the disputed territory. Other grants were issued as they came along without distinction. Mr. Jardine's grant was made out under the same conditions as other leases. I am aware that a great number of grants on the Labrador Coast

were not issued in the last twelve months nor for many years past. It is not for me to ask why people take out these grants. I have no interest in that. If everything is in order then they come before the Executive and a grant is issued. They get a grant and pay rent, that is all the interest the Government has in it. In all cases the holders of these grants have to pay large sums of money, and it is not many men that can afford to pay big amounts exacted by the Government for rentals. They do not as a rule undertake the payment of these rentals unless they have a large sum of money at their disposal. As regards the policy itself I never was a believer in the policy of tying up the Labrador. On a great many occasions I have stated the matter in public and stated my conviction that we should utilize for the benefit of the people that timber which is locked up over there. This has always struck me as a dog in the manger policy and I see no reason why we should not utilize resources such as that to the very best advantage. We have in this country the greatest asset that a country can have a large quantity of timber and we have very little else. Down on Labrador, I have been informed, more particularly at Hamilton Inlet, there are hundreds of miles of great timber lands going in from the banks of the Rivers for many miles that could be utilized for pit props that have never been touched since the country was first discovered. What development have we seen in the last twenty years since we have had this policy going. What hope is there for the future of ever having any great development in connection with those areas. It has been found out that it is hardly within the realms of possibility to establish large public operations in that country owing to the many disadvantages, more particularly the fact that there are only

three of four months of navigation. At the present time we know very little of any of these conditions, and we cannot expect anyone to come down and spend millions of dollars in the construction of works unless they are assured of the success of their enterprise.

Every member knows that the great need of the country at the present time is employment. There is evidence of lack of employment on every side, more particularly in regard to the fishery as there is a shortage in supplies. This bill besides helping the employer and the country, opens up an avenue of employment and provides occupation for the people who need it, and I think it is a pity at a time such as this that we cannot hide our political feelings and work together for the good of everyone. Two years ago we did not think of the exportation of pit props nor did we appreciate what value it would be to the Colony. We were unaware that there were such benefits to be obtained from this industry and that such a large amount of this material was being used in Great Britain, while cords upon cords of this wood were rotting in our forest of no benefit to the country or the people. I have no doubt that this bill, if it passes, will be of great use to the people themselves. Last year we came into this House and asked to pass a measure for one year. The circumstances under which we asked for it were such that we thought there would be no necessity for a longer period. We hoped to anticipate any early termination of the war. We all expected that when the war was over no more requirements of this kind would be needed, but unfortunately for us and unfortunately for the whole Empire that war is not to-day apparently any nearer conclusion than it was at that time, and therefore we are asking this Legislature to enact a measure to allow Great Britain and

France to export pit props from the Colony and to carry on that industry which is necessary for the keeping up of their manufactures and works and to keep the armies of France and our other allies supplied, and it is only natural that this House should unanimously adopt the measure. Both sides should agree to rise above mere party criticism. The bill which was introduced last Session passed unanimously—that the export of pit props should be allowed for one year. As I say we are extending that privilege because the termination of hostilities is not in sight at the present time and probably it will be necessary to extend beyond that period. Both sides agreed to that position last fall. I say now that there is no intention to continue this bill as far as Newfoundland is concerned, after the termination of the war. The member for Twillingate said a few minutes ago that he trusted the Government would not extend this privilege beyond the two years. I give him an undertaking here to-night that the Government will not extend the privilege of exporting from Newfoundland beyond the end of the war. It may be that we might have to extend it for another year, if it should happen that England was still at war, but as Mr. Kent has said we should not hesitate to offer any resources that we have to be used by her and her allies in any possible manner. These are the only conditions under which the Government is asking for this extension as far as Newfoundland is concerned, but I claim it is a different proposition when we come to look at Labrador. The Labrador is an immense country, very largely waste land, with an enormous quantity of timber, enormous Falls and inland seas, whose banks are covered with a thick growth of timber that has lain there for centuries and will remain there for centuries to come unless something

such as we propose is undertaken there. We want to give them the right to take from that resource, and we hope that it will bring in something to the revenue of the Colony, that it would not do if it were not developed in some way.

In these days of depression it would be a blessing to open some of these our industries. I hate to see men have to go away to get work. I hate to see men not working but getting relief when they are willing and eager to work. I hate to see a source of work closed when men are standing idle around. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think the passage of this measure will be an inspiration to our men, and also that no one need be out of a job during the coming year at any rate. The temptation would not be as strong to them if this measure was but for one year, for just as they had acquired the knowledge of its working, the time would have expired. This leaving it for ten years was in the opinion of the Government the best that could be done in view of the present conditions in Europe, England and France. This in view of the necessary depression which must follow the immediate conclusion and last stages of the war, will keep our men at work and at the same time doing work asked for by Great Britain.

I therefore, Mr. Chairman, support this measure to open the wilderness to our people.

MR. HIGGINS—I would say just a word or two Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that anything I may have to say will not have the authority that some of the speeches here to-day have shown, but I would like to express my appreciation of this measure. Two members of the Executive Government have spoken, and as they spoke I was trying to think if anyone in whom they or anyone else might be interested, had great interests at stake in

Labrador. I may say that at the present time I know of no person interested in this venture. I think that it is a measure advanced in the best interests of the people.

When the first speakers of the Opposition spoke, I thought with them that not unlikely some of the members were interested in this bill, as by it they might reap benefits from their land which they did not deserve; but as I have said, to the best of my knowledge and belief such is not the case. I confess, however, that I was struck with this attitude when the hon. gentleman who made the remark was speaking. Having said this I will make one or two observations of the bill, which may have been suggested by the remarks of the two members of the Executive who have spoken.

While this is in some ways a war measure, yet it was also the fixed policy of this Government before war was thought of. Some of the members who have spoken spoke of it as a war measure. Now I would like to say frankly that as far as it appears to me it has been clearly explained that that is not so. The Premier has fully explained the situation and you will remember that he said that the Government had considered the war only in so far as it was the wish of Great Britain that we export some of our timber to England. This you will also remember was carried out under an act made last year, which authorized the cutting for a period of one year. I would under no circumstances approve of the export of our raw material but for the fact that the war has made it a necessity. It is a well known fact that Newfoundland's wealth is in her unworked industries, and to thus open them to the world would be to give them up. I am hoping that the Government is keeping a strict eye on any who may be contemplating a wholesale export of this

timber, where the same is not justified by necessity due to the war.

I would say as a member of the Government that the lines laid down by my hon. friends, Mr. Morine and Mr. Coaker, although perhaps said with a little foundation, yet may be laid aside. It is my hope and belief that this work will be undertaken by Newfoundlanders, and that any benefits which may accrue may come to them. I agree with Mr. Kent in many of his remarks on this subject. It is a privilege to Newfoundland to have these industries, and it ought to be a privilege of Newfoundlanders to work them. My hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, has showed that a lot of this area has been granted as timber areas, some 22,000 miles. It is not reasonable to suppose that when this land was taken this step on the part of the Government was anticipated. They were in all probability sincere when they took it, but now that this industry has been started they may be able to get enough to pay the taxes made upon such land.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, that I think this policy of the Government will be brought to a successful issue by the introduction of this measure. In all details the interests of the people have been conserved as far as this was possible, and it is my opinion that as a result of the adoption of this measure great benefits will accrue to us as Newfoundlanders and to our country.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss this matter at any length at this hour here tonight, but I would just like to say a word or two. I was struck by a statement made here tonight by Mr. Coaker to the effect that he had been offered a great sum of money if he would use his influence to introduce a bill into this legislature to permit the export of pulp wood from the Labrador. Now in the fall of 1913, Mr. Coaker told

me that he had been offered by a gentleman resident in this city, on condition that he went over with his party to the Morris party, and on condition that if elected he would bring in a bill to permit the export of pulp wood, a considerable amount of money. The amount named was \$250,000. The promoters were prepared to pay an export tax of \$1 per cord. I would give this House the name of this gentleman, but for the fact that his name was given to me privately by Mr. Coaker, and that consequently I do not feel that I ought to do this without permission. I may say, however, that he is not a Newfoundland, but a resident of the city.

The members of this House will appreciate the fact that in view of such information as this, one cannot be too careful when considering such a matter as this. I thought I would just say this while we are at this juncture.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two in reference to the remarks of the Colonial Secretary. From articles I have seen in the "Standard of Empire," one of the leading papers of England, and one of which I think the Hon. Robert Watson, until recently a member of the Executive Council, is the Newfoundland correspondent, I should judge, in view of the fact that the writer was a member of the Council, that this matter of exporting timber from the Labrador had not come before the consideration of the Government until very recently. This would contradict the statement made here that this was a fixed policy of the Government. At any rate a matter of such great importance as this ought not to be held over until so late in the session. The Premier has given notice of suspension of rules, and here this a most important bill is just about to be introduced. There was no just reason why this matter should not have been

introduced before in order that this House might have more time to think over its provisions.

I think it was a fair inference to draw that that campaign referred to did exist. Now it is quite possible that the action of the Government may have been entirely independent of any campaign that was going on. I think that the very presence of a member in this House discussing this matter is proof that he has no interest in it. For a member will find himself in that position that his interests will be effected by Legislation; in which case it is his duty to withdraw. Every member who votes in connection with this measure, will do so with the same clearness of intention as I do myself. There is another remark which I wish to make in reference to what I said about this bill being brought in under the guise of Pit Prop Resolutions of last year. Now you are not asking to extend that for the duration of the war; but instead of that you come in here and amend that section to extend it for a period of ten years, not for pit prop purposes but for any purpose. That justifies the remark that the resolutions were introduced under the disguise of Pit Prop Resolutions of last year. We are prepared to respond to the call of the Empire. It is a duty that we are bound to fulfil. But we are not prepared to vote for the measure in its present form. I do not think that there is any reason why we should go further than that in connection with the matter before the chair.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it has been said by the different speakers that there would be no opposition to any resolutions that would help the Empire in any way to meet the great conflict now engaging the attention of Europe. We all agree on that point; that every pit prop required from Newfoundland, we will be too glad to supply, but when it comes to the

question of the general exportation of timber resources, it is another thing. It will not be confined to pit props, but everything will be mowed down. Timber for local use has been a great asset. Now those living in St. John's will have to buy all their fuel. If there is not a substitute put in its place, the result will be that they will have to leave the country altogether. We do not value our timber. We think that cutting pit props will be a grand thing for the country. Yes, but only for the time being. Those who prosecute the fishery are depending on timber for fishing purposes, and also for building houses. If the men have to carry their fuel down to Labrador, it will be such a hardship that a great many will not be able to prosecute the fishery at all. If you cut off this supply of fuel what are you going to get in its place. Now I do not question the sincerity of the promoters of this measure, but I certainly disagree with it, because the best of us make mistakes. Dean Swift said that he did not wonder at a man being wicked but he did wonder at a man not being ashamed. Mistakes have often led on to fortune. We have already passed one contract and cannot retrench, and now we are entering upon another such project. As it has been stated here, I believe that this has been brought down to this Legislature in favour of those interested in timber on Labrador, under the guise of Pit Prop Resolutions. These people want to make a good thing out of it. This Legislature had a policy which has now been reversed. What for? Because we are up against bad times? You will not get men to go and cut pit props. Our men are not going to stay in the woods if there is a good fishery. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I will not support the measure in its present form. We are giving these people a license to clean the country out. There will

be no reforestation and the place will be soon in a wilderness condition, over one half the area of Newfoundland. I do not think that this measure is wise or patriotic, for patriotism is that which will bring prosperity to our future generations. It is only in keeping with the policy of the Government which is to let things go ahead.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman, I feel it my duty to say a few words with regard to these resolutions. We should, Sir, look after the people's rights. The Premier stated that the three mile limit was in good condition, but the little that is left should be looked after. "We want to help the poor of our country," is one of the cries. It seems to me, Sir, that we are up against something very hard. If we are going to help the people it should be done long ago, for there are hundreds and thousands of them leaving the country. I think, Sir, that this is a serious matter for the Government to consider. If the Premier would take any suggestions from this side, there would be some machinery to protect the three mile limit, but as the resolutions now stand, I cannot support them.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reference to a disclaimer that was made in this House, by Mr. Emerson: that he is not interested in this bill. I accept that information. I did not understand him to deny that he was solicitor for a client who was interested. I do not think that it was either decent or proper. I am glad that the same gentleman disclaims a matter that has been one of notoriety for many years. From May 10th certain documents were circulated around this city. They were in my possession from that time. But until this evening, I did not hear a disclaimer either from that gentleman or from anybody else. As the leader of the Op-

position has said: no member of this House, interested in this bill, should take part in the debate. The owners of timber lands are getting all this for nothing, and there should be a clear understanding that it should not extend beyond the period of the war; and last year we were given to understand that that was the sentiment of the Government. I want to record my strong dissent from this policy.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.
And it being after midnight

FRIDAY, May 28th.

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

On motion this report was received.

On the motion for the adoption of the report Mr. Kent moved, and Mr. Lloyd seconded the following amendment:—

"It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to grant a license to any person to cut timber for pit props on Crown Lands on Labrador and to export the timber cut under such license to any port in the United Kingdom or in the Republic of France for pit props and to grant a license to any person being the holder of a license to cut timber for pit props on lands on Labrador to export timber cut on any area held under and included in such license to any port in the United Kingdom or in the Republic of France for pit props. All licenses granted hereunder shall be subject to the following conditions:—

- (1) The license shall continue in force until June 30th, 1916 or during the duration of the present war if it be not then terminated and no longer. Provided that the licensee shall

have the right to export as aforesaid timber cut before June 30th, 1916 under the said license at any time up to December 31, 1916, and in the event of the war continuing after June 30, 1916, wood cut for the said purposes between June 30, 1916, and the termination of the war may be exported at any time up to six months after the termination of the said war.

- (2) The licensee shall pay an export duty on any timber so exported of more than \$1.00 per cord.
- (3) The license shall be subject to such conditions and regulations as to the time, manner, place, and area of cutting and for the preservation of the growing trees and of the forest areas as the Governor in Council may from time to time prescribe.
- (4) Before any export entry therefor is granted the person applying for such export entry he shall satisfy the Collector of Customs on oath that the timber for which he is seeking export entry was cut on Labrador and that it is exported solely for pit props only, and that all other conditions contained in this Act and in the license have been observed and fulfilled.
- (5) Nothing in the license contained shall authorize the cutting or exporting of timber cut in Newfoundland.

2. Any person exporting pulp wood or pit props without a license under this Act or being a holder of such license without entering the same for export or without paying the export duty thereon shall be liable, in addition to the penalties provided by the Crown Lands Acts, to a penalty for any such offence of \$500.00 and an amount equal to double the amount of the duty payable on any pit props so

exported to be recovered in a summary manner before a Stipendiary Magistrate."

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared for the amendment Messrs. Kent, Lloyd, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes (9); and against it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance & Customs, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereux, M. J. Kennedy, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, Le Peuvre, Currie, Higgins, Walsh (15); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for the adoption of the report was put and there appeared for it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereux, M. J. Kennedy, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, Le Peuvre, Currie, Higgins, Walsh (15); and against it: Messrs. Kent, Lloyd, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes (9); so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the law respecting the Exportation of Timber" was read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

REVENUE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act Further to amend the Revenue Act 1905" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

TRAIN FERRY SYNDICATE, BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 4 George V., Cap. 6, entitled "An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Ltd." was read a

second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had appointed a Select Committee to co-operate with Select Committee of the House of Assembly on the subject of the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Employment of Men engaged in Logging," and that such Committee consisted of the Honourables J. D. Ryan, J. Anderson, J. Harvey, M. G. Winter, W. C. Job, P. T. McGrath, and John. J. Murphy.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of motion.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 28, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. PARSONS asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary for report of Harbor Grace Water Co. the amount of water rates collected in 1914-15 and expenses; also, to ask a report of the Marine Dock Co., Ltd., for the year 1914-15; also, if any property acquired, the amount paid for same, and to whom; also, to ask for a report of the Harbor Grace Industrial Society, the amount of twine given out, how much knitted, and returns for same.

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I beg leave to lay upon the table of the House the report of the Marine Dock Co. of Harbour Grace; also a statement regarding the Harbour Grace Industrial Society. I beg

leave to lay upon the table of the House, additional information asked by Mr. Stone; the poor relief in the district of Trinity. Also the reply to a question asked by Mr. Targett.

SUPPLY.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Additional Estimates, \$89,415.00.

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the following resolutions:—

"RESOLVED:—That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30th, 1915, the sum of \$165,120.97 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Colony.

"RESOLVED:—That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses for the financial year ending June 30th, 1916, the sum of \$2,351,104.87 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue of the Colony.

"RESOLVED:—That a Bill be introduced to give effect to these Resolutions."

On motion it was ordered that this

Report be received and adopted, and that leave be granted for the introduction of the said Bill.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

Whereupon the Bill entitled: "An Act for the granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1915, and the 20th day of June, 1916, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

REVENUE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: "An Act further to amend The Revenue Act, 1905."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question. I have received quite a number of letters raising an important question about seed potatoes. The Minister of Agriculture is not here, but perhaps the member for Placentia will do who is a member of the Board of Agriculture. These letters are signed by people who ask what arrangement is going to be made in connection with this question; but I have been unable to answer because I know nothing myself.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman, the Agricultural Board is thinking out the matter. We are doing the best we can. There is no free distribution. If, however, you call in the morning at the Board's Office, the whole thing will be explained in every respect.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman, I may say that I have had several letters

from my district, and the people there complain that there has been no distribution.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, there is quite a demand for seed potatoes in the North, and there is no grant. Even if they could have their road grants, it would be something.

MR. DEVEREAUX—We can do nothing in regard to road grants, but any information we have, we will be only too glad to give you.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I have received letters also on the same subject.

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

TRAIN FERRY SYNDICATE LTD BILL.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend 4 George V., Cap. 6, entitled: 'An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Ltd.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, as I have explained to the House already, this bill is merely for the purpose of extending the period of the original act, so that the war will not be counted as running in the time limited in the original act. Honourable members will remember the nature of the bill. This amendment merely provides that the time to be computed in section 4 of the bill valuing upon the Company to operate

within three years shall be extended so that the war shall not interfere with it. In other words, the time is to run as if it began after the war. Under section 12 the Company was given the right to import material for construction of the railway for 20 years, duty free. This time is now to run from the conclusion of the war. The same thing is true about the sections 16, 17 and 19, under which certain rights are to run for terms of years.

This amendment now provides that in the computing of time for the conclusion of the railway, in the act 4, Geo. 5, Cap. 6, and also the times limited under sections 12, 16, 17 and 19 the time from Aug. 4th last until such time as a proclamation shall be issued stating that a state of war no longer exists, shall not be counted.

Mr. Thompson has asked that this be done, and he has associated with him several prominent people, amongst others a prominent man on the Fisheries Board of Scotland, Provost Smith, a member of the Department of Fisheries under the British Government, and a member of the Fisheries Board of Scotland. It may be that Mr. Thompson may be able to induce this man to come here and build the railway and take up this question of fresh fish and other matters. I think that the request is a very reasonable one because he can do nothing in the way of raising money while the war lasts.

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

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the law Respecting the Exportation of Timber," was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

SALE OF CODFISH BILL.

On the motion for the second reading of the Legislative Council's amendments to the Sale of Codfish Bill, Mr. Morine proposed the following amendment:—

"That the amendments be not read a second time, but that a message be sent to the Legislative Council to communicate the reasons for disagreeing; and that the Premier, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Coaker, and Mr. Morine be appointed a Committee to draw up such reasons."

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, in relation to the Bill now before the Chair, I move that the House return these amendments to the Legislative Council, stating that the House cannot agree. I think that I shall have no difficulty in persuading the House that that ought to be done. Section 2 provided that one of the persons appointed should be the President of the Newfoundland Board of Trade, and another the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union. The third to be appointed by these two. The Upper House substituted "Fish Exporters of Newfoundland" in place of "Board of Trade." We have not given anyone the authority to say who shall be considered exporters. A majority of fish exporters can select a person at that meeting.

The Board of Trade is an incorporated body, but the Fish Exporters have no existence as a body and no authority, not being of a corporate character. Then on the other hand looking around for some corporate body that could be said to represent the interest

of the sellers, I fixed upon the President of the F.P.U., not as I assured the House for partisan purposes but because it was the only incorporated body that might be said to represent the interest of the sellers. There are all sorts of societies in Newfoundland for other purposes; but there was no trade corporation that directly represented the fishing class that I could fix upon except the F.P.U., and my object was to have two sides—the merchants on one side and the fishermen on the other. Now the Councils' amendments provide that the second member of the Board shall be appointed by the outport members of this House as directed by the House. Now what power has this House to direct that anything shall be done by the outport members. In the second place what is an outport member. If I live in Catalina or any other place I suppose I am an outport member. We in this Colony use that phrase to mean people outside of St. John's. Is not the member for St. John's East an outport member in relation to the town of Torbay; and has he not a great deal more to do with the fishery down on Labrador than the member for Fortune Bay. I cannot conceive under what process of reasoning the member for Burgeo and La Poile and the member for Fortune Bay and the member for St. Georges are to select the men to settle the price of fish on the Labrador, with which the people of the East Coast are particularly concerned, while the six members for St. John's East and West are shut out. I think that this is a suggestion that could only originate in our House of Lords. There certainly seems to be strong discrimination against the City members. They are not thought fit to select a member of this Board. Then I look at the portion of the House of Lords that rebelled against the President of the Fishermen's Union. They had no

doubt of the propriety of reducing the whole matter to a political question between the outport representatives in this House. We must get together Liberal and Tory members and give a political aspect to the whole thing, instead of letting the fishermen be represented by the only fishermen's organization in the country.

My Bill wished no injustice and cannot while the Board of Trade and the F.P.U. appointed a member each, and the third was selected by these two by the Supreme Court.

The next thing the Lords do is to deal with Section 7. That Section provided for two possible contingencies. If either party failed to appoint an arbitrator, application could be made to the Court; and if the Board was appointed and failed to name a price, an application could be made to the Court for that purpose. Now the learned gentlemen above have struck out the right to make application to the Board for the appointment of one or other of the arbitrators. I do not know why. I suppose they do not know themselves. Under the amended bill, if the fish exporters or the members fail to make an appointment, no application can be made to the Court at all, and the whole matter utterly fails; Under the Act as it went up the Supreme Court had power to make a price where a Board had been appointed and had failed to make a price; and if the parties failed to appoint a Board the Court could do so, and if that Board failed to fix a price the Court could fix one. But there had to be a Board and it had to fail to fix a price before the Court could fix one. Now the learned gentlemen above have absolutely stricken out the right of the Court to appoint an arbitrator, and you cannot have a Board to fail; and it is the failure of the Board which gives the Court power to fix a price. The consequence is that the

whole thing will be hung up by the failure of either party to name an arbitrator, and the whole Act will become waste paper.

Now the next matter is this: Section 3 gave the Court or the Board the same power to enforce the attendance of witnesses and take evidence as is given to Commissioners under our Public Enquiries Act. This is a universal power given to almost every Board of Enquiry in the world. These gentlemen are so afraid of enquiries into their affairs that they have absolutely stricken out of this Bill the right of the Board—constituted either by the expression of this House on the one hand or the Supreme Court on the other—to call witnesses or send for books or take evidence or anything of that kind. They have left them with the duty of fixing the price of fish, and have deprived them of any machinery with which to get the data to make the price. They say: "You shall name a price; but you cannot get any information; you shall have no right to make enquiries."

They say that it is no right that one man on that Board if he is a merchant should have the right to send for the books and accounts and information of another man, and obtain a knowledge of his business. I do not imagine that any arbitrator appointed on that Board would try and pry into the business of the merchants of the community.

There seems to be nothing which we have provided in this Bill which they have not meddled with. The last part of Section 3 provided that witnesses should not be entitled to any fees or travelling expenses. I considered that the question of the price of fish could be settled in St. John's, and that all the necessary witnesses on one side or the other could be got in St. John's at the proper season of the year. The House of Lords, however,

has provided that witnesses shall be allowed travelling expenses at the discretion of the Board. They have not provided, however how these expenses are to be paid, or have not provided any fund from which they can be drawn. There is no plaintiff or no defendant in this matter to bear the expenses. There was only one provision for payment in the Bill, and that is where counsel are provided by the Board they shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. All other expenses must be paid by the people who engage the witnesses.

Now, Sir, for these reasons my motion is made. I only wish to say two or three words in the way of comment upon some of the reasons given in another place for opposition to this Bill. In the whole debate in the House of Lords, this Bill was misrepresented, either because it was misunderstood, or because it was opposed. I do not know which. I accept the idea that it was misunderstood, because member after member got up in the Upper House and complained against the unfairness of fixing by a Bill the price a man would have to pay for fish. Now this Bill does not fix a price. It does not aim at the fixing of a price. It leaves it quite open to the buyer and seller to fix their own price. It only requires that the buyer and seller shall fix a price. I take it that the whole effect of this Bill would be to say to the buyer and seller "make your own agreement, and make it in definite terms. If you make it in indefinite or deceptive terms that are calculated to deceive, this Board shall have the right to fix a fair price." Now that is quite clear from the Bill itself. And yet man after man, intelligent merchants, members of the Upper House, got up in their places and oppose the Bill bitterly because it fixes the price which a man must pay for fish. They tell the world at

large how much they have lost in the Labrador fishery, deplore the condition of this industry and say this Bill will make it worse. The only thing this Bill does is to let the seller know what he is going to get for his fish if he does not make a bargain or if the bargain is in indefinite terms. The Bill is for greater certainty, for greater fairness, for greater confidence between the buyers and sellers between the fishermen on the one hand and the merchant on the other. That is what is needed in this country. The gentlemen who opposed this bill are principally gentlemen who have made a great deal of money out of this industry. They get together at a hole and a corner meeting and fix their own price, which they will give the fishermen. They try to make up one year what they have lost in another, because we have evidence this year these men in the fish business have sworn that they paid the current price this year which was fixed at a rate that allowed them to make large profits and they justified these profits because of the losses they sustained last year, even though the profits this year may be made from different people than those upon whose account they met the loss last year. The men who have done these things for years past are now taking the position to continue the same class of operations and the result will be that if it goes on much longer the Labrador fishing business will have to be conducted as a Fishery Department of the Government in the interests of the whole people. The fishermen will have to be protected. Their catch will have to be taken from them and realised by the Government and the proceeds divided pro rata amongst the people who caught the fish after the return comes in because if on the one hand the merchants are continually losing money and if on the other hand the fisher-

men cannot carry on the industry under the present conditions the only thing left will be to have the business carried on under Government control and have the profits divided amongst the people entitled to them.

Then one prominent member objects that this Bill imposes an improper duty upon the Supreme Court. Now, Sir, if we had in this country a Public Utilities Board or a board of that kind that they have in other countries then matters of this nature may be dealt with by such a board, but as we have no board of that kind and as we have to make the best use of the means at our command the Supreme Court is the best body we can get to deal with matters of this kind after the Board has failed to fix the prices. The Supreme Court of the Colony is not a hard-worked body. It is composed of men who have the confidence of the country. It is composed of men, who, although lawyers, are yet well versed in the public and commercial affairs of the country. It is a body that is accustomed to taking evidence and examining information and I refuse to admit that the Supreme Court or any of its Judges have any right to object to duties of this kind being imposed upon them. I don't know any body that is more capable of dealing with a question of this kind in the public interest; and it must be remembered that it was only on the failure of the board to fix a price that the Court would have to do this work at all. There is no reason why this Board should fail. I do not believe that it will fail.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the position taken by Mr. Morine with reference to the amendments made by the Upper House, and I am strongly of the opinion that if the amendments were accepted the worth of the Bill would be destroyed. It would be a useless thing

and inoperative and would not fulfil the purposes for which it was intended. One of the most surprising things in connection with the conduct of the gentlemen of the Upper House is the somersault some of them performed in connection with the appointment of a Board to fix the price. One day the gentlemen of the Upper House argued that clause was a fairly good one, and the idea of giving the President of the Board of Trade the right to be one member and the President of the F. P. U. another was all right. The next day we find them discussing the same clause, and some one moving that the whole thing be capsized, and nearly every man in the Upper House voted against what he had said the day before. Men who had formerly opposed the clause on the other hand voted for it when the vote was taken that day. How can you explain conduct like that. We cannot now have any confidence in members of that House.

This Bill was brought in with the idea of creating greater confidence between buyers and sellers in regard to the Labrador fishery. If you cannot establish a Board on the lines suggested by this Bill as if went from this House all our efforts will be in vain to create that confidence. The men consider they have not been treated fairly in the past because they have not had a say in the fixing of the price. There has been a strong agitation around Conception Bay this past four or five years in relation to this matter. Our Councils have taken the matter up and have given it considerable attention—a great deal more attention than members of the Upper House. This Bill was not brought in here after being considered a few weeks or a few days or a few hours. It had been given months of consideration by delegates from Conception Bay who were interested in the matter, and they had gone into it in all

its aspects and they arrived at the conclusion that this proposal would be the most suitable for all concerned. Well our efforts to improve present conditions will be in vain if we are to be blocked in everything by gentlemen of the Upper House. Conditions must change. They cannot continue as they have been going. Who is going to bring about this change, the business men or the Government. The business men certainly will not. Is the Government going to do it. You cannot get a Government sufficiently united on a question of this kind without bringing in politics or bringing in personal feeling. Cannot we look at this thing from the standpoint of the community without bringing in politics at all.

Another thing suggested by the Upper House was that you take the power of being a member of the Board from the President of the F. P. U., as representative of the fishermen and place it in the hands of the members of this House. How many men in this House are interested in the Labrador fishery? How many men in this House know Labrador fish from shore fish? The Conception Bay members are the only ones interested in this Bill to any extent. There are very few men from Trinity Bay or Bonavista Bay or Placentia Bay that go to the Labrador. A great many of the Bonavista and Trinity men who go down there are shore fishermen. The Conception Bay men are the men who are most interested in this Bill and in the conditions which prevail in the Labrador fishery. No district in the country is as much interested in these conditions as are the Conception Bay districts. They know the conditions are intolerable. They know that in the past they have had to take the prices given them and that they knew nothing whatever about the fixing of that price. A man may say to his merchant "another man offered

me four dollars and your are only giving me \$3.60," and his merchant would reply, "I am giving you what the majority of exporters say is the proper price and you must take it." These conditions must change. The class of merchant who conduct the Labrador fishery at present are different altogether from their forefathers.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Speaker: Just one word in reply in support of this motion. We have all listened to the earnest address of the hon. gentleman that has just sat down, and I would like to congratulate him upon his speech, which was worthy of him every way. It came from his heart, and I may say his sentiments are in thorough accord with the sentiments of us here on this side. The Bill which was proposed was an honest attempt to deal with the difficulties that have been existing throughout the Island for years. It was regarded as such by every member on this side. I can only regret that the Upper House has not been able to make this law. It was regrettable particularly as it did not take away the right between parties to fix their own price. Another thing is in relation to the effect of this Bill on the Labrador fishery. I may say that I regard this fishery to-day as amounting to a tragedy. I believe I stated that when I supported the Bill last year, there was something like 90,000 quintals shipped from the Coast, and it is gradually getting less every year, and it seriously affects the trade of the whole country. One of the chief causes of the trouble is the uncertainty of the price of fish, a subject which has been causing incessant trouble for years in this Colony. I think I mentioned two cases where men refused to ship their fish when the ships went down there. Now I repeat that I am sorry this effort did not meet with the approval of the Up-

per House. I can only hope now that when a message goes up to them that they will reconsider this matter. It is a very momentous and important question, the whole trade of the country is affected and particularly Conception Bay.

It has been pointed out by Mr. Coaker that the people of Conception Bay are poor but I think he will find that some of the people on the north side of Conception Bay have as large bank accounts as any fishermen in the country. In that way alone they own over something like a million dollars in the Bank of the country, which is a large amount for Conception Bay.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker: I must say that I most thoroughly agree with all that has been said in relation to the amendment made by the Council, but I think it were better that this Bill should wait yet another year rather than let it go through in the condition it is in at present. I may say that this was what I regarded as a fair remedy required by conditions which existed on the Labrador and in Conception Bay, and it was one which I think should have presented no difficulty to the Council. It was made in the hope of establishing the current price of fish and definitely to fix that which was uncertain, and everyone is aware of the difficulties that this question has up to this present time presented to the country. I think it is imperative that these conditions should exist no longer, and some means ought to be provided whereby a remedy might be effected.

As regards the means for selecting the representative Board for the fixing of the price of fish, the substitution made by the Legislative Council is, to my mind, very absurd. I think the members of St. John's east and west ought to feel flattered to be left out of that, because it appears to me

the only object of introducing amendments is to better the original bill. As it stands however now, it can be only regarded as unworkable. I think the only thing we can do would be to refuse to accept their amendments, for it would be better to have the Bill thrown out altogether than let it pass in its present form. Personally I think it would be better to reject the Bill in the form now proposed, for it would only tend to make conditions worse than ever. If the Council still adhere to their position, we shall have to let the measure remain over until next session when we come up again. The Legislative Council cannot always throw out our Bills; in the long run they will have to accept them. I think the motion put by the hon. member for Bonavista is a fair and proper one for us to act upon.

DR. LLOYD—I would like to add just a word to express my concurrence with the motion before the Chair. I was pleased to hear the Leader of the Government give his assent to the proposition now before us, for I consider that it would be unworthy of this House in any way to concur with the amendments made by the Legislative Council. For they are unreasonable, and absolutely illogical. The machinery for appointing the Board is unworkable. They have not provided any means for this Board to carry out their suggestions. You will notice in the first place, the Board has given the power of fixing a price in case the party do not fix it, but the means of obtaining the necessary data is absolutely not touched upon. This is taken from the Board but given to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has a power, but the Board has not. It is an insult to be asked to concur in a measure as illogical and absurd as this, I think we ought to give a blank refusal to accept these amendments.

MR. PARSONS—I feel if I did not rise to express my sentiments as the representative of a part of Conception Bay, I should be acting not quite fairly to the people I represent. This Bill is one of the questions that has been before the people of this country from time to time in many forms, and I may say that I was very glad when I realized that this session would see a direct attempt towards a materialization of the steps which were considered necessary to constitute our first legislation in this matter.

And this bill in its original form did not call for any unreasonable thing as far as I can see. There were some who thought that this bill was going an unreasonable distance, but as far as I can see the proposals are very reasonable. There are cases on the Labrador every year where in order to get away a steamer cargo twenty cents a quintal is offered in addition to the current price so as to hurry up the cargo and save demurrage, and there were some people who thought that this bill might interfere with that, but I think that the tenor of opinion is that the bill is reasonable; that it will be a settlement of a problem that has been agitating the people of Conception Bay for sometime and I think if it passed in its original form it would be a very good bill.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I wish to agree with the remarks of the honourable member who has just sat down in regard to the interest that is been manifested in this bill, particularly by the people of Conception Bay I represent one of the districts of Conception Bay and know the interest that they have taken and the attitude which they have assumed towards the bill, and I feel as if I would not be doing my duty if I did not add a word in regard to the amendments made by the Upper House. It is certain that in sending back the bill with

these amendments if we accept them we would only be making the Labrador fishery worse than ever. The bill was introduced for the purpose of meeting cases and providing machinery for fixing the price of fish and in order to bring back confidence in the minds of the fishermen towards their merchants, and we find the Upper House interfering with a bill for this purpose when they know that there has been a great lack of confidence for a number of years. In introducing this bill one of the hopes of the party was that it would revive the interest in that fishery on the Labrador which of late years has been declining. It will have the opposite effect if these amendments are passed, and I wish to agree with the honourable introducer of the bill and all the other members who have spoken upon these amendments in stating my opinion that these amendments cannot be accepted and that the only bill that should be permitted to pass would be the original one as it was introduced.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I have been drafting an amendment and I find that in order to comply with parliamentary practices it will be necessary to alter my original proposition so as to give the Legislative Council the chance to withdraw from the position that they have assumed. My motion will, therefore, be that these amendments be not read a second time, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council saying that "This House is unable to accept the amendments they have proposed and that the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and myself be a committee to draw up the reasons for our inability to accept the amendments". That will allow them to withdraw from these amendments without throwing out the bill. If we refuse to pass these amendments we would have to draft the bill again. I ask that this

resolution be accepted in the form that I now propose it.

On the amendment as proposed being put it was carried; and it was ordered accordingly.

RAILWAY LOAN RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in Relation to the raising of a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Commerce.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, this Act is the same as the Act of last year with the exception that the interest on the money raised is four per cent. It will be remembered that the Act introduced last year was for a sum of \$2,000,000 to complete the railway branches, and when the Premier went across to London he was advised by his financial agents there that our per cent inscribed stock was more acceptable to the people than three and a half per cent, and that the amount of money received from a four per cent loan would be so much greater than that received from a three and a half per cent, that it would practically off-set the difference in interest. We all know that last year just about the time that the Prime Minister went across to England the money markets all over the world were very short, and it was very difficult to raise any money at three and a half per cent, so he decided to raise a temporary loan of £1,000,000 to carry us over last year, and to take the advice of the financial agents as to the four per cent, loan instead of the three and a half. The difference of a half per cent in the interest, as the House

knows, was provided for in the Estimates brought down a few weeks ago. The matter was then fully discussed and all the explanation that was necessary was given. All the papers I think were tabled at the time and any information asked for by honorable members on the other side in the nature of correspondence in connection with the amounts raised by the Premier last year was tabled. If there is any further information that the House requires I shall be glad to furnish it.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me right the only information that we had was certain advice given by the financial agents twelve months ago as to the conditions that were prevailing then. That advice was that a four per cent. loan was more attractive and that the public were expecting four per cent and that a four per cent loan would give more money in proportion than the difference between three and a half and four per cent. That was the attractive feature. Acting on that advice the Premier did not proceed with the floating of the loan. I also wish to ask whether up to the present time there has been any correspondence in the nature of advice from the same financial agents as to the present conditions, and as to whether the rate of interest there is being offered now under the new conditions will be sufficiently attractive to raise this loan.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to give all the information that is possible. As to the conditions that exist now, I may say that there is no money being raised at all. The British Colonies are not making any loans in England at the present time and we have no correspondence upon the conditions.

MR. LLOYD—I have already discussed this matter before and I do not

intend to go into it at any length now, but I wish to make clear to the leader of the Government that he is absolutely in error in reference to the question of no money being raised in London at the present time. Loans are being floated. I have clippings here showing that a similar loan to this was recently raised by the Victorian Government within the past few weeks. They offered four and a half per cent. for a loan extending from 1920 to 1925, and they issued two and a half million pounds, that is \$12,000,000. Now I have another clipping stating that the loan was a success. The Canadian Government has floated a loan at four and a half per cent. at 99. I am only giving you these two instances of large loans which are being raised at the present time. The point of my question was as to whether the Government had received any advice as to whether it were better to offer four and a half per cent rather than four?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—No, nothing has been done, except that the temporary loan is being continued at Bank rate of interest.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a bill to give effect to the same.

The House went into committee of the whole on the public service loan.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled 'An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony' was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of

Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to raising a sum of money by loan for the Public Service of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, this loan of \$500,000 is intended to carry us over the anticipated deficit at the end of the fiscal year. I think this has been fully outlined already by the Budget on Thursday last. It is intended to obtain a temporary loan to pay off the deficit which is represented at \$516,000. The loan bill now proposed is a short one in point of years and it is expected that in ten years provision will be made to pay off the amount. It is expected that within the ten years normal conditions will have arrived again, and out of surpluses from time to time we will be able to pay back the amount. The several debates of the House have shown that we have had surpluses within recent years amounting to \$1,000,000. We hope to get back to that position again, and when that position is arrived at it will be easy to dispose of \$500,000, that we are asking for by a loan this year. I may say that I have already arranged with the Bank of Montreal to get \$500,000 at five per cent. It is the lowest obtainable rate to-day and I think we are justified in accepting it. The amount of \$25,000 for interest has already been provided for in the estimates tabled a few days ago. There is no other information to be given and if there is anything required I shall be glad to furnish it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of

a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled 'An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the Public Service of the Colony' was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to a temporary loan for Public Purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the bill entitled 'An Act for raising a temporary loan for Public Purposes' was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

RULES SUSPENDED.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Rules of the House were suspended in relation to all matters now before the House or to come before the House.

MOTION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, Mr. Halfyard moved for the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into and report upon the expenditure of local and main line road grants, and special grants, in and about Victoria Village, in the District of Carbonear, on appropriations made in 1913 and 1914.

MR. HALFYARD—I might as well state the circumstances of this enquiry. I was asked by several members of the F.P.U. Council of Carbonear to ask for the returns from the Public Works Department, for Victoria Village for the last year. I did this, and I find that there are down here payments to certain inhabitants of that place who received no payments. One man is down here, Mr. Clark, as receiving \$200. This man is prepared to swear on affidavit that he did not work for or get this money. For this reason I thought it would be well to ask for an enquiry.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would suggest to the hon. member that instead of sending a commission of inquiry the outpost Inspector be asked to report. I know nothing about this case personally. This is the first I have heard of it.

MR. MORINE—Might I offer a suggestion. Perhaps, Mr. Halfyard will withdraw his request and the Government ask the Auditor-General to hold an enquiry. After that the Auditor-General can communicate with the hon. member direct. Mr. Halfyard can give the Auditor all the information at his disposal, and so help have this matter fixed up as soon as possible.

MR. HALFYARD—In view of these suggestions, I would ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw my motion. I ask that the Government ask the Auditor-General to hold an enquiry and communicate with me direct.

MR. COAKER—With regard to this matter, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the whole is a very serious thing indeed. At least twenty men have communicated to me that their names are down there incorrectly. I would strongly urge that the investigation be a stiff one, so that the delinquents may be stopped in their work. This thing has been going on for the past 10

months, and I hope that the Government will see that justice is done immediately.

The said motion, with leave of the House, was withdrawn.

PETITION OF RIGHT BILL.

Mr. Kent, on behalf of the Select Committee, presented the following report:—

"The Select Committee to which was referred a Bill, entitled 'An Act respecting Proceedings Against the Crown by Petition of Right,' have considered the matter to them referred, and beg to report the Bill hereto annexed and recommend its adoption by the House.

St. John's, May 29, 1915.

(Sgd.) J. M. KENT,
W. F. LLOYD,
E. P. MORRIS,
ALFRED B. MORINE,
CHAS. H. EMERSON."

On motion, this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Proceedings Against the Crown by Petition of Right," be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question. It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, May 31st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 31st, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copies of the returns of

all local road grants, and special grants, for Chapel Cove, Hr. Main District, for the years 1913 and 1914. If any money was sent to Chapel Cove in the fall of 1914 to repair washouts, to give a detailed account of expenditure of same.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement, in detail of Fines and Forfeitures received by the Government from July 1, 1913, to date, and of the appropriation thereof.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Col. Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing how much coal was supplied to the Court House at Greenspond; also, the Magistrate's dwelling house, for the years 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914, and price per ton.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, answers to questions (1) and (2) are in preparation. The third question should be addressed to the Public Works Department.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement with the Newfoundland-American Packing Company, Incorporated" 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 Respecting certain Retiring Allowances" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council that the Legislative Council were pleased to substitute the name of Hon. Mr. Bishop in place of Hon. Mr. Murphy to act on the Select Committee in conjunc-

tion with the House of Assembly upon the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Employment of Men engaged in Logging."

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Bank Fishery" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Rt Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the said amendments were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. Morine presented the following report:—

"Mr. Speaker:—The Committee appointed to draft reasons for the refusal by the House to assent to the amendments by the Honourable the Legislative Council on the Bill sent up from this House for the concurrence of the Council, entitled "An Act Relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador Coast" beg leave to report as follows:

"The amendments refer to "fish exporters" and "outport members" of the House, but contain no definitions of said terms. They provide for certain action by such outport members under the direction of this House, and the House has no authority to direct. They would create partisan political differences in relation to a matter which should not be treated in a partisan manner.

"The provision for the appointment of members of the Board by the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof is stricken out of the Bill, by the effect

of one amendment.

"The proposed Board is by another amendment deprived of all power to summon and examine witnesses on oath, and so left without the means of acquiring necessary information.

"The provision that fees and expenses may be allowed witnesses will tend to make the work of the Board expensive; there is no provision for imposing the costs on any person; if it be intended that it shall be borne by the Consolidated Revenue Fund, this House is the only one which can originate such a proposition.

"For these and other reasons, Your Committee are of opinion that the proposed amendments would destroy the usefulness of the proposed measure.

(Sgd.) E. P. MORRIS,
A. W. PICOTT,
ALFRED B. MORINE,
J. M. KENT."

St. John's, May 31, 1915.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council in accordance therewith.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. Kent presented the following report:—

"The Select Committee to which was referred the petition of William Ellis and others praying for leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Builders Association" beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred and report the Bill hereto annexed and that the petitioners have leave to introduce the Bill.

(Sgd.) J. M. KFNT,
C. H. EMERSON,
W. J. HIGGINS,
JOHN R. BENNETT,
W. F. LLOYD,
W. F. COAKER,
E. P. MORRIS."

St. John's, May 29, 1915.

On motion this report was received

and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Master Builders Association" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

REVENUE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act 1905" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

TRAIN FERRY SYNDICATE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 4, George V, Cap. 6, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Ltd.,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the law Respecting the Exportation of Timber."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

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 the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the law Respecting the Exportation of Timber" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

PETITION OF RIGHT BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Kent, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Proceedings against the Crown by Petition of Right."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speak resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Proceedings Against the Crown by Petition of Right" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively, the 30th day of June, 1915, and the 30th day of June, 1916, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" was read a second time and it was ordered to be referred to a Com-

mittee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively, the 30th. day of June, 1915, and the 30th. day of June, 1916, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively, the 30th. day of June, 1915, and the 30th. day of June, 1916, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

RAILWAY LOAN BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony" was read a second time, and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to

consider the Bill entitled "An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the Public Service of the Colony" was read a second time and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the Public Service of the Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that

the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the Public Service of the Colony" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for a temporary loan for Public Purposes" was read a second time, and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for a temporary loan for Public Purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for a temporary loan for Public Purposes" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPTAHY.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Mr. Kent, the following resolution was adopted:—

"RESOLVED—That this House desires to express its regret at the death of the Hon. James Baird, who for many years was a member of the Legislative Council, and that out of respect to his memory this House do now adjourn.

"RESOLVED:—That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the family of the deceased."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 1st, at four of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 1st, 1915.

The House met at four o'clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

NEWFOUNDLAND BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION INCORPORATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Kent the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to incorporate the Newfoundland Builders Association."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to incorporate the Newfoundland Builders Association" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act respecting the Grand Bank Water Company"; and "An Act to amend and continue in force for a further period the Act 5, George V. Session 1. Cap. 4, entitled 'An Act Respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony'; 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 Respecting the Seal Fishery" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I have just been looking through these amendments, and I think a lot will have to be cut out. I think the best thing to do under the circumstances is to have the whole reprinted. The original on one side and the amendments on the other. In this way it would be easier to trace them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, this is an excellent suggestion. I move that the second reading of these be deferred, and in the meantime we'll have them reprinted as has been suggested.

On motion the further consideration of the said amendments was 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 Bills sent up, entitled respectively, "An Act Respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate Limited"; "An Act for Raising a Sum of Money by loan for

the extension of the Railway System of the Colony;" "An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the Public Service of the Colony;" and "An Act to provide for a Temporary Loan for Public Purposes" without amendment.

PETITION.

Mr. Moulton presented a petition from certain owners of sealing steamers, protesting against the Sealing Bill now before the House.

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION.

Mr. Kent gave notice that on tomorrow he would move the following resolution,—

"That in the opinion of this House no sufficient justification has been shown or alleged for the failure of the Government to have the Departments of Justice and of Agriculture and Mines represented in this House each by its proper responsible Minister or for the appointment of the Ministers responsible for these Departments respectively to seats in the Legislative Council."

MR. GRIMES—I would ask the Prime Minister if any attention has been given to the petition from the women of the W.C.T.U.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this matter was referred by the Governor to the Government, and they decided to do nothing at present. The petition asked that our volunteers be prohibited from purchasing intoxicating liquors.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 2nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 2nd, 1915.

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

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled Reports of United States Officials on treatment of British Prisoners of War and interned civilians at certain places of detention in Germany.

QUESTION.

Mr. Coaker asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs whether Mr. Walsh, the member for Placentia, was paid \$1,000 for services during 1914 in connection with the Customs Protective Service, or if any payment was made to Mr. Walsh by the Department of Customs.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively, "An Act further to amend The Revenue Act 1905", and "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Services for the financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1915, and the 30th day of June, 1916, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" 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 Respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture, and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors," with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time presently.

SEALING BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Legislative Council's amendments to the Sealing Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Chairman, the amendment to Section 2 seems to be all right. My objection to it is that it is unnecessary.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is not correct that the seals belong to the owners of the sealing steamers?

MR. MORINE—No. That is so. I move to strike out "belong to the owners of" and insert "shall be part of the voyage of" in section 2.

On the amendment being put, it was carried.

On amendment to Section 3.

MR. MORINE—I would propose that this be made "Terms which the minister considers reasonable."

In Section 4 say "in Colony" not "in St. John's."

Amendments adopted.

In Section 11, if you change the "of" to "not exceeding" then you ought to have a minimum fine; say \$100 or \$200. Under the present system a man may be fined ten cents.

Amendment adopted.

MR. MORINE—On amendment to Section 11 as to fines, say "not less than \$500 or exceeding \$1,000." Insert after unlawful, "for the crew of any steamer."

This brings up again the old question of the three mile limit, and Sunday sealing. Make it illegal to bring in any seals so killed, no matter where they were killed.

MR. MORINE—Section 11. I suggest that the section read in this way: "It shall be unlawful for the crew of any steamer to kill any hoods between March 10, 1916, and May 2, 1919, or bring into any port in the Colony any hoods killed between the said dates under a penalty of not less than \$1,000, to be recovered from the owner of such steamer by any person who shall sue for the same."

Section 12.

MR. MORINE—I think the section might read in this way: No seals shall be killed by the crew of any steel ship prosecuting the seal fishery in any year after April 15th, nor shall any seals killed after the said date be brought into the Colony by any steel ship under a penalty not exceeding \$5,000 nor less than \$1,000. All such seals shall be confiscated, and the proceeds thereof shall go to the Marine Disaster Fund.

Section 13.

MR. MORINE—I propose we disagree to any amendment to the 13th section.

The motion, on being put was adopted.

Section 16.

MR. COAKER—Substituting "15" for "10" would be very unfair. What steamer is going to trouble about landing her crew on the 15th April? It would be just as well to stay out until the 30th. If it is to be of any benefit at all it must be reasonable. After a vessel misses the seals—and they will know by the 2nd or 3rd of April whether they have missed the seals or not—the Captain will have until the 10th to make up his mind whether or not he is going to come in. If you are not prepared to accept the 10th, it would be just as well not to have the clause in.

MR. MORINE—Compromise, make it the 12th.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, make it the 12th.

On motion, the amendment was adopted.

Section 1.

MR. MORINE—"After the word 'any' insert the word 'Captain.'" what does that mean?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I presume, instead of "person."

MR. MORINE—It is not in the 6th line of manuscript. Some of the am-

endments appear to have been numbered from the printed bill, and some from the manuscript.

MR. MORINE—The amendments to that section can be agreed to.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think so.

On motion, the amendments to Section I were adopted.

MR. MORINE—Then the only other one is section 10.

MR. COAKER—The chief reason for putting in that section was to give the cooks a claim upon the services of the assistant cooks. At the present time the assistant cooks are ordinary members of the crew selected by the chief cook to do this work. Now take last spring. These assistant cooks had to be up in the morning at 2 or 3 o'clock and had to work until 10 or 11 at night and they got no more for their services than the men who were in their bunks all day doing nothing, and all night as well; and naturally men do not want this work. The object of the section is to give the chief cook the right to be able to command these men, because they will be shipped as assistant cooks. It is in the interests of the owners as well as the men that this section be put in. If the services of the men were not satisfactory, the owners would have the right to refuse to pay this amount; if the services were satisfactory, they ought to be very glad to pay it. This is a very important section, and would have a lot to do with making the cooking a success.

MR. MORINE—I would suggest that we change that whole section, and go a little bit farther than we went before, really. Put it in this way: "At the end of the voyage the chief cook shall be paid a bonus of \$20, and the assistant cooks a bonus of \$15 each"—strike out the words "by the owner of the ship," because it comes out of the voyage—"unless the work has been inefficient." That would entitle

the men to sue for it before the Court and would entitle the owner to show that efficient work had not been performed. The men would have the right to make the claim, and the owner would have to show that the work was not efficient.

On Sections 5, 6, and 7 as amended by Council.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I move that we do not consider this question of the taxation of sealers. That is an invasion of the rights of the Crown, because no such taxation should be considered by this House unless proposed by a Minister of the Crown. I move that we do not enter into the consideration of this amendment: the clauses 5, 6 and 7.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the amendments with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the said amendments were concurred in. It was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the amendments sent down had been passed with some amendments, in which the concurrence of the Legislative Council was requested.

PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE BILL.
The Legislative Council's amendments in and upon the Bill sent up entitled: "An Act respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors" were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the amendments had been passed without amendment.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the

Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively: "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Master Builders' Association," and "An Act respecting Proceedings against the Crown"; without amendment.

PRODUCTS CORPORATION CONTRACT BILL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled: "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited" with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the said amendments were read a first time.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I gave some attention to these amendments yesterday, and I have also discussed them with members of the Legislative Council, and with the Premier. The amendments proposed are of no particular importance, except the last one, which is very objectionable, in my opinion. It is section 20. There is nothing in the Products Contract which grants water. It only grants those water powers which are not already owned by somebody else. It does not apply to the people of towns and settlements. The word "domestic" proposed is so extremely narrow. We must remember that this is a perpetual franchise which is being given, and the drainage area of the Humber is the most extensive that we have. This amendment gives the Company all rights over the water. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving that these sections be accept-

ed, with the exception of the last, section 20.

It was ordered that the said amendments be adopted with the exception of the proposed new section 20, which should be expunged, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council to this effect.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council, acquainting the House of Assembly that they had under consideration the message of the Honourable House of Assembly in relation to certain amendments made by the Council in and upon the Bill sent to the Council, entitled: "An Act relating to the sale of Codfish on the Labrador Coast", and in reply beg to state as follows:—

(1) Labrador fish exporters are a well known and recognized body of business men in this country and the term or phrase "Labrador Fish Exporters" is, they submit, a sufficient definition. The phrase in the amendment, "The members of the House of Assembly who sit for outport districts" defines clearly all members of the House of Assembly who represent Districts in the House of Assembly other than those who represent the Districts of St. John's and West.

(2) The Council regret that they cannot agree with the contention that the effect of one amendment takes away the power of the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof to appoint members of the Board.

(3) The Council submits that it is not necessary to give the Board power to summon and examine witnesses on oath, all facts necessary to enable the Board to fix a fair and reasonable price for fish shipped off the Labrador Coast when no price is agreed upon, can be obtained. To give a Board constituted as it will be power to examine books of account, business dealings and other like transactions con-

necated with the sale of Labrador cod-fish would not be conducive to the successful carrying on of trade and business, and is invidious and objectionable.

The Council has no objection to rescinding the amendment in relation to fees and expenses.

For the reasons stated the Council is of opinion that the amendments made to the Bill do not destroy the usefulness of the proposed measure, but are in many respects recommendations similar to those of the Commissioners on Fishery matters.

On motion of Mr. Morine it was ordered that the said message be considered this day six months.

RESOLUTION RE DEPARTMENTAL HEADS IN UPPER CHAMBER.

MR. KENT moved and Mr. Morine seconded the following Resolution:

"That in the opinion of this House, no sufficient justification has been shown, or alleged, for the failure of the Government to have the Departments of Justice and Agriculture and Mines represented in this House, each by its own proper responsible Minister, or for the appointment of the Ministers responsible for these departments respectively, to seats in the Legislative Council."

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, It will be remembered that in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne I dealt with the subject matter of this resolution very fully. Therefore I do not intend to deal with it at any length this afternoon. The object of the resolutions is to assert a rule of great practical importance in carrying out the principle underlying our system of responsible and representative Government which requires the executive heads of the principal departments of the Government to occupy seats in this the Representative Chamber. It is not a rule of law. It is rather a convention-

al practice which has grown out of the modern development of the constitution, especially in those Colonies like Newfoundland in which the Upper House or Legislative Council is filled by appointment on nomination by the Government party which happens to be in office for the time being. Another object is to condemn any departure from this useful rule of practice unless full and ample justification can be shown for such departure. No excuse of party exigency is sufficient. No mere political advantage ought to be allowed as a reason for not observing its requirements. The present Government has ignored this rule by appointing Messrs. Squires and Blandford to the Upper House in order that they might qualify for holding the offices of Minister of Justice and Minister of Agriculture & Mines respectively; and in my opinion the Government deserves the censure of this House for what it has done in this regard. We owe this duty to ourselves as the representatives of the people, and to the people at large who sent us here. The time has come when we ought to insist that Ministers holding such important portfolios as those of the Justice Department and the Agriculture & Mines Department should hold a seat in this House. During the present session we have had examples of many matters of very great importance to the Colony in which the Department of Agriculture & Mines has been particularly interested come before us in regard to which it would have been advisable to have had the responsible Minister of that Department here to deal with them. Both the Justice Department and the Agriculture and Mines Department are entrusted with duties over which the public through its duly elected representatives should keep direct and constant supervision. The Agriculture and Mines Department is en-

trusted with all the internal resources of this Colony. During this session we have had the Bill relating to the contract with the Products Company and we have had also the Bill dealing with the cutting and export of pulp wood in Newfoundland and Labrador both of which are very extensive measures which come under the jurisdiction particularly of the Department of Agriculture and Mines. The duties belonging to the Justice Department of course, enter into and relate to the work of every Department. The Justice Department is the Department the responsible head of which should be here to keep in touch with legislation and to attend to the framing of all legislative measures. We have had evidence throughout the whole session of the necessity of having the Minister of Justice present in the House all the time. Now it has always been—except on rare occasions—the practice to have the principal Departments of the Government represented here by the Departmental Heads, the responsible Ministers. It should be under very exceptional circumstances indeed if at all, that the appointment of these responsible Ministers should be made from amongst the members of the other Chamber. It should not be permitted. This is the Chamber where they should be. This is the Chamber where the responsible work is done and this is the Chamber through which these Ministers are responsible to the country for the work of legislation and administration. It is our duty to see that the principles underlying our constitution of responsible Government should be carried out by this Chamber as much as possible that, for instance, the Minister should be responsible through this House, directly to the people, they should be men representing some constituencies and sitting here in this House.

As stated in this Resolution no jus-

tification has been shown or alleged for the appointment of the present Minister of Justice and the present Minister of Agriculture and Mines to the Upper Chamber. In the case of both these Ministers they were defeated decisively at the Polls in the autumn of 1913. One of them—the Minister of Agriculture and Mines—was defeated, and held at the time of his defeat the portfolio of Agriculture and Mines and notwithstanding that and in spite of the pronouncement of the people which must be held to be a vote adverse to his continuing office, he still holds that portfolio and qualifies to do so by being appointed to a seat in the Upper House. I regard that as being in defiance of the wishes of the people, and as putting the Legislative Council to a use for which it was never intended it should be used. In the first place, a pronouncement by the people such as was given in the District of Bonavista last election should be accepted. Again, the appointment to the Legislative Council in the manner in which they have been made is using that Council for partisan purposes, which should not be allowed. In the case of the Minister of Justice, he himself was defeated in the District of Trinity. On his appointment to the Justice Department he took the place of another Minister who was also defeated. He was appointed to the Department and in order to qualify him he was appointed by the Government to a seat in the Legislative Council. Both these Departments might have been filled by men holding seats in this House. It is probable if the Government sought persons in this House from amongst their following they would find men equally qualified to fill these offices as the men who now hold them.

Both Mr. Blandford and Mr. Squires are men for whom I have a personal regard, but when we come to deal with matters of this kind we cannot

consider our personal likes at all, especially when we find that there is material in this House which would be equally able to undertake the duties of these offices. Then the position of these Ministers is not the more objectionable by the fact that two bye-elections have been since held, and neither Minister offered himself for election. I think they were bound to do so or surrender their office.

There is another feature in connection with this that I would like to mention. It appears to me to be wrong, that we should have so many of the Executive Government, including these two important portfolios occupying seats in the Legislative Council instead of in this Chamber. We have at the present time four out of nine of the Executive Council in the other Chamber. That is not in keeping with the spirit of the constitution. It may be said that there is no express law or authority directly against it. That is true, but it certainly is not in keeping with the spirit of the constitution, which in recent time, and more particularly in the self-governing Dominions, more and more is tending to have all members of the Executive Government, except such as are necessary for conducting the Executive Government business in the Upper House, in this representative Chamber. My object in moving this resolution is to give expression to my own opinion, that this trend of the constitutional line of development ought not to be retarded, and we ought not to go back at all in matters of that kind, but ought to try to keep the responsible Ministers here in the representative House where their work will be more useful, and where they will be more in touch with the people through their representatives. I beg to move the Resolution.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few

words in reply to my hon. friend on the motion which he has made. I agree with the general principle laid down by him that the modern practice tends towards having in this Chamber a preponderance of Ministers holding departmental offices, especially of the class similar to that of the Minister of Finance and Customs and so, to put it more clearly, the motion made by my hon. friend reads, that there should not be in the Upper Chamber a preponderance of Ministers over those with seats in this Chamber. Mr. Kent's motion was as follows:—

RESOLVED:—That in the opinion of this House, no sufficient justification has been shown, or alleged, for the failure of the Government to have the Departments of Justice and of Agriculture and Mines represented in this House, each by its proper responsible Minister, or for the appointment of the Ministers responsible for these departments respectively, to seats in the Legislative Council.

There was no failure. What was done was perfectly constitutional according to precedent in this country and in entire harmony with the practice in the Mother Country for a hundred years, on which Constitution ours is based.

There are some slight variations in some Colonies where they dealt with the right by enactment, but generally the principle is well recognized that there must be a full representation in both branches, but the preponderating modern tendency, is to have a greater number in this Chamber and especially of that class of department like the Finance Department, and a class which was placed here to deal with money matters. But, when you come to deal with Departments like that of Agricultural and Mines and with the Department of Justice, I think I will be able to show the House that in making these

appointments the Government has been quite in harmony with practice. It will be interesting to go back in the matter and point out the practice in England, but I want to make it clear from the start that I admit that the tendency in modern times, the gradual trend and growth, is to have the principal offices, a majority of them in this branch, and if we were here today, bringing in legislation of a permanent character affecting the principle, it may be different. Look at the practice in England back in 1804 in Pitt's second administration. There were 12 in the Cabinet, and only E. Pease and Castlereagh in this branch, all the others were in the Upper House, and out of an administration of 12 there were only 2 in the Commons. This will not now be tolerated, and in the administration of the present Government it was 14 to 7; now it is 7 out of 21, 7 in the Lower House and 14 in the other. In the Duke of Portland's administration in 1807 there were 2 in the Commons and 9 in the Lords. In Earl Grey's, 3 in the Commons, 13 in the Lords; in Lord Melbourne's, 3 in the Commons, 13 in the Lords. These are departmental industrial heads. In Lord Melbourne's administration, there were 5 in the Commons, 10 in the Lords; in Gladstone's, 8 in the Commons, 8 in the Lords; in Mr. Disraeli's, 6 in the Commons, 6 in the Lords; in Gladstone's second administration, 7 in the Commons, 7 in the Lords; in Salisbury's first administration there were 2 in the Commons and 14 in the Lords; that was only in 1885. In Gladstone's third administration, there were 7 in the Commons, 7 in the Lords. In Salisbury's second administration, there were 6 in the Commons and 10 in the Lords, showing the gradual tendency of having more departments in this branch. In Gladstone's fourth

administration, there were 11 in the Commons, 6 in the Lords; in the Rosebery Cabinet there were 11 in the Commons, 6 in the Lords; in Salisbury's third Cabinet there were 8 in the Commons, 12 in the Lords; in Balfour's Cabinet in (1903) there were 16 in the Commons, 10 in the Lords; in Campbell-Bannerman's administration of 1906, there were 12 in the Commons, and 7 in the Lords; in Asquith's Government in 1914 there were 12 in the Commons, and 8 in the Lords, and in the present reconstructed Ministry there are 15 in the Commons and 7 in the Lords. The most important department, Secretary for War, is in the House of Lords. I merely point to this to show that it bears out the position I take. What we have done in appointing two department heads in the Upper Chamber, is not out of proportion to the practice obtaining in England, and, as I will show, in the other Colonies; and further, that it has been the practice in Newfoundland, because within our own recollection indeed, the Colonial Secretary there continued for fifteen years; the holders of the office being the late Sir E. D. Shea and Mr. Maurice Fenelon, and the Colonial Secretary and the Financial Secretary, the late Mr. Donnelly were both departmental heads in the Upper House at the same time within our own recollection. And now, coming nearer home, we had a Prime Minister and Attorney General, the late Sir W. V. Whiteway in the Upper House, and Sir Robert Bond sitting side by side and the late Hon. A. W. Harvey and present Mr. Justice Emerson; four members of the Executive Council, including the Attorney General and Colonial Secretary. These remained for some time till they found seats. In February 1895 Sir William was elected for Harbour Grace. We had then four mem-

bers of the Executive Council and two departmental heads, the Hon. A. Harvey, Mr. Emerson, the Attorney General and Colonial Secretary. This I admit was an exceptional and extraordinary occasion, but the principle is the same. If it is good for six months or a year it is good for a whole term. What is true of a month is true for a year. These are cases which occurred in our own country and if right and constitutional for Sir Robert Bond and Sir Wm. Whiteway to take their seats in the Upper House even for a week, it involves the principle as to whether it is right or wrong for departmental offices to be held by members of the Upper House. I say it is perfectly in keeping with the Constitution, in harmony with it, and also in the Old Country from which the constitution here is modelled, and with the practice prevailing in the other colonies. In Canada the Minister of Justice for many years, Mr. Mills was a member of the Senate and at the same time Minister of Justice and Attorney General and at the same time and in the same chamber the late Mr. Scott was Secretary of State. Both were members of the Cabinet for years and members of the Senate. Mr. Graham Attorney General was a member of the Upper House of the Cape of Good Hope for a number of years. Mr. Findlay Attorney General of New Zealand was in the Legislative Council and member of the Cabinet for a number of years. Mr. Geo. Foster Pearce, was Minister of Defense of Australia, held a seat in the Legislative Council and was a member of the Cabinet for years. In 1911 in Victoria two ministers were in the Upper and six in the Lower House; in Queensland, two were in the Upper House and six in the Lower House; in South Australia two in the Upper and four in the Lower; in West Australia two in the Upper and four in the Lower House; in Tasmania one in the Upper and 5 in the Lower;

and in the Australian Commonwealth in 1910 there were three ministers in the Upper House and seven in the Lower. I am quoting from the last word on constitutional government by Keith, Barrister at Law of Inner Temple and Oxford, a work in three volumes, a great and acknowledged work on Constitutional Law in the Colonies. In 1910 in New South Wales there were two in the Upper House and eight in the Lower; in Victoria four in the Upper House and eight in the Lower House; in Queensland two in the Upper and six in the Lower; in South Australia two in the Upper and four in the Lower; in West Australia two in the Upper and six in the Lower, New Zealand one Minister in the Upper House. If reference is had to Tod's "Parliamentary Practice Government in the Colonies" the same principle will be found enunciated over and over again. As I pointed out, not alone two members but two Ministers, Mr. Scott, well known here, was Secretary of State for years, the most important office in Canada, and the Attorney General was Mr. Mills.

There is no question whatever, it is quite in harmony with the constitution that we should have one or two ministers in the Upper House. There was never a question as to members of the Cabinet being there, but as I have said, within our own recollection we have had as many as two, which we have to-day. My hon. friend said we have suffered this session by reason of there being no Attorney General and Agricultural Minister in this House. But I think the House will admit that generally speaking during the session now closing, the same attention to detail, the same general satisfaction has been given as if the ministers were here. There would be a question if the Colonial Secretary had continued in the Upper House as heretofore, and yet it may be a toss up as to whether the Colonial Secretary's office is not as important and necessary to be in this chamber as

the Attorney General and Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I think if it was a question of deciding between the Colonial Secretary or Minister of Justice being here we would say the House is more in touch with and more in need of the Colonial Secretary—touching as he does every department of public life. As I have pointed out, in the past we have had the Financial Secretary of the Colony dealing with all the finances, and the Colonial Secretary for years in the Upper branch. Sir Edward Shea went in, in 1874, and came out in 1889 serving under three governments as Colonial Secretary and never went to a district. He was succeeded by Mr. Fenelon. Mr. Donnelly was then appointed in 1874, and went to Placentia in 1878. If we admit that practice, if there was inconvenience, it would be more easily felt where there are no deputies. In England where the head of a department is in the House of Lords as a rule he has a Deputy or Secretary in the lower house, which to a certain extent represents him, and can lessen the inconvenience that may arise by his being out of the House; but here there is always someone to answer and look after these matters as in England and on these grounds we can be justified. We have no intention to depart from the well recognized principles under which the country was working when the appointments were made. My hon. friend pointed out that we have too many members of the Cabinet in the Legislative Council. We have four there to-day; for many years we had three, sometimes there were from one to five. It is a matter that varies from time to time. The next administration may have two members in the Upper House, they may consider it not to their interest to have any, and the administration following may have four or five. It is an illustration of a rule which in the past gave no trouble and my hon. friend

must feel that by it and by our action in the premises no violence has been done the Constitution or to hon. members.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favour of the motion:—Messrs. Kent, Lloyd, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Targett, Abbott, Grimes, Morine (12); and against it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Colonial Secretary, C. H. Emerson, J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, Currie, Higgins, G. Kennedy, Walsh (15); So it passed in the negative, and was ordered accordingly.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendments sent up in and upon the amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the confirmation of a contract with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited." without amendment.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Friday next, June 4th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker. On motion for the adjournment, I would like to ask the Hon. Premier whether any of the moneys of the Patriotic Fund had been spent for any other purpose than those for which they were subscribed. There are many rumours afloat that the Patriotic Committee has applied some of the moneys towards payment to different parties for services performed, and I think a statement from the Premier would clear up this matter and put an end to it once and for all. I may say that many people who have been desirous of subscribing to this fund have been

deterred owing to this impression. It is but fair that the people should know exactly what the object of this Fund is. Upon what basis it stands and what its exact aims and objects are. I have no doubt that the Premier will explain these points which I have felt it my duty to draw attention to, to the satisfaction of the people. Any rumours of this nature are apt to prove most injurious to the existence of this fund.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member; without making any special enquiries I should say there was nothing whatever to justify any such rumour. The patriotic fund is totally distinct from the loan made by the British Government to this Colony for war purposes. I may say that every cent that is spent is discussed at the meetings of the Patriotic Association. Neither the Government, nor any other person has anything whatever to do with it. Mr. Munn is the Treasurer, Sir E. R. Bowring, is Chairman and in his absence there is a Deputy Chairman, and every case for relief will come before that body. The outside expenses in connection with the war, and offices in connection with the service, are paid out of the government war loan. The Patriotic Fund is a separate department altogether. Personally I have heard no such rumour. But I do not mean to say the hon. member is quoting from any chance rumour on the street, but I think there is nothing in it at all. No man need be deterred from giving any subscription on account of this rumour.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I would like to confirm what the Prime Minister has just said. The Prime Minister has already explained the purposes of the Patriotic Fund and the government war loan, and shown that they are utterly dis-similar. The two funds have no connection at all, and

there has been no relation existing between them whatever. Not a cent could be expended wrongly, because as the Prime Minister said, every cent is discussed at the public meetings. I am on the Financial Committee, and I may say that I know exactly how every cent has been spent, and I think no person desirous of subscribing to this fund need be deterred, but may rest satisfied that every cent of his money will go towards aiding the disabled and wounded in war.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the fact just now thrust upon our notice has been already brought before the Patriotic Association. I need not state the objects of this Association, nor enlarge upon the work it has done. Every statement of expenditure is quite public. There is no secrecy about it whatever. I may say that this rumour was probably started by some man who did not desire to subscribe, and invented that as a reason.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Speaker, It is my opinion that this fund will do much good and the revelation of the rumours made by Mr. Grimes will facilitate considerably the work of this Committee, as it will enable them to contradict any such statement in the beginning. I have been in contact with this movement since its inception, and I may say that at the first many people were of the opinion that it was helping the Government to equip our men. That is entirely incorrect. The fundamental idea of this fund is entirely different. The fund can cope with no more than aiding the disabled soldiers, the sick and wounded in war, and looking after the dependents of those who have suffered in it. There is no reason whatever for this rumour to arise, and a mis-conception such as this can quite easily have a bad effect upon it. As has been said it is out of the war

loan that the government pays the officers and maintains the Regiment generally. The patriotic fund is solely for the benefit of the sick and wounded and the dependents of our soldiers. We cannot say what casualties may occur when our men go to the front. We cannot expect them to have better luck than any other Regiments, I hope the press will take notice of this and disabuse the public mind of any mis-conception that may have been entertained, and that this fund will raise larger subscriptions than heretofore now that the matter has been set on a clear footing.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to make any lengthy remarks, but I may say that the confusion arises from the fact that it was generally believed at first that this fund was insurated to assist the Government, and it was further believed that the same body of men had control over both funds. This is where the confusion arose. It is however, not the case.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 4th, 1915.

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

QUESTION.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns of all local and main line grants allocated to and expended by Michael F. Keough of Plate Cove, District of Bonavista, during the years 1912, 1914 and to date.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member this information now. I will see that it is prepared, however, and let the member have it by mail on Monday.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from

the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Respecting the Exportation of Timber," with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs, the said amendments were read a first time.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, the amendments as read just mean that the time will be extended from the 30th of June to the 1st of September. That is instead of coming into effect June 1st, 1915. It will come now 3 months later.

This amendment is in keeping with the petition presented by Mr. Kent some time ago and gives some time for the filling of contracts which had been entered into before this Act was brought in.

On motion, the said amendments were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had appointed a Select Committee of that House, consisting of the Honourables John Harvey, M. P. Gibbs, K. C., W. C. Job, M. G. Winter and P. T. McGrath, upon the amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the amendments made by the Council in and upon the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery"; and they request that the House of Assembly will be pleased to appoint

a Committee of their Body to confer with the Committee of the Council upon the said amendments, with power to sit out of session and report at the next session of the Legislature.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, in reference to that message from the Upper House I wish to point out that this House has no power to appoint a Committee to sit out of session. All Committees go out of existence. The only thing we could do would be to appoint a Commission.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I have just pointed out that position to the Speaker. It has never arisen before, and if the House agrees to it, there would not seem to be any great objection to doing it. There would be no objection if this House desires to appoint a Commission embracing members from the Upper House as well as from this House, so that the desire of all might be accomplished before the next session. There may be some suggestions to go into the law.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the message be accepted with a slight change. Appoint a Committee here now and that can be added to later on by the Government appointing a Commission. I move the adoption of the proposal with the amendment that the words "with power to sit out of session" be stricken out.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I do not think you should appoint a Committee without power. I think the same thing might be done as last year with reference to the Fishery Commission. The matter was referred to a Select Committee, and afterwards to a Commission. You cannot appoint a Committee.

On motion of Mr. Morine the request of the Legislative Council was agreed to with the exception of the clause having reference to power to

sit out of Session, which the House of Assembly had no authority for agreeing to.

It was ordered the following Committee be appointed: Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Coaker, Moulton, Winsor, Young, Jennings, and Hon. Mr. Cashin.

It was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body accordingly.

PENITENTIARY REPORT.

Mr. Kent, on behalf of the Select Committee, presented the following report:—

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MATTERS RELATING TO THE PENITENTIARY.

Have enquired into the matters referred to them, and beg to submit the following findings and recommendations:—

Sanitation & Health of the Prisoners:

The health of the prisoners appears to be good, but the Committee find there are circumstances about the Penitentiary which would tend to better their present conditions if changed.

The complaint about a pit for nuisance was well founded. In the north-west corner of the yard there is a large pit in which human excrement is dumped several times daily. The ill-effects of it are somewhat mitigated by dumping into it refuse matter from the broom department. It is emptied only once a year—during May, and at that time lime is used. During the summer months flies in excessive quantities are found about the yard, the kitchen and around the food. It is fortunate that no ill-effects have arisen from this. The Committee recommends that the Government send down the Superintendent of Public Works to provide means of doing away with the pit and get something to take its place.

The Committee also finds that there is but one dry closet for the use of the

prisoners, who use it when they are working in the broom factory. There is also another dry closet used by the cooks. The Committee recommends that these closets be done away with, and that the Government obtain the services of the Superintendent of Public Works to recommend some scheme of water closets which should connect with the drainage of the institution.

The main building, around which the male prisoners have their cells, is airy, bright and fairly well ventilated. In the winter time the cells appear to be over-crowded. The accommodation of the male prisoners offers a marked contrast to that of the female prisoners, whose quarters are dark, close, damp and badly ventilated. The close proximity of the wash-house also adds to the ill-effects of this unsanitary accommodation, and it is further intensified by the fact that wet clothes are hung out to dry in the hall facing the cells.

The Committee recommends the Government direct the Superintendent of Public Works to devise some means of surmounting these objectionable features of the female department.

Nu-sance Kettles:

The Committee finds that up to the time complaint was made in the House of Assembly, prisoners used their nuisance kettles for scrubbing up their cells. Since that time the practice has been discontinued.

The Committee recommends that separate kettles be continued to be used for the purpose of washing out the cells.

Surgeon:

The Committee finds that a practice has prevailed of prisoners obtaining the services of a surgeon only when the Superintendent judged proper, and that the rule calling for a weekly visit of the surgeon to the Penitentiary has not been strictly adhered to in the past. The attention

of the surgeon to this rule was not directed at the time of his appointment. The surgeon knew nothing of the rule until his attention was called to it by the Select Committee.

The Committee recommends that the weekly visit be made to the Penitentiary by the surgeon, and that every month he inspect the whole Penitentiary and its inmates, and that he be required to formulate a regular Medical Register which he shall enter up on his visits.

Food:

The Committee finds that complaints in reference to Fish and Potatoes are well founded. In the case of the fish the fault appears to be due to the unsuitable vessel in which the fish is watered, and, at the time of the Committee's first visit to the Penitentiary, on removing the lid from the receptacle, a very offensive odour came from the vessel. In the matter of potatoes, in their raw state, they appear to be good and sound, but the evidence fully establishes the fact, that when cooked, the Potatoes are wet and unpalatable. The Committee had some of the Potatoes cooked out of the Institution and found them dry and palatable. The Committee finds that the potatoes supplied are good and sound and that the fault lies in the cooking, and recommends that better provision be made for the superintendence of cooking. The Committee recommends that a glazed earthenware vessel be substituted for the wooden cask at present in use for watering fish. The Committee also inspected the fish, the hard bread, the oatmeal and the peas, and found the supply of good quality.

Clothing:

The Committee finds that some of the prisoners who were serving terms longer than a fortnight or a month, were clothed in rags. Miss Dunphy complained of the difficulty of ob-

taining supplies for mending purposes. This appears not to be the fault of the Board of Works, as the latter has never refused to send in supplies requisitioned, but of the system in vogue.

The Committee recommends that Miss Dunphy be supplied with requisition forms and counter foils which she may send to the Board of Works through the Superintendent of the Penitentiary; and further recommends that no such prisoner be compelled to wear rags. The Committee also finds that in the severest part of the winter the bed clothing is insufficient, and recommends that this matter be attended to. The Committee also finds that the complaint in reference to the heavy clothing of the male prisoner Snowden being taken away from him, was well founded, and that he was compelled for several months to wear thin inside clothing without any means of changing them.

Remand Prisoners:

The Committee finds that the correspondence of the Remand Prisoners is opened and read by the Superintendent of the Penitentiary in accordance with the general rule that the correspondence be read by him.

The Committee recommends that this rule be changed, so that it will apply only to prisoners committed to the Penitentiary on a warrant of conviction; and that prisoners not convicted, who are held there merely for safe custody in lieu of bail, be allowed to receive and send letters to their Counsel or Solicitor sealed and unread by the Superintendent.

In the matter of interviews between Solicitor and Remand prisoner, the practice of privacy prevails. There is no need for any recommendation on this matter.

The Committee finds that the practice of placing Remand Prisoners in cells with convicted prisoners pre-

vails at times. The Committee recommends that this practice be discontinued.

Juveniles:

The Committee finds that although Juveniles are usually kept from association with adult prisoners, in the cells, and are classified as far as possible according to age and denomination, still the Committee finds that in one case a Juvenile prisoner was placed in the same cell with an adult prisoner convicted of Indecent Assault, and in another case convicted of Incest.

The Committee considers this highly reprehensible, and recommends that under no circumstances Juveniles be again placed in cells with adult prisoners convicted of such offences, and considers also that the practice of placing Juveniles with adult prisoners should be discontinued.

The Committee recommends that the House direct the attention of the Department of Justice to the hours of the officials and generally to the staff of the institution, in reference to the length of duty and the size of the staff.

In conclusion, the Committee desires to state that they find the Penitentiary otherwise clean and well kept and the grounds tidy; the Matron's quarters are close, small and badly ventilated, and recommends that better accommodation be afforded, and that provision be made for an annual vacation for her. The Committee regrets that the time at its disposal did not afford opportunities for as full an investigation as might be desired.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) J. M. KENT, CHARLES H. EMERSON, R. J. DEVEREAUX, W. F. LLOYD, J. R. BENNETT.

MR. MORINE—There is just one matter which this excellent report has not touched upon. I presume it was

not drawn to the attention of the Committee. I refer to the practice of taking prisoners through the streets on their way to and from work in their prison clothes. It strikes me that that is very unfair to the prisoners, and, I think, rather depressing to the public. A good many of these prisoners are first offence men who have not done anything exceedingly serious and yet they are paraded through the streets dressed in black and white I think it is as unfair to the public as it is to the prisoners themselves. There is no reason why they should be degraded and stamped with shame in the eyes of the public on the streets. Of course I know the reason for this uniform was with the idea of preventing escapes. There is not much danger on that score. Dangerous criminals are not taken outside to work. Even if they did escape I do not see where they could run to. They would have a difficulty in getting out of the island. Furthermore there should be sufficient guards to prevent escapes, otherwise they should not be taken out. I trust that this matter will receive attention. I do not know any other country in the world in which convicts are allowed out in sight of the public in the same way as these unfortunates.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

LOGGING BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Legislative Council's amendments to the Logging Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said amendments with some amendments.

On motion this report was received

and adopted, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow Saturday June 5th, at two of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1915

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

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the amendments made by the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act to Regulate the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging," with an amendment in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendment was read a first time.

On motion the said amendment was read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council in accordance therewith.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of Public Schools under Roman Catholic Boards for year ending Dec. 31st, 1914.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the government to the matter of the Supreme Court on circuit. In Court this morning I had occasion to move for the

transfer of a suit to the Circuit Court, and I understood from the Judges that they had been notified that the Court was not going on circuit west. The Judges expressed the opinion, in which I know the members of the Bar concur, that that is a great mistake. I hope the government will reconsider the matter. The usefulness of the Court on circuit is not to be measured by the number of cases it tries but rather by the number it does not try—the number settled and the number that do not come before the Court at all. It was suggested in Court that the reason for taking the "Fiona" from circuit was in order that some person might use her for some other purposes around the coast, not connected with the public service. It was not stated for what she was intended. I think the Government should take this matter into their serious consideration. A number of cases have already been transferred to circuit, and doubtless others will be.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have not had an opportunity of consulting with the Attorney General on the point, because I was not aware that any Departmental instructions had gone to the Judges in connection therewith. It will be remembered that when we were at the Estimates it was suggested that the cost of the circuit would be at least reduced, to what extent I am not prepared to say, but the vote usually passed was \$3,000; this year it was \$1,500. In other words, this was one of the items in connection with which the Government thought a reduction might be made; but I don't know that the Attorney-General has decided to recommend to the Government that the whole circuit be abolished. It may be that the Court will go to places where it is known there are cases to be tried, for instance, Bay of Islands, Codroy, Placentia, Burin, Bonne Bay,

can all practically be dealt with now without sending any special ship. In that way the only expenses to be paid would be the travelling expenses of the Judge by train. That was the idea at the time the Government made the reduction. I will be very glad to take the matter up.

MR. KENT.—Inference to this matter, I think it is a pity that the circuit court is not made a fixture, I mean that the dates for the calling of the circuit court are not fixed, so that litigants who might have suits would know during the winter when and where their cases would be tried. Last winter I had a case which it was decided to transfer to northern circuit, to a place in Notre Dame Bay, which was a port of call last year. There were other cases which were not transferred because there was no fixed time. The Court travelling in the way which the Prime Minister has pointed out is a very inconvenient way. I was on circuit one year when the Court travelled in that way. It was delayed at certain places longer than was necessary, the whole schedule of sittings was thrown out of gear, and there was a lot of confusion; and so much expense was incurred in litigants and witnesses that it would be almost as cheap to have the cases heard in St. John's. I think the Circuit Court ought to be a fixed establishment, and ought to have a fixed mode of conveyance. As to whether a Circuit Court should be held or not is not a matter which should be decided at the last moment. The principle of a Circuit Court is, I think, a good one. The moral effect of the calling of the Court is healthy; and every lawyer who has gone on circuit knows that for every case tried, five or six have been settled out of court. A lot of expense is saved and a large number of disputes are settled which might otherwise have to come to St. John's

and go to trial. If the Court is going, I think the 'Fiona' ought to be put on the route for the convenience of the Court. It gives the Court more dignity and standing to travel in that way than it would have if it were to travel by the ordinary modes of conveyance, finding board and lodging as best they can.

MR. MORINE.—Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the saving of the trifling sum of \$1,500 would justify the withdrawal of the Circuit Court, and to send the Court by rail, coastal steamer, etc., is undignified, in addition to the inconvenience which Mr. Kent has referred to. Furthermore, the most important thing is certainty. At the present time the Court will not set down a case for circuit, because it has been notified that the circuit will not go, and if there has been any modification it is evident that the Court has not been notified of it; and the result is that if you ask the Court today or to-morrow to have a case transferred to circuit, the request will be refused, and confusion worst confounded is liable to ensue. I think the Premier should supplement his promise by having the matter attended to at once.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—I may say for the information of the House that for years the Judges have been going to certain places by rail, and have afterwards picked up the 'Fiona.' The 'Fiona' has been on circuit, but has been able to go off on other services while the Court has been travelling by rail, picking them up afterwards at certain ports.

MR. HIGGINS.—I would just like to add a word, as a practitioner who has been going on circuit. I think in practise it has been the case that the least possible use of the steamer has been made. I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the effect of going on a regular circuit boat

is very much more dignified and very much more likely to have beneficial results than going in the casual way and arriving at places at all hours. I join as a practitioner in the spirit of the remarks that have been made, and hope that the Government will give consideration to the suggestion that the circuit be sent as usual.

MR. COAKER.—With regard to this matter of the Court going on circuit on the 'Fiona,' I would consider that as long as you have a circuit court the Judges should proceed by the 'Fiona.' As the member for St. John's East has pointed out, a great deal more respect is paid the Court when it proceeds in that way. There is greater dignity attached to it, and it has a better effect in every way. If it is desirable to do away with the Court, by all means do away with it, but if it is going at all it ought by the 'Fiona.' If the 'Fiona' is not required for any more important service, she could not be used in a better way.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I shall be glad, as I have said, to take the matter up with the Attorney-General. I don't quite agree with the argument that it would be lowering the dignity of the Court to have it travel by train instead of by the 'Fiona.' Judges travel by rail in other countries, in England, for instance. Conditions have changed here considerably during the last fifteen years. I remember when it had to be done by steamer. Now, you can get to Placentia by train and do all the circuit from Bonne Bay right down to Channel, and there are only the intervening places—Burgeo, one part in Fortune Bay, and one in Burin, and it could be easily arranged to have the boat take the Judges there. I entirely agree with my friend, Mr. Kent, that it is desirable that there should

be a certainty as to the time when the Court is going to be at a particular place; but I don't know that the Court has lost any dignity in travelling around Conception Bay, as it has been doing, by train. However, this was one of the matters in which it was thought that a reduction might be made, but I will see the Attorney-General in connection with it.

MR. MORINE—Will you do that at once?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, this afternoon.

At three of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Governor commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended upon His Excellency in the Council Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, at the Bar of the Council Chamber, addressed His Excellency as follows:—

May it Please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly have voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

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

1. An Act to amend 5 George V. Sess. 1, Cap. XI, entitled "An Act to increase the Revenue by the Imposition of Certain Duties on the Estates of Deceased Persons".

2. An Act to amend 5 George V. Sess. 1, Cap. X, entitled "An Act respecting Stamp Duties."

3. An Act to amend the Customs Act, 1898.

4. An Act respecting certain retiring allowances.

5. An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony.

6. An Act for raising a sum of mo-

ney by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony.

7. An Act to provide a temporary loan for Public Services.

8. An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905.

9. 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, 1915, and the 30th day of June, 1916, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

10. An Act for the confirmation of a contract with the Newfoundland American Packing Company Incorporated.

11. An Act to amend and continue in force for a further period the Act 5, George V, Sess. 1 Cap. 4, entitled "An Act Respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony."

12. An Act to amend 4 George V, entitled "An Act Respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Limited."

13. An Act for the confirmation of a contract with The Newfoundland Products Corporation Limited.

14. An Act to amend the law respecting the Exportation of Timber.

15. An Act respecting the Grand Bank Fishery.

16. An Act respecting Patents and Trade Marks

17. An Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens.

18. An Act respecting the administration of Local Affairs.

19. An Act to amend 4 George V, Cap. 17, entitled "An Act Respecting the Operation of Saw Mills."

20. An Act respecting the General Hospital.

21. An Act respecting the Establishment of a permanent Marine Disasters' Fund

22. An Act to incorporate the Patriotic Fund

23. An Act to amend the Act 5,

Géorgé V, Sess. 1, Cap. 10, entitled "An Act respecting Municipal Affairs," and for other purposes in connection with the St. John's Municipal Council.

24. An Act respecting the Grand Bank Water Company.

25. An Act to incorporate the Newfoundland Builders' Association.

26. An Act respecting Proceedings against the Crown.

27. An Act respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.

28. An Act to regulate the Employment of men engaged in Logging.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

His Excellency was then pleased to make the following Speech to both Branches of the Legislature:

Mr. President and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council;

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

In relieving you from your sessional duties rendered unusually arduous by the lateness of the season, and the consequent interference with your personal affairs, I desire to thank you, in the first place, for the spirit in which you have responded to the call to perform your legislative functions at a necessarily inconvenient period, and, in the second place, for the unanimity that has marked your deliberations in all matters of Imperial interest.

I also warmly thank you for the measures you have taken to ensure the Colony's participation with the rest of the Empire in the great war which is calling forth all the resources of the British race for the maintenance of the world's freedom and the advancement of civilization I earnestly trust that the Colony's contingents towards the naval and military strength of the Empire, will prove effective in proportion to the numbers engaged, as they will serve to make manifest the desire of the whole people of

Newfoundland to ensure an early and successful termination of this great struggle through an honourable and lasting peace dictated by the allied nations.

The provision you have made for pensions and allowances for those of our men on active service by sea or land who may suffer disablement, and for the dependents of those who may fall in defence of the flag, is highly creditable to you and testifies to the praiseworthy spirit in which every aspect of this overpowering problem is dealt with by the Legislature and people of this Colony.

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

I thank you for the appropriations you have made for carrying on the Public Service and for meeting the obligations which the War has brought upon the Colony. The money so provided will be expended with special regard to economy in view of the trying circumstances which confront us and the world at large.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council;

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

The Bill which you have passed providing for the establishment on the West Coast and on the Labrador of industrial enterprises of exceptional magnitude will, I trust, result in the early initiation of those undertakings and the providing of further means whereby great numbers of our people may secure permanent and remunerative employment and the Colony a further addition to an enhanced and lasting prosperity.

In bidding you farewell I earnestly pray that the appalling conflict, now raging in the Old World, may be brought to a speedy and honourable issue, and that our country, with the blessings of Peace, may then renew the conditions of material wellbeing which were its portion for many years past.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, by Command of His Excellency the Governor said:

"Gentlemen,—It is His Excellency's Will and Pleasure that this General

Assembly be prorogued until Wednesday the fourteenth day of July next, then and there to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly".

APPENDIX

House of Assembly, Newfoundland

THURSDAY, May 13th, 1915

In re Agreement and Amended Agreement between Newfoundland Government and The Newfoundland Products Corporation Ltd. Speech by Mr. William R Howley, K.C., at the Bar of the House protesting on behalf of The Labrador Pulp and Lumber Co. Ltd., The American Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co., The St. George's Lumber Co., and The International Timber Co., against the ratification by the Legislature of Newfoundland of the Said Agreement.

May it please Your Honour and Honourable Sirs,—On behalf of the interests which I represent to-day I have to express my exceeding thanks and appreciation for the courtesy which has been extended to us in permitting us the privilege of being heard at the Bar of this Honourable House. This courtesy is all the more appreciated because of the fact that we understand that it is the first time in the history of this Colony that such a privilege has been granted to any petitioner.

I am here to-day Sir, speaking on behalf of several corporations with large interests in this Colony, and which claim that the proposed measure ratifying a contract between the Government and The Newfoundland Products Corporation will embarrass and interfere with their rights and interests in this Colony and seriously diminish them in value. The fact that Your Honourable House has been gracious enough to accord us the privilege of being heard at the Bar is an augury to us of hope that our presentments will obtain a fair consideration

from each and every individual member of the House I presume Sir, it is unnecessary for me to say that in making this presentment we know no political party; we have no politics; we are not associated with or against any political faction or section of this House. We apply to the fairness and intelligence of the members of this House individually, irrespective of any allegiance or party claims upon them; and all we ask for is a fair consideration of our case and if you Sir, or any Honourable member of this House, should believe in our case, we ask you or him for your or his support in our objections to the present measure. When I said "our objections to the present measure" I did not mean that my clients or any of them oppose a measure of this kind. I would say that any of my clients if they expressed an opinion on the matter at all, would be rather pleased than otherwise to see the Colony gain the advantages which any large industrial measure would give promise of. But what we do object to is that concessions be granted to this Company at our expense; that concessions be granted on our property in diminution of our rights privileges and interests. That if such diminution of our interests be impossible to avoid such full and proper measures as will safeguard our compensation will be provided in the Act. Now Sir, I propose as briefly as possible—so as not to take up more of your valuable time than is absolutely necessary—to deal with the objections of the different parties that I represent, one after the other. With your permission I shall first of all present to you the case of The Labrador Pulp and Lumber Co.

I propose Sir, to show you briefly

what this Company is, what properties or rights it has acquired in this Colony, what the acquirement of these rights has cost it, what actual amount of money it has at stake in this Colony at the present time, and then to show how and to what extent the proposed measure with the Newfoundland Products Corporation encroaches upon these rights. The Labrador Pulp and Lumber Company is a Canadian Company incorporated in the City of Montreal about the beginning of 1909, for the purpose of acquiring, developing, and operating timber and pulp lands on Newfoundland Labrador. In pursuance of its purposes that Company entered into agreements for the purchase of two large areas of timber lands on Labrador—one with the late S. P. Benjamin, comprising 387 square miles on the Kenimou and Kenimiche Rivers, purchase price of which was one hundred and sixty thousand dollars; the other, with the Messrs. Job Bros. and Co. Ltd. of this city for the purchase of some 2,000 square miles of timber lands at Sandwich Bay, the purchase price of which was four hundred thousand dollars. These agreements provided for the payment of the purchase price in instalments, and the finalisation of the payments—somewhat retarded by the fact that litigation ensued and has only recently been concluded—has been made, and to-day the Labrador Pulp and Lumber Co. are the possessors of all the right, title and interest of Messrs. Job Bros. and Co. in 2,000 square miles of timberland at Sandwich Bay and of the late S. P. Benjamin in 387 square miles of timber lands at Kenimou and Kenimiche Rivers; for which my clients have paid in cash the sum of five hundred and sixty thousand dollars. I have heard it said, Mr. Speaker, that none of the people that I represent here to-day, has any rights. I can hardly believe it possible that any intelligent mem-

ber of the community, much less any member of this House, can entertain that idea for a moment. When I tell you that we own these properties to-day, for which we have made a cash outlay of over half a million dollars, is there any sane man who will stand up and tell me that we have no rights? I will admit, and I want to be perfectly frank and to have the Honourable gentlemen who are listening to me in possession of all facts that will bear upon the case, that we have to-day no expressed water power rights. I shall show later why we have not any water power rights or rather why we have not so far taken any steps to get possession of the same. Now, Sir, if I may ask you to turn to the proposed Agreement with The Newfoundland Products Corporation, with a view to ascertaining how far, if at all the proposed agreement interferes with my clients and their interests, I shall, first, with your permission analyse the rights and privileges which this agreement confers upon the Newfoundland Products Corporation; and Sir, will you permit me to draw the attention of the Honourable members to the fact that when at any time after this measure is ratified, if it be ratified, any question comes up as to what are their rights and where the boundary mark comes between what they can do and what they cannot do, it will not be decided by what it may be said they intended to do or what they want to do, it will be decided by the language of this contract, and by what this contract gives and what it does not give.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may draw your attention to this map which I have had prepared from the official records of the Colony, you will see that the areas of timber lands held by my clients on the Kenimou and Kenimiche Rivers, aggregating 387 square miles, and purchased by us for a cash outlay of one hundred and sixty thousand dol-

lars, are within the drainage area of the Hamilton River, between Lake Wincapau and the sea. And the consequence is that all the rights which shall accrue to the Newfoundland Products Corporation under this agreement, will directly affect our property on the Kenimou River. I have made a sort of analysis of the rights given the Newfoundland Products Corporation under section two of the agreement which I shall, with your permission, repeat, Sir, and then propose to show how these rights interfere with us. Under this section the Government gives to the Newfoundland Products Corporation the following rights, first, for a minimum period of five years (I say "for a minimum period" advisedly) it reserves from grant to any person any water powers or water privileges within the said drainage area of that part of the Hamilton River above named, that is, the Hamilton River from the head of Lake Wincapau to the sea. That includes the Kenimou and Kenimiche Rivers and their tributaries; that is to say within the area which my clients hold. (2) For a minimum period of five years it grants to the Newfoundland Products Corporation an irrevocable option on these water powers and privileges. (3) That option if exercised carries with it all the rights and privileges, duties and obligations granted to or imposed upon the Company by this agreement. Now, Sir, what are the rights and privileges, what are the duties and obligations created by this contract so far as regards the Newfoundland Products Corporation? First, they have the right to divert, stop or dam up any stream, lake or watercourse within the said drainage area, including the said area over which my clients have timber rights. Secondly, to make, construct or maintain any dam, watercourse, culverts, drains and reservoirs. Thirdly,

to compel us to contribute a portion of the cost of their dams and of their maintenance and operation. Fourthly, an exemption from taxation of all stock, dividends, debentures, debenture stock, mortgages and other securities of the Company. (I am not speaking now of the exemption from Municipal taxation of the lands and works used in connection with the manufacture of fertilizers, but of the stock generally.) Fifthly, Section 9 virtually dispossesses the Crown of control over any public lands within a distance of fifty miles of the Company's operations until such time as the Company has taken up its full quota of land thereunder. Sixthly, they have the right under the amended resolutions to acquire compulsorily lands of private parties or corporations anywhere on Labrador. Seventhly, to submerge, destroy, damage or injuriously affect private rights and interests, land or property. Eighthly, they have the right to use all the waters acquired by them under this agreement subject to very limited private rights and with a proviso that even these limited private rights should not seriously interfere with or prejudice the Newfoundland Products Corporation.

As to the duties and obligations, they undertake to furnish a certain amount of power to persons engaged in other business than the manufacture of fertilizer at certain rates to be settled by an arbitration tribunal appointed in the manner set out by Section 3 of this Agreement. They also have the obligation of compensation for injury to private rights in the manner prescribed—by arbitration—under this Act. There is the creation of a very limited easement as to the use of these waters in favor of certain parties under certain conditions. Now, what is the effect of all these rights? First of all upon our properties on the Kenimou and Kenimiche

Rivers?—and before I consider that question, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I shall briefly state to you how it is that my clients have not so far taken any steps to acquire any water power. In the opening of my remarks I told you that my clients had only quite recently finalised the purchase of these properties. As a matter of fact the litigation which arose out of the purchase of these properties has only been completed within the last month and the formal titles have passed into the hands of my clients since the first of April last. So that the actual full ownership of these properties did not vest in my clients until a little over one month ago. Hence, no steps have yet been taken by them to inaugurate or to prepare for any extensive operation of the development of these properties; but when I tell you, Sir, as I have already told you that the purchase price has exceeded \$500,000; when I tell you that the persons associated with this Company are men whose wealth is well known to be up in the millions of dollars—the Messrs. McMartin of Cobalt and Porcupine—and that their position and financial standing and connection with different interests bring them into closest touch with all those large financial centres which must be appealed to for the backing of any enterprise involving large amounts of money; then Mr. Speaker I think that I shall have given sufficient assurance to any reasonable man that I am not speaking on behalf of substantial men with substantial interests in this Colony, which I submit deserve—not alone deserve but compel—a proper mead of protection from this Colony and those in authority within it. Now Sir, if the Newfoundland products Corporation is allowed to exercise the rights given under this agreement in its present form, what happens to our interests on the Kenimou and Kenimiche Rivers? In the

first place all water rights within the territory covered by our timber grants are reserved for a minimum period of five years. We cannot do anything. We cannot get any water rights for at least five years. If the Newfoundland Products Corporation elects to exclude its option in favor of these waters, we cannot get them at all. If the Newfoundland Products Corporation, having exercised its option, proceeds to exercise its rights under this contract as it now stands, I submit that it is not only impossible for us to own a water power, but, under the terms of this agreement as it stands at present, it will not be possible for us to drive a log down the Kenimou River. One of the most objectionable clauses in this agreement to all interests that I represent here to-day is Clause 28. Clause 29 without the final provision is objectionable; with the final provision it is more objectionable; with the final provision as amended it is still more objectionable, and I would explain to you why. Clause 29 without this provision is objectionable because it makes all other rights over waters subject to the right of and exercise of rights by the Newfoundland Products Corporation. I submit with all respect that the Clause dealing with this phase of the situation should make the exercise of rights given to this particular Company subject to the general rights and to the rights of others; that the position should be just reversed; that this large concession here should be subject to the exercise of existing rights in individual and in the public. Instead of that the public and holders of existing rights are made subject to this Corporation, and with the additional proviso that we will not, in the exercise of those limited subject rights, interfere with or prejudice them. I say that is an excuse for a right; an excuse for having taken

away a right—I do not say done deliberately by those connected with this House;—a blind to our eyes to try to disguise us that rights which are absolutely essential to us are taken away from us I take the position for the Company, on whose behalf I now speak, as well as for the Companies on whose behalf I shall address you later, that we must insist upon Clause 20 coming out; and I say “insist” not in the sense of dictating to the Members of this House as to what they should do; I say “insist” in the sense that Clause 20 in its present form absolutely destroys all power to use their properties by my clients. I say that the deletion of Clause 20 in its present form is absolutely essential to the use, in the slightest degree whatever of the rights which my clients have; not alone essential to an operation, but essential to any use whatever, because under Clause 20, as it now stands, we cannot bring a log out of that country if the Newfoundland Products Corporation chooses to restrain us. Then, Sir, the rights of expropriation granted to this Company, I submit, are so broad that they threaten us with regard to every inch of land which we own either on the Kenimou or Kenimiche Rivers or down in Sandwich Bay. The rights of expropriation are so broad that they can expropriate anywhere on the Labrador; not within the drainage area given to them, not within a certain limited area of the drainage area, but anywhere on the Labrador. They can come down into our Sandwich Bay property, many miles away, hardly connected with the properties or operation of this Company up in this Hamilton river section, they can come down there and expropriate our property. We get compensation,—compensation under a system of arbitration under this Act.

I shall further on deal with this question of compensation, and the method of assessment. I also propose to reserve until the conclusion any suggestions that I may have to make with regard to amendments that will properly protect the interests that I represent. If the House wishes, Mr. Speaker, I shall be very pleased to leave this plan so that they can consider it. I may say that you will notice that our timber areas on the Kenimou and Kenimiche Rivers are colored pink, whereas our areas on the Sandwich Bay section are colored yellow.

I shall next, Sir, with your permission, proceed to deal with the case of the American Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co. In order to be perfectly frank with regard to this company I shall state at the outset that this Company has no water power privileges in this Colony at the present moment. I will go further and I will say that by special agreement made with the Government of this Colony and ratified by this House in 1912, this Company was granted an option on water power privileges more extensive than ordinary. I mean, the concessions with regard to water were more extensive than could have been dealt with in a formal application under the Crown Lands Acts. I shall go still further and state frankly that the option under that agreement has since been relinquished to the Government, and that we at the present time hold no water rights expressly so, in this Colony; but we hold some 400 square miles of timber lands on the Humber River and Deer Lake, for which we have paid \$300,000 in cash. The American-Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Company was incorporated in the State of Michigan in the year 1909 for the purpose of acquiring and developing certain timber and pulp land

in the Deer Lake section of this country. In pursuance of its purpose it bought out the timber lands held by Messrs. Rood and McGregor of New Glasgow, and the Humber River Pulp and Lumber Co. of Newfoundland, the purchase price being—either \$250,000 or \$300,000. I did not act for the Company at that time and I am not absolutely certain which of the above prices was paid. At the same time there was pending two applications for water powers on the Lower Humber River, one from Mr. R. B. Job and a joint one from Messrs. R. B. Job and Edward F. Harvey—both of whom were interested to some extent in the Companies who were selling to my clients. These gentlemen had given the usual notice of applying for water powers in the Gazette and had filed their application in the Crown Lands Office; but the application for some reason had never been passed upon by His Excellency in Council; and at the time my clients purchased these timber lands, any interests that Messrs. Job and Harvey had in those two water power applications were also assigned to them. In pursuance of the plan of development which my clients had in mind, in the year 1910, following their acquisition of this property, they arranged with the firm of G. F. Hardy, hydraulic engineers of New York, I think the men who designed and superintended the erection of the Harmsworth works at Grand Falls,—men of international repute,—to make a complete survey and examination of the country surrounding the area, its topography, its possibilities of water power. The year 1910 and some considerable portion of 1911 was spent by Messrs. Hardy's staff, at considerable expense to my clients, in making a most complete examination, followed by a report upon the possibilities of that country. Hardy's report, which I have had the

pleasure of seeing, was a most exhaustive document, and went into figures showing the cost of construction of necessary dams, etc., made provision for all necessary works as far as could be calculated (e.g. pipe lines, etc.) of a large pulp manufactory, and also recommended to us that in order to carry out the undertaking which we had in view it would be necessary to obtain certain concessions with regard to raising Deer Lake and storing the waters on Grand Lake. The consequence was that in the winter of 1911-12 I was instructed to approach the Government of the day to ask for the necessary concessions. We were aware when we came to ask for these concessions that the exercise of them would to some extent damage or interfere with the existing rights in other people; and when we approached the Government we informed them of what was absolutely necessary to the successful carrying out of our developments, and said that "we are prepared to have attached to the grant of these concessions every reasonable precaution that you can suggest to safeguard every interest both public and private." The result of our negotiations was the agreement of 1913—an agreement which was ratified by the Legislature and which appears on the Statute Book as "The Deer Lake Pulp and Paper Act",—to which I shall refer more particularly later. At the time that we approached the Government with regard to this matter the plan outlined by Messrs. Hardy and figured on by his firm involved an outlay of \$7,000,000. The contracts for the underwriting of that \$7,000,000 were signed and executed in London, securing to us the necessary \$7,000,000 to carry out our undertaking; but as we proceeded with our negotiations it became evident that other rights to properties over which the Government of this Colony had no control were ne-

cessary for our development work; and we were compelled to negotiate for the acquirement of these. The conditions upon which it became possible to acquire these were such that upon the figuring of Messrs. Hardy and Co. it was found that it would involve an additional expenditure, the extent of which they could not then tell, but they placed it at a minimum of one and a quarter million dollars, and the financial experts who had figured upon the cost of the proposed operations and the probable returns to be had on the investment turned the measure down with this additional expenditure attached to it. The consequence was that we were compelled to abandon our idea of development in that country, and after some delay the concessions granted to us or optioned to us under Government contract of 1912 were surrendered by us to the Government. But that is all we surrendered to the Government—only what was granted to us by the contract of 1912; what we had before, and what we paid our money for we still have, and it is in respect of that that we now seek protection. Upon the final realization of the impossibility of carrying out the 1912 agreement, with the super added burdens, my clients last year entered into negotiations with some large American capitalists for the establishment of a sulphite mill in connection with this property; and last year the representatives of these people spent the summer on the property making a most exhaustive examination of its capabilities with regard to a sulphite mill proposition. It was late last Fall when they reported, I have not seen their report, but I have been told that the report was entirely satisfactory, and during this past winter the necessary negotiations following that report to arrange for the financing of the new proposition have been going on and are not yet com-

pleted; and if this measure goes through the House, as it now stands, they will never be completed, and the American Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co. had as well gone down to the wharf and thrown their \$300,000 overboard; and that is the reason we object to this contract in its present form. Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to draw your attention to a Map which I have also had prepared from the official records of the Colony, you will see the lands of the American Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co., colored pink, situate on both sides of Deer Lake and running up on the north-western side of the Upper Humber River, nearly up to the extreme limit of the watershed of the Humber. This map which, with your permission, I propose to use in illustration of anything I have to say on behalf of the American Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co. and the other Companies of which I have not yet spoken, shows all that western section of the country extending from the south side of Bay St. George up to Hall's Bay. The lands of the St. George's Lumber Co., are colored green, the lands of the American Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co. are colored pink, and the lands of the International Timber Co. are colored yellow. The watershed of the Humber River, within which it is proposed to grant this Newfoundland Products Corporation water rights, is outlined in red. The ten mile radius of Corner Brook within which certain rights are given to this Company are marked by a yellow circle; and the forty mile radius is outlined by a purple circle. A glance at this Map will show that the proposed grants of the waters within the entire watershed of the Humber River includes all waters flowing through the lands of my clients. Now, do not, please, let any honourable gentleman misunderstand me. I do not

object to a grant of water powers within this section to the Newfoundland Products Corporation, but I do object to a grant in the terms of the measure now before the House, because I say these terms are such as practically render useless the property of my clients; these terms are such that they place my clients in the position that there is only one possible market for their property, and that market is the Newfoundland Products Corporation; and that market can only be available upon whatever terms the Newfoundland Products Corporation chooses to offer us. We have no other market because any other purchaser would be subject to the terms of this contract as we are ourselves.

On behalf of the International Timber Co. and the St. George's Lumber Co., a good many of the objections and some of the principal objections which we had to this measure have been done away with by some of the amendments which have been brought down; but they are still in certain matters objectionable. The International Timber Co. was incorporated in Michigan in 1909 for the purpose of acquiring and developing certain timber lands in Hall's Bay. They did acquire some 779 miles of timber lands in Hall's Bay, and the total outlay, which I mis-stated in the petition presented to this House through an error arising from pressure of work, the total outlay was one hundred and thirty thousand dollars. These people have been operating two saw mills down there since the purchase, but have been contemplating the installation of a pulp mill for some time—and I wish to be perfectly frank as far as they are concerned. They have not at the present time any expressed water powers in the country where their timber is situated. I go further and say that a year or two ago we applied for certain water powers down there with a

view to establishing a pulp industry, and our applications, so far as regards two water powers, were approved by the Governor in Council, but our application for the third water power was refused, and although no official reason was given for the refusal I understood at the time that the refusal was in pursuance of the policy of not granting to any one man a water power that flowed through land of another man. We applied for the water powers on Indian Brook, Banbury Brook and South Brook. Indian and Banbury Brooks flowed through the territory owned by my clients; South Brook flowed through the small territory held under license by other people. We did not act upon the approval of the two Brooks given us at the time; the reason was that our application was made in pursuance of an examination and report made by a hydraulic engineer; and the two Brooks which were approved to us were not in themselves sufficient to give the power that we needed; and we let the matter alone, waiting for the time to come when we could negotiate, as we thought to negotiate, with the parties who held the other place, or to supply the deficiency in water power by having South Brook left out. We have to-day no expressed water power rights in that country, and—to be perfectly frank—we are to-day in the position that the two water powers that were approved to us have been allowed to lapse. The reason I say why we have not acted was that these two powers in themselves were insufficient; but we have our timber intact; we have our original investment in operation; and under this contract or under the contract as amended by the resolutions we are in this position that the watershed of the Humber over which rights are granted to the Newfoundland Products Corporation enters in upon our terri-

tory and therefore creates certain rights in the Newfoundland Products Corporation which may, if exercised by them operate to the detraction or diminution of value of a section of our property—for which I admit under the contract as it now stands a tribunal to assess compensation is provided; but we say that is not enough to satisfy us; that is not enough to protect us as we submit with all respect the Hon. Members of this House should be prepared and anxious to protect us.

The St. George's Lumber Co. was incorporated in Newfoundland. I believe it has been said on different occasions by those who wished to criticise my Rt. Hon. friend the Premier, that he is a shareholder in the Company; but when I speak for the St. George's Lumber Co. I speak not so much for that practically defunct Co. to which the Rt. Hon. the Premier belonged, but for the bond holders who have subscribed and taken up two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of the bonds of that Company. The St. George's Lumber Co. was incorporated in Newfoundland in 1900 to acquire and work certain timber properties in Newfoundland. A purchase price and expenditure of two hundred and ten thousand dollars was made on the property when those in authority in the Company issued a prospectus asking for a bond subscription of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and that two hundred and fifty thousand dollars was underwritten in New York and the money was subscribed, and spent over there in St. George's Bay in connection with the development of this property. When I say "the money was spent" I say it was spent with the exception of sixty thousand dollars when internal friction gave rise to litigation resulting in the affairs of the Company passing into the hands of a Board of Directors who really were a joint Committee representing the original

shareholders and the bond holders. The property is there to-day still held by us; still representing an outlay on our part of three hundred thousand dollars, that is one hundred and ninety thousand and the original hundred and ten thousand. Now the contract as amended is not as objectionable to the St. George's Lumber Co. as it was originally, but a glance at the map will show that the same objections which obtain on behalf of the International Timber Co. Ltd. apply on behalf of the St. George's Company with this additional objection—that the rights of water power which it is open to the Newfoundland Products to obtain under section 1 of their agreement, that is rights within forty miles of the Humber River, will, according to this map, give them rights over waters which flow through the property of the St. George's Lumber Company and also afford them opportunity should they so desire it or should they deem it necessary to destroy by flooding, submerging or other use of these waters a very large section of the lands held by the St. George's Lumber Co. These, gentlemen, briefly are the particular objections raised in each of these four cases against the measure in its present form. I think that I have said enough to show you that the present agreement will affect my various clients— affect some of them more than others; I think I have said enough to satisfy even the man who laughs at the idea of our having rights, that we have rights, substantial rights, rights that may be valued at hundreds of thousands of dollars, rights which we have acquired at an expenditure in the aggregate of over one and a quarter million dollars in cash; and I wish now Mr. Speaker to draw your attention to the Deer Lake Pulp and Paper Act of 1912—this Act which we relinquished to the Government. As I stated early in my remarks, when we found

upon the report of our Hydraulic Engineers that certain water power concessions beyond what we could obtain under the ordinary procedure provided in the Crown Lands Act, were necessary for our development we approached the Government and asked for them and realizing that other people's rights ought to be respected and protected, we informed the Government that we were prepared to accept our concessions with every conceivable safeguard to other interests attached. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I can speak with first knowledge not alone of the contract of 1912 but with regard to all that led up to it because I had the privilege of representing that Company then as I do now, and the first draft of this contract was prepared by me and the subsequent amendments that were interchanged between the government and me up to the time when the Act was finalized, passed through my hands and mine alone. If you will permit me to draw your attention to that agreement which will be found on page twenty seven of the public Legislative Acts of 1912, you will find under Section 2 that—"The Government hereby grants to the Company for a term of ninety nine years from the date of these presents the rights (a) to raise the waters of Deer Lake aforesaid to the height or level of fifteen feet above the level or mark of high water and to take, impound, dam, store, use and enjoy the waters of said Deer Lake so raised; (b) to raise the waters of Grand Lake to the height or level of ten feet above the level or mark of low water, and to take, impound, dam, store, use and enjoy the waters of said Grand Lake, so raised; and (c) so far as the Government can, consistently with any grants heretofore made and actually subsisting, grant the same, to use the waters of Junction Brook, below Lot number 40, granted to the Reid Newfoundland Company, and the

Humber River above Deer Lake aforesaid, and to use the waters of the Humber River, below Deer Lake aforesaid; provided that the rights to use the several waters granted to the Company by this section are not exclusive rights, but are to be limited to the use of the said waters for the purpose of furnishing power for the operations of the Company and in connection with the lumber, pulp and paper mills and manufactories which the Company proposes to erect on the Humber River, below Deer Lake aforesaid; and provided further that the rights hereby granted shall not be taken or construed to prejudice, obstruct or in any ways effect any public rights nor or heretofore used, enjoyed or exercised or which may hereafter be created or granted by the Legislature over, upon or in relation to the said waters or any of them." but the Government of the day deemed it necessary and desirable in order to fully protect outstanding rights, in order to fully protect other rights, in order to fully protect such rights as I represent to-day, to add a proviso—"Provided that the rights to use the several waters granted to the Company by this section are not exclusive rights, but are to be limited to the use of the said waters for the purpose of furnishing power for the operations of the Company at or in connection with the lumber, pulp and paper mills and manufactories which the Company proposes to erect on the Humber River, below Deer Lake aforesaid; and provided further that the rights hereby granted shall not be taken or construed to prejudice, obstruct or in any way affect any public rights now or heretofore used, enjoyed or exercised Now Mr. Speaker, I ask you to insert that proviso in this contract because the private rights which I represent here to-day are just as much entitled to this measure of protection as the Government of 1912 thought it desir-

able to provide against the Deer Lake Company. Next Sir, I do not immediately propose to suggest any objections to the tribunal for assessing compensation provided in the contract now before the House, but I would like to draw your attention to the fact that you have two different tribunals provided for assessing compensation and two different modes of procedure. In the case where the other man has to pay and the Newfoundland Products Company has to receive, you provide one system of arbitration and one system of procedure to assess the damage, but in the case where the Newfoundland Products Company has to pay and the other man has to receive you provide another system of arbitration and another system of procedure. I do not mean to suggest for a moment that there is anything disastrous to any interest either to the other man or the Newfoundland Products Company underlying that clear distinction, but what I do mean to say is this, that when the 1912 contract was drawn up the Government when asked to protect the rights of individuals did not consider either one of the tribunals or the method of procedure you have in this Act sufficient to protect private rights and they established a special board of arbitration with a special procedure, with a special right of appeal to the Supreme Court with special powers of ruling under Section 8 of the Deer Lake Pulp and Paper Act. Gentlemen, I say that if this enactment was necessary to protect private rights in 1912, I who now represent the class of private rights which were protected in 1912, ask to have this enactment put in here to protect our rights. Further than that, under Clause 9 of the Act of 1912 the Government deemed it desirable for the protection of other peoples rights to make it incumbent upon the Company that was getting the concessions to use all reasonable diligence

in deciding upon questions of compensation and the same having been decided to pay promptly if that was necessary then, is it not necessary now? Further, Sir, in 1912 the Government of the day dealing with the Company that had assets representing an expenditure of three hundred thousand dollars deemed it imperative that before they exercised any of their concessions they should make a deposit of a quarter of a million dollars to secure the proper compensation of any private rights that would be injuriously affected. Is not this necessary to-day to protect such rights as I represent here? Is it not more necessary because then you were dealing with a corporation that had three hundred thousand dollars invested in your country, and to-day you are dealing with a corporation that has not a copper. It is perfectly true that you have on the share list of this corporation men whose means to pay are beyond question; but their liability so far as the Newfoundland Products Company is concerned only extends to the amount unpaid on the shares they have subscribed for. Therefore I ask, Sir, in the interests of the proper protection of those rights which I represent in order to secure that the properties held by my clients for which they have paid their good money shall be properly compensated for if injured or destroyed, that a substantial deposit be required from this Company before they do any injury. Now, Mr. Speaker, just one more point: I have already referred at some length to the objectionable nature of Section 20 of the agreement now before the House. I have drawn your attention to the fact that it not only greatly curtails—(take the most generous view of it)—that it not only greatly curtails existing rights but it makes them subject to the exercise of the provisions of this Act; and it is absolutely and unreservedly objectionable. I have outlined

and suggested that it not only should come out but that some substitution that should create the reverse condition is the smallest, the least protection that in my humble opinion this House ought to provide for people in the position of my clients, or anybody who has got any right in that section of the country. In addition to the reservation provided for in the 1912 agreement contained in the latter part of Section 2 of that agreement we have in section 14 the proviso that the vested rights, if any, of all persons holding land, whose interests shall be affected by the use of the said waters, shall be reserved. That was necessary in 1912; in 1912 the Government of the day insisted upon that clause being inserted in order to protect other peoples rights from the injury of interference that would come to them from the exercise by us of the privileges given us under that contract. I submit that it is at least as necessary to-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen, I do not suggest nor do I wish anybody who listens to me here to-day to think for a moment that I wish to suggest or insinuate that these omissions to safeguard public rights have been deliberate on the part either of those who are seeking those concessions or those who propose to give them—much less on the part of those who propose to give them. I take it, Sir, that every member of this House has been in a sense carried away with the prospect of a large industrial concern such as this measure gives promise of; and if he has omitted or overlooked how far the Act or Agreement in its present form infringes on already existing rights, that he will be only too ready to make good that omission once his attention is called to it. I say, Sir, that I think it would be a great pity, it would be a great pity if the scheme of development proposed by the Newfoundland Products Corporation did

not have its chance and that this country and its people did not have the opportunity of having such an industrial enterprise undertaken in its midst; but I say that the concession which provides for the establishment of that industry ought not, and I submit need not, so far as the success of the thing is concerned, unduly interfere with or prejudice the rights of anybody whether it be a foreign company or anybody else who has got rights whether they be in timber land or water power, or forest woods, or farms, or anything else. Any man to-day who has his money invested in this country whether it is the humble home of the fisherman or whether it is the big railway undertaking of the largest contractors of the country, is entitled to have all his rights and his investments conserved as fully as possible consistent with development. If this plan of the Newfoundland Products Company and those they represent, the development of the plans of construction work, may encroach upon private rights then the fullest and completest methods of compensation and of determining same, and all proper security for the payment of that compensation, should be provided by this Legislature before this contract is ratified.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen, I must again thank you for your courtesy to me and your patience in listening to what must necessarily have been a dry uninteresting address. Your time is valuable, and I have been privileged through your kindness and your desire to do what is right to come here this evening and occupy your attention for an hour or so. I have presented to you as shortly and as clearly as I possibly could the position with regard to those people whose interests have been entrusted to my care. I leave the matter in your hands individually, irrespective of the differences that exist between one party and another—

with which I have nothing whatever to do. I leave it in your hands trusting to your sense of right and justice, trusting to your realization as being custodians of the honor of this Colony of the effect of any action of this Legislature upon capital already in-

vested or capital that you may hope will be invested here in the future, to give the proper measure of protection to such interests as I represent, the fullest and fairest consideration.

I thank you Mr. Speaker and Honourable Gentlemen.

The first of these was the...
 second...
 third...
 fourth...
 fifth...
 sixth...
 seventh...
 eighth...
 ninth...
 tenth...
 eleventh...
 twelfth...
 thirteenth...
 fourteenth...
 fifteenth...
 sixteenth...
 seventeenth...
 eighteenth...
 nineteenth...
 twentieth...
 twenty-first...
 twenty-second...
 twenty-third...
 twenty-fourth...
 twenty-fifth...
 twenty-sixth...
 twenty-seventh...
 twenty-eighth...
 twenty-ninth...
 thirtieth...

The second of these was the...
 third...
 fourth...
 fifth...
 sixth...
 seventh...
 eighth...
 ninth...
 tenth...
 eleventh...
 twelfth...
 thirteenth...
 fourteenth...
 fifteenth...
 sixteenth...
 seventeenth...
 eighteenth...
 nineteenth...
 twentieth...
 twenty-first...
 twenty-second...
 twenty-third...
 twenty-fourth...
 twenty-fifth...
 twenty-sixth...
 twenty-seventh...
 twenty-eighth...
 twenty-ninth...
 thirtieth...

The third of these was the...
 fourth...
 fifth...
 sixth...
 seventh...
 eighth...
 ninth...
 tenth...
 eleventh...
 twelfth...
 thirteenth...
 fourteenth...
 fifteenth...
 sixteenth...
 seventeenth...
 eighteenth...
 nineteenth...
 twentieth...
 twenty-first...
 twenty-second...
 twenty-third...
 twenty-fourth...
 twenty-fifth...
 twenty-sixth...
 twenty-seventh...
 twenty-eighth...
 twenty-ninth...
 thirtieth...

The fourth of these was the...
 fifth...
 sixth...
 seventh...
 eighth...
 ninth...
 tenth...
 eleventh...
 twelfth...
 thirteenth...
 fourteenth...
 fifteenth...
 sixteenth...
 seventeenth...
 eighteenth...
 nineteenth...
 twentieth...
 twenty-first...
 twenty-second...
 twenty-third...
 twenty-fourth...
 twenty-fifth...
 twenty-sixth...
 twenty-seventh...
 twenty-eighth...
 twenty-ninth...
 thirtieth...

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY,—

- Motion for, 6.
- Committee on, 23.
- Draft, 28.
- Debate on, 28, 51, 76, 105.
- Presentation of, 119.
- Governor's Reply to, 119.

ADDRESSES TO GOVERNOR, 308, 475.

AMERICAN-NFLD. PACKING CO. RESOLUTIONS, 557, 571, 616,
628; BILL, 656, 724, 727.

ABBOTT, MR.

- On Prohibition Bill, 677.

APPENDIX—W. R. HOWLEY'S SPEECH, 857.

BANK FISHERY BILL, 656, 689, 724, 831.

CUSTOMS BILL, 26, 68, 112, 190, 197, 682.

CLIFT, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 28.
- Temperance Resolutions, 213.
- Supply, 262, 284, 369, 584.
- Stamps Duties Bill, 263, 267, 488.
- Products Corporation Resolutions, 417, 585, 597.
- Address to Governor, 480.
- Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 539, 541.
- Municipal Council Bill, 569.
- Export of Timber Resolutions, 732.
- Ways and Means, 751.

CURRIE, MR.

- On Local Affairs Bill, 155, 162, 451.
- Labrador Fishery Bill, 178.

Temperance Resolutions, 212, 219, 224.
 Logging Bill, 365.
 Supply, 380.
 Products Corporation Bill, 599, 600.

CROSBIE, HON. MR.

On Local Affairs Bill, 448, 452.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON.

On Local Affairs Bill, 156.
 Supply, 190, 353, 432, 436, 442, 457, 467, 590, 788.
 Customs Bill, 193.
 Temperance Resolutions, 233, 236.
 Lunatic Asylum Affairs, 241.
 Stamp Duties Bill, 264.
 Seafishery Bill, 346.
 Products Corporation Resolutions, 425.
 General Hospital Bill, 453, 491, 742.
 Address to Governor, 485.
 Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 539.
 Municipal Council Bill, 549.
 Prohibition Bill, 672, 679.
 Public Message, 726.
 Tables Despatch from Secretary of State, 776.
 Postal Telegraphs, 788, 792, 794.
 Export of Timber Resolutions, 810.
 Patriotic Funds, 846.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTIONS OF, 239, 834.

CLAPP, MR.

On Supply, 370, 778.
 Municipal Council Bill, 570.
 Revenue Bill, 819.

COAKER, MR.

On Address in Reply, 41.
 Logging Bill, 67, 138, 364, 777.
 Local Affairs Bill, 75, 159, 452.
 Labrador Fishery Bill, 130, 177, 823.
 Penitentiary Enquiry, 115, 142.
 Terra Nova's Crew, 143.
 Seafishery Bill, 168, 342, 835, 837.

- Estates Duties Bill, 181.
Supply, 190, 261, 262, 287, 353, 355, 362, 370, 371,
372, 374, 376, 382, 431, 432, 434, 438, 440, 444,
457, 463, 471, 584, 590, 593, 620.
Customs Bill, 191, 192, 682.
Temperance Resolutions, 212, 225, 238 .
Stamp Duties Bill, 266, 488.
Products Corporation Resolutions, 418, 597, 600,
612, 627, 738, 741.
Address to Governor, 484.
Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 538, 541.
Municipal Council Bill, 554, 571.
Packing Co. Resolutions, 616, 628, 635, 643, 649.
Prohibition Bill, 665, 671.
Bank Fishery Bill, 689.
Euphrates Steamship, 726.
Public Message, 726.
Export of Timber Resolutions, 736, 805.
Ways and Means, 757, 759, 770.
Postal Telegraph, 793.
Revenue Bill, 819.
Road Board Enquiry, 830.
Supreme Court on Circuit, 853.
- DOWNEY, MR.**
Moves for Address in Reply, 6.
On Labrador Fishery Bill, 137.
Temperance Resolutions, 213.
Local Affairs Bills, 452.
Products Corporation Bill, 534, 588.
Packing Co. Resolutions, 639.
- DEVEREAUX, MR.**
On Address in Reply, 89, 105.
Temperance Resolutions, 226.
Packing Company Resolutions, 644.
Ways and Means, 769.
Revenue Bill, 819.
- DWYER, MR.**
On Supply, 290, 473.
Municipal Council Bill, 570.

EMERSON, HON. C. H.

- On Temperance Resolutions, 148, 199.
- Local Affairs Bill, 450.
- General Hospital Bill, 497.
- Export of Timber Resolutions, 809.
- Prohibition Bill, 675.

EXPORT OF TIMBER BILL, 589, 615; RESOLUTIONS, 729;
BILL, 820, 847.

ESTATES DUTIES RESOLUTIONS, 179, 194; BILL, 239, 243,
259.

FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, HON. MINISTER.

- On Customs Bill, 68, 112, 190, 192.
- Labrador Fishing Bill, 133.
- Estate Duties Resolutions, 180.
- Supply, 185, 260, 262, 275, 282, 298, 302, 303, 430,
579, 591, 618.
- Stamp Duties Resolutions, 263, 486.
- Address to Governor, 483.
- American-Nfld. Packing Co. Resolutions, 575, 617,
631, 635, 636, 638.
- Ways and Means, 690, 749, 756, 759.
- Export of Timber Resolutions, 730, 737, 847.
- Railway Loan Resolutions, 827.
- Public Service Loan Resolutions, 828, 829.

GRIMES, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 32.
- Labrador Fishery Bill, 132, 826.
- Local Affairs Bill, 163, 453.
- Temperance Resolutions, 218.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 266, 488.
- Supply, 433, 439, 441, 443.
- Prohibition Bill, 671.
- Products Corporation Bill, 738.
- Ways and Means, 763.
- Patriotic Funds, Moves Adjournment, 845 .

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL, 267, 453, 491, 506, 742, 743.

GRAND BANK WATER CO BILL, 680, 690, 728, 743.

HALFYARD, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 35.
- Sealfishery Bill, 175.
- Temperance Resolutions, 228.
- Supply, 430, 434, 438, 444, 457, 595, 622, 778.
- Local Affairs Bill, 446, 451.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 488.
- Products Corporation Bill, 602.
- Packing Company Resolutions, 650.
- Prohibition Bill, 679.
- Ways and Means, 759.
- Export of Timber Resolutions, 815.
- Victoria Village Road Board Enquiry, 829.

HICKMAN, MR.

- On Temperance Resolutions, 148, 197, 237.
- Customs Bill, 192.
- Labrador Fishery Bill, 137.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 266, 487.
- Local Affairs Bill, 449, 452.
- Prohibition Bill, 671.
- Export of Timber Resolutions, 814.

HIGGINS, MR.

- On Naturalization of Aliens Bill, 104.
- Seal Fishery Bill, 173, 349.
- Temperance Resolutions, 202, 223.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 265, 487, 489.
- Logging Bill, 365.
- Supply, 379, 473.
- Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 541.
- Municipal Council Bill, 553.
- Packing Co. Resolutions, 639.
- Prohibition Bill, 665, 670, 728.
- Export of Timber Resolutions, 813.
- Patriotic Funds, 846.

HOWLEY, K.C., W. R., APPEARS AT BAR OF HOUSE, 579, 857.

JENNINGS, W. B.

- On Address in Reply, 39.
- Naturalization of Aliens Bill, 104.

Sawmills Bill, 139.
Local Affairs Bill, 162.
Seafishery Bill, 175.
Temperance Resolutions, 200.
Stamp Duties Bill, 265.
Supply, 360, 373, 439, 441, 444, 460, 591, 593.
Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 539.

KENT, MR.

On Motion for Address in Reply, 16.
Naturalization of Aliens Bill, 71, 103.
Local Affairs Bill, 73, 149, 157.
Address in Reply, 83.
Labrador Fishery Bill, 131, 825.
Customs Bill, 194.
Estates Duties Bill, 196.
Temperance Resolutions, 217, 234.
Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. B. Ayre, 240.
Supply, 261, 275, 353, 376, 377, 378, 431, 435, 437,
472, 583, 584, 591, 592, 595.
Stamps Duties Bill, 264, 265, 267, 487, 490.
Products Corporation Resolutions, 311, 415, 529,
587, 596, 598, 600, 606, 608, 612, 624, 685.
Seafishery Bill, 350, 848.
Logging Bill, 365, 778.
Address to Governor, 476.
Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 504, 538, 541.
Municipal Council Bill, 548, 777.
American-Nfld. Packing Co. Resolutions, 560, 645.
Patriotic Association Bill, 653.
Prohibition Bill, 678.
Public Accounts Committee, 721.
Postal Telegraphs, 794.
Export of Timber Resolutions, 800, 805, 814, 816.
Resolutions re Ministers in Upper House, 836, 840.
Patriotic Funds, 846.
Supreme Court on Circuit, 852.

KENNEDY, MR. M. J.

On Temperance Resolutions, 215.
Municipal Council Bill, 554.
Prohibition Bill, 671.

LABRADOR FISHERY BILL, 26, 68, 123, 177, 185, 727, 820, 831, 839.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL, 27, 71, 99, 113, 148, 352, 367, 446, 456, 589.

LOGGING BILL, 51, 67, 138, 165, 271, 364, 369, 775, 777, 851.

LUNATIC ASYLUM AFFAIRS, 241.

LLOYD, MR.

On Address in Reply, 54.

Estates Duties Bill, 180, 196.

Customs Bill, 191.

Temperance Resolutions, 214, 235.

Products Corporation Resolutions, 287, 382, 389, 421, 529, 561, 587, 588, 596, 597, 598, 607, 609, 610, 623, 625, 737.

Supply, 262, 285, 290, 302, 303, 354, 361, 375, 468, 590, 595.

Stamp Duties Bill, 264, 265, 487.

Logging Bill, 366

Seafishery Bill, 366, 838.

Address to Governor, 481.

General Hospital Bill, 498.

Municipal Council Bill, 550, 567, 571.

American-Nfld. Packing Co. Resolutions, 572, 633, 635, 639.

Public Message, 726.

Prohibition Bill, 728.

Volunteer Force Bill, 739.

Export of Timber Resolutions, 733, 737, 810, 816.

Ways and Means, 744, 756, 773.

Labrador Fishery Bill, 826.

Railway Loan Resolutions, 828.

Patriotic Funds, 847.

LeFEUVRE, MR.

On Local Affairs Bill, 451.

Bank Fishery Bill, 689.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, MINISTER.

On Labrador Fishery Bill, 129, 177, 178.

Seafishery Bill, 176, 339, 351.
Supply, 356, 360, 363, 433, 439, 457, 460, 592.
American-Nfld. Packing Co. Resolutions, 577, 617.
Bank Fishery Bill, 656, 689.
Export of Timber Resolutions, 733, 737.
Supreme Court on Circuit, 853.

MOULTON, MR.

On Supply, 373.
Products Corporation Bill, 605, 615.
Packing Company Bill, 642.
Bank Fishery Bill, 689.
Export of Timber Resolutions, 737.
Postal Telegraphs, 793.

MORRIS, MR. F. J.

On Temperance Resolutions, 215.
Municipal Council Bill, 553.
Products Corporation Bill, 633.

MUNICIPAL COUNCIL BILL, 271, 352, 546, 562, 579, 775, 776.

MORINE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 22, 63.
Seafishery Bill, 27, 75, 102, 270, 837, 848.
Naturalization of Aliens Bill, 103, 104.
Local Affairs Bill, 114, 151, 156, 158.
Penitentiary Enquiry, 118, 140, 850.
Labrador Fishery Bill, 123, 176, 178, 820, 827, 831.
Temperance Resolutions, 148, 205, 211, 219, 220,
224, 237.
Estates Duties Bill, 180, 194.
Customs Bill, 192, 195.
Resolution of Condolence, Hon. J. B. Ayre, 240.
Products Corporation Resolutions, 257, 323, 506,
538, 596, 597, 598, 600, 606, 609, 610, 614, 625,
839.
Supply, 260, 263, 285, 286, 300, 303, 307, 353, 354,
370, 372, 374, 380, 463, 468, 470.
Stamp Duties Resolutions, 263, 264, 266, 487, 490.
Address to Governor, 475.
General Hospital Bill, 495.
Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 545.

- Municipal Council Bill, 555, 571.
American-Nfld. Packing Co. Resolutions, 574, 575,
629, 633, 637.
Bank Fishery Bill, 657.
Prohibition Bill, 662, 669, 673, 676, 678.
Personal Explanation, 681.
Public Message, 726.
Ways and Means, 765.
Postal Telegraphs, 791.
Export of Timber Resolutions, 794.
Revenue Bill, 819.
Road Board Enquiry, 830.
Supreme Court on Circuit, 851.
- NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL, 27, 68, 102, 115, 140, 148,
367.
- NFLD. PRODUCTS CORPORATION RESOLUTIONS, 244, 311,
382, 389, 506, 561, 585, 595, 601, 623, 685, 725, 737,
743, 839.
- NEWFOUNDLAND BUILDERS ASSOCIATION BILL, 832, 835.
- PARSONS, MR.
Seconds Motion for Address in Reply, 13.
Labrador Fishery Bill, 826.
- PRIME MINISTER, THE.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 19.
Naturalization of Aliens Bill, 26, 68, 102, 140.
Local Affairs Bill, 27, 71, 74, 99, 113, 148, 367, 452.
Scalfishery Bill, 27, 75, 99, 271, 352, 366, 835, 837,
848.
Patents and Trade Marks Bill, 28, 76.
Address in Reply, 58.
Logging Bill, 68.
Customs Bill, 68, 192.
Penitentiary Enquiry, 118, 143.
Labrador Fishery Bill, 128, 825.
Terra Nova's Crew, 143.
Estates Duties Bill, 180, 195.
Temperance Resolutions, 207, 211, 220.
Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. B. Ayre, 239.

- Products Corporation Resolutions, 244, 258, 338,
394, 415, 421, 523, 587, 595, 598, 602, 611, 613,
623, 685, 738.
- Supply, 285, 286, 290, 303, 354, 370, 371, 375, 376,
437, 465, 590, 591, 595, 620, 622.
- Address to Governor, 479.
- Marine Disasters Fund, 500, 537, 541, 545.
- Municipal Council Bill, 546, 562, 569, 571, 776.
- American-Nfld. Packing Co. Resolutions, 557, 572,
575, 647.
- Patriotic Association Bill, 652.
- Prohibition Bill, 657, 678.
- Grand Bank Water Co. Bill, 680.
- Sawmills Bill, 684.
- Public Accounts Committee, 721.
- Volunteer Force Bill, 729.
- Export of Timber Resolutions, 737, 796, 804.
- Ways and Means, 752.
- Train Ferry Service Bill, 819.
- Railway Loan Resolutions, 828.
- Victoria Village Road Board Enquiry, 830.
- Resolutions re Ministers in Upper House, 842.
- Patriotic Funds, 846.
- Supreme Court on Circuit, 852.

PETITIONS,—

- Abbott, J., 183, 272, 309, 578.
- Bennett, Hon. J. R., 166.
- Clift, J. A., 65, 66, 182, 258, 272, 309, 368, 474, 561.
- Coaker, W. F., 24, 92, 93, 120, 122, 182, 272, 309, 589.
- Clapp, W., 120, 429, 454, 618.
- Currie, J. S., 108.
- Devereaux, R. J., 121, 683.
- Downey, J. F., 65, 145.
- Dwyer, J., 272, 428.
- Emerson, Hon. C. H., 108, 617.
- Grimes, G., 119, 505.
- Higgins, W. J., 271, 428.
- Halfyard, W. W., 94, 165, 182, 272, 273, 309, 505.
- Hickman, A. E., 454.

- Jennings, W. B., 66, 92, 166, 182, 258, 272, 429, 499,
505, 561.
Kent, J., 272, 310, 428, 429, 542, 683, 722, 775.
Lloyd, Dr. W. F., 122, 144.
LeFeuvre, T., 108.
Morris, F. J., 120, 683.
Moulton, R., 388, 454, 836.
Morine, A. B., 119, 166, 182, 256, 308, 310, 311, 353,
368, 388, 474.
Morris, Sir E. P., 94, 144, 167, 454.
Piccott, A. W., 108, 166, 268, 683.
Parsons, E., 108, 166, 268.
Stone, J., 92, 108, 122, 143, 166, 183, 258, 273, 368,
474, 505, 561, 601.
Targett, A., 66, 122, 165, 183, 258, 308.
Woodford, W., 775.
Walsh, W. J., 121, 682.
Winsor, R. G., 122, 166, 183, 561.
Young, M., 256, 268.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISER.

- On Labrador Fishery Bill, 135.
Seafishery Bill, 346.
Local Affairs Bill, 449.
Municipal Council Bill, 570.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE RESOLUTION, 721.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL, 819, 833, 834.

PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS BILL, 28, 76, 105, 112.

PENITENTIARY ENQUIRY, 115, 140, 142, 165, 181, 848.

PETITION OF RIGHTS BILL, 142, 165, 179, 239, 830, 833.

PERMANENT MARINE DISASTERS FUND BILL, 498, 500, 537,
545, 562, 723, 727.

PATRIOTIC ASSOCIATION BILL, 542, 652, 682, 684, 777.

PROHIBITION BILL, 657, 690, 728, 774, 776, 836, 838.

PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN RESOLUTIONS, 828, 829.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 657, 725, 727.

REVENUE BILL, 774, 817, 819, 832.

RAILWAY LOAN RESOLUTIONS, 827, 833.

RULES SUSPENDED, 829.

RESOLUTIONS RE MINISTERS IN UPPER HOUSE, 836, 840.

QUESTIONS,—

Abbott, Mr., 66, 95, 111, 122, 145, 243, 259, 269, 274,
429, 475, 544, 618, 727, 847.

Clift, Mr., 274, 743.

Clapp, Mr., 475, 655, 723, 724.

Coaker, Mr., 25, 50, 51, 66, 95, 108, 184, 196, 274,
369, 456, 499, 544, 589, 655, 723, 836.

Dwyer, Mr., 26, 109.

Grimes, Mr., 26, 49, 66, 97, 111, 147, 259, 269, 369,
429, 456, 474, 656, 745, 836.

Halfyard, Mr., 26, 94, 147, 167, 184, 259, 274, 369,
388, 429, 499, 544, 561, 618, 654, 682, 683, 723,
830.

Hickman, Mr., 562, 656.

Jennings, Mr., 122, 147, 183, 243, 506.

Kent, Mr., 24, 25, 49, 50, 97, 111, 122, 241, 429, 455,
475, 589, 618, 831.

Lloyd, Mr., 25, 122, 147, 197, 257, 259, 723, 727, 743.

Morine, Mr., 99, 145, 168, 185, 257, 268, 273, 388,
429, 474, 589.

Parsons, Mr., 818.

Stone, Mr., 26, 98, 109, 146, 184, 197, 368, 388, 429,
455, 456, 474, 578, 655, 724, 776.

Winsor, Mr., 49, 98, 122, 167, 184, 475, 506, 562, 618,
723, 831.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, Opening, 3; Closing, 855.

SEALFISHERY BILL, 27, 75, 99, 168, 270, 339, 366, 369, 835, 836.

SAWMILLS BILL, 107, 112, 139, 179, 654, 684.

SUPPLY, 140, 185, 259, 271, 275, 353, 369, 389, 430, 457, 475, 579,
589, 618, 778, 818.

STAMP DUTIES RESOLUTIONS, 239, 263, 486; BILL, 500, 537, 545.

SELECT COMMITTEES,—

- On Address in Reply, 23.
- Local Affairs Bill, 165.
- Sealing Bill, 176, 848. ✓
- Logging Bill, 165, 778, 818. ✓
- Penitentiary Enquiry, 181.
- Petition of Rights Bill, 239.
- Nfld. Builders Association, 776.

STONE, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 51.
- Supply, 263, 372, 374, 443, 591, 595, 779.
- Local Affairs Bill, 449.
- Bank Fishery Bill, 690.
- Ways and Means, 770.
- Postal Telegraphs, 779, 792.

SPEAKER, THE.

- Rules re Order Paper, 143.

TARGETT, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 52.
- Supply, 373, 443.
- Local Affairs Bill, 449.
- Ways and Means, 768.

TEMPERANCE RESOLUTIONS, 107, 148, 197.

TERRA NOVA'S CREW EPISODE, 142.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL, 722, 729, 774, 776.

TRAIN FERRY SYNDICATE BILL, 774, 817, 819, 832.

WINSOR, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 80.
- Supply, 442, 591.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 488.
- Packing Co. Resolutions, 646.
- Prohibition Bill, 674.
- Ways and Means, 767.
- Export of Timber Resolutions, 816.

WALSH, MR.

On Products Corporation Bill, 740.

WAYS AND MEANS, 690, 744, 818.

VICTORIA VILLAGE ROAD BOARD ENQUIRY, 829.

YOUNG, MR.

On Labrador Fishery Bill, 135.

PROCEEDINGS

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Legislative Council of Newfoundland

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

DURING THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1915

1915

1915

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
OF THE
NEWFOUNDLAND

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

DURING THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1915

PROCEEDINGS
of the
Legislative Council of Newfoundland

SESSION 1915

WEDNESDAY, April 7th, 1915.

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, p.m., His Excellency the Governor, having arrived at the Council Chamber and being seated on the Throne, the Hon. the President commanded 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 pleasure that they attend at the Bar of this House; and they being come thereto, His Excellency was pleased to open the present session of the Legislature with a gracious Speech from the Throne.

His Excellency the Governor then withdrew.

Mr. President took the Chair.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY.

HON. JOHN HARVEY.—I rise to move the customary vote that a committee of the House be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the gracious Speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this session of the Legislature. I feel that the Speech is well conceived and admirable in expression. It reviews a large number of events that have hap-

pened since our last meeting in regular session twelve months ago. It refers to the visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, a signal honour to the Colony which called forth a burst of loyalty which was so speedily and unexpectedly to be put to the test of this period of stress. That burst of loyalty has proved to have been no mere matter of lip service. The speech tells of the visit of the Royal Commission, a visit that was extremely interesting, and none the less so because a member of this House had the honor of serving as a member of that very important Imperial body, and one feels, as a Member of this House, that the House to some extent shares the honor. It refers to the visit of Mr. Duff, who with Dr. Hjord of the Norwegian Fishery Department, gave such illuminating and interesting addresses before leaving here. It refers to the visit of Professor Dunstan, which we hope will be fraught with much ultimate good to the Colony. It refers to the anticipated report of the Joint Commission appointed by the Legislature on fishery matters. It mentions a fact which we must have all anticipated, an unfortunate fact namely, that we have a deficit in the budget, a matter which no Government under the circumstances could have avoided or reversed. It refers to the possibility of the introduction of a large new indus-

try. I do not know anything about that, but I do know that anything the Government may do in that way will have the warm support of every member of the House. It refers to the commercial conditions which have obtained since the outbreak of the war, and it rightly indicates that the Colony has come through this time of stress immensely better than might have been expected. Referring to social conditions, it does seem opportune to me to say something here in reference to the extraordinary results that have been obtained from the stoppage of the liquor traffic in Russia. If it were not that it had been stated upon the highest authority, it would almost be impossible to believe that the stoppage of the liquor traffic throughout that great Empire had resulted in increased productivity of from thirty to forty per cent. We see to-day what a heart searching matter is this question of the liquor traffic for Great Britain. That an appreciable percentage of the workers in Great Britain are to a serious and alarming extent being demoralized by the drink traffic, is evident. This is a temperance country, but no one can live very long in St. John's without being aware of the inroads that the liquor traffic has made on the working people in this town. I would like, Sir, to see somebody again make the attempt to push forward an agitation for the prohibition of the retail liquor traffic here. I believe if a stop could be put to drink, and it could be followed by the other part of the programme which I have myself often advocated in this House, a measure for compulsory education, it would do more to improve the social conditions in the life of this town than all the civic commissions and new municipal legislation, desirable as these things may be, that we can ever devise. Commercially, we have come through this crisis so far wonderfully well, but

while I was one who at the beginning of the war believed that in its early stages there was no need to anticipate any serious commercial difficulty, or any need for the enforcement of any drastic legislation, no need to expect any sort of local cataclysm, I think we are by no means through the wood yet. I think we have probably harder times ahead of us than behind us. We begin the year 1915 with unprecedented prices for our staple products. These values, in my opinion, are more or less artificial and temporary. They are based upon values ruling in only one of our markets. No other market warrants a price at all approaching the figure at which fish has ruled here for the last three or four months. I believe that with a normal fishery this year these extreme values for fish have got to come down. It may be considered by some injudicious to refer to this view in this place, but I think it better that the facts should be weighed. Unfortunately our staple product has not got a world-wide market. Value depends to a large extent upon the financial status of our consumers. Unfortunately our customers are mostly poor. In Portugal, which for years disputed with Brazil the position of being our largest customer, you will find the currency rates of exchange have been dropping for a long period, and since the war began have come down with a run. The same condition of things exists less acutely in Spain and in Italy, and in all those countries it is likely to grow rather worse than better as the war goes on. I believe that the value of codfish has got to come down by and by owing to the European financial conditions. The trouble is not that these people do not want our fish, or are not prepared to pay a very large price for it. The trouble is that they cannot find gold in London. Some years ago the value of the Portuguese mirlreis was about fifty-

four to fifty-five pennies, and although the price for fish in Portugal is higher than ever, although the poor man pays more for it, still the amount which that currency will remit to Newfoundland is very much less per quintal than it would have been had the exchange not fallen. The difference in the exchange between the remitted value of a quintal of fish selling at 15 milreys, then and now, would be over \$2.00 a quintal. We have got to see, I think, a falling of values of codfish from recent extreme levels, and the process of scaling down values is often difficult, and sometimes dangerous also. From this opinion of mine, and for general reasons, I draw the deduction that the Colony will want to exercise individual industry and general economy to an unusual degree, and what is true of individuals is equally true of the Government. This must be a time for well thought out and rigid economy on the part of the Government. I wish to say that I am now speaking absolutely for myself. I have had no conversation with the Government or any member of it I am not criticising the Government, nor am I speaking for them. We have got to realize the fact that the purchasing power of the Colony is likely to be less. We begin the year with the sealfishery at a virtual blank. That means a virtual reduction of the purchasing power of the Colony of perhaps three-quarters of a million dollars. All these things mean reduced imports and reduced revenue. On the other hand the Colony has very heavy obligations, some of which while they have been incurred, have not yet been seriously entered upon. Taxation is about as high as it can be put, if it is not to cease to be productive, and the Colony's budget will have to be balanced by economies. For a good many years past we have been borrowing very considerably,

and there is no doubt that the public income has been materially increased by the fact that a certain portion of these borrowings, being in the ordinary course of business annexed through the Custom House, have been showing as normal revenues. In the future it is perfectly evident that borrowing is going to be much more difficult than in the past. Very much richer countries than we will find it difficult to borrow. I would like, Sir, to see some arrangement attempted aiming at the holding over for better times or possibly even at cancelling obligations which the Colony has incurred, but which have not yet been fully entered upon; such things as the Fortune Bay railway and possibly the Bonne Bay railway. I do not know if it is possible to hold over such things, but if it is possible I should like to see some effort made to do so. It is impossible for any man not in close touch with the details of the Government administration to say where, or how, or if, important economies in public expenditure can be effected, and I am a perfect amateur with regard to Government accounts, but running over the digest of these accounts which appears in the Journal of the House, there are several heads which strike one as being such as might be cut out for a time or reduced. I have made a note, for instance, of "dredging." I think that the estimate for dredging in the last published accounts of the House of Assembly is \$32,000. I should think that dredging, while a very desirable service, might be suspended until we can better afford it. I notice that the cost of operating the Fiona for I fancy about six months of the year, is \$29,000. I do not criticise the expenditure it may be reasonable, but I think it might be reduced without anybody suffering seriously. Take the tuberculosis campaign; I don't

know what the actual cost is, but I see the estimate for it is \$24,000. I think that it is an expenditure which may be greatly reduced, because I don't think value is being got for it. I do not wish to criticise the gentleman in charge of the work, who is no doubt an enthusiast, but I do think that the lines on which it is being run are a mistake. I note such things as agricultural exhibitions, most desirable, but on which the expenditure might temporarily be saved. Take the matter of expenditure on new roads which might probably in times like these be at least partly, if not wholly, saved, I take the matter of subsidies for extra trips for coastal steamers not included in the permanent contracts. Some of these may be necessary, but when not absolutely so, they ought to be cut out until we can better afford them. These are only a few things which I notice in going through the accounts, and I would like to add that I think it would be a proper and graceful act on the part of this Council if during the time of war, it intimated that it was not anxious to receive the usual sessional payments. There is no doubt that growing through the country there is an increasing sense of the nearer possibility of Confederation. I do not think to-day there is any greater desire than there has ever been, but there is a feeling that it is becoming possibly more inevitable. Personally I believe that the instinct of the public in this matter, like many instincts which people sometimes hold, but which they may not always be prepared to give entirely detailed reasons for, is a thoroughly sound one and I think it is strong enough to be proof against superficial and alluring arguments which are frequently brought forward upon special details. I

would, if I were a Canadian, be a very strong confederate. There is no question that from a sentimental point of view confederation with Canada would be very desirable for Canada, and I do not entirely ignore the sentimental point of view, but I do not believe, that practically speaking, and as an actual fact, confederation will make any great difference to Canada in any other way. It would make us a sort of "tied house" We should be forced to buy from Canada many things for which we are free to scour the world to-day and she would take nothing from us except the iron ore upon which one of her great industries already depends. It is true we occupy the lodge of her domain, but while we stand at her gate I do not think Canada is going to suffer by that, because we may fairly claim to be fully as loyal and as devoted to the Empire as Canada herself. The interests of this Colony at present are specialised, limited, insular, if you will, Canada's are unspecialised, unlimited and continental. We are today free to treat our own specialised problems in the light of our common sense to make or mar them as we wish. In confederation they would of necessity be dealt with from the point of view of quite different interests and subjects. I can only visualize the linking up of Newfoundland with Canada as that of a traction engine and a runabout operating on the same road. The runabout in its mad career may very well find itself in the ditch, up to the axles in mud, and it may be tempted, or it may have to link up with the traction engine to get itself out, but in this case it must be remembered that when once linked up it is tied up forever, and I do not think the partnership would be particularly advantageous to either, least of all to the runabout. However these matters are sunk to-day

in the wider issues upon which the speech dwells. I think, Mr. President, that we are fully justified in congratulating the Government on the broad and fearless way in which they have dealt with our part in the world crisis which has arisen, and we may fairly say the same of the Opposition, which has acted as every Newfoundlander would desire. These things may be fairly entered to the Colony's credit in the great ledger of history. This has been Newfoundland's chance come at last to do something worth while in the world, to get away from this small and artificial existence which tends to numb our thoughts and to deaden our characters, and instead, to know something of true service, to do something for the great realities of life. The Colony has fairly justified her claim to be not only ancient, but loyal too. For I doubt if any other Colony or Dependency has provided anything approaching the percentage of native born sons that this Colony has done. I doubt if any city under the flag can match the native volunteering of St. John's. I imagine that no Colony has at this time written the same proportion of lives upon the hero's roll of honor. One of the most inspiring things about the early days of the war was the rush of helpers from every portion of Greater Britain. When war came the question upon everybody's lips, friends and foes, alike was this, what about the Dominions? Shall Great Britain fight alone? Those little Islands which we in our island look at across the Atlantic and to whom we owe so much. They had fought alone before, for right, against the world in arms, and whether the Dominions had helped or not, they would have done it if necessary, once more, fought ungrudgingly, victoriously, as they have always fought.

The Kaiser asked the question, and

he answered it himself in the blundering, stupid way with which we have now become so familiar. England did not ask, there was no need for her. But to those who did ask the answer was not long in coming. Promptly, proudly, gloriously, it came from every corner of the world where the British ensign waves. This is our quarrel. This is the Empire's war. We are the Empire, we and you together, and we claim our right. The inbred qualities of race, the ties of blood and of obligation, the common memory of a great past and faith in a great future, these things spoke like an instinct, and that intangible thing we call Nationality, ignoring all personal, petty, parochial claims, showed that it lived in every part of the great whole. It showed that the Empire was no ill-related and loosely bound series of independent units, but a living organism, a great moral force. It showed that the Empire's bond was certainly not any matter of military force, not merely the bond of race, or of language, or even of color, but that it was rather a spiritual understanding manifesting itself in the British character, in British ideals and in British institutions. All the Dominions are sending men, but in one respect at least none of them can send the men that we can send. You cannot make a seaman in a week. They cannot send these men because they have not got the type inured to all the hardships of the sea. We have hardy, fearless, true seamen, who have lived with the sea, who have braved its terrors a thousand times, who know it in all its moods, and I say Mr. President, that while we are justly proud of our first Newfoundland Regiment and of our reserve force, we may be prouder still of this, that this Ancient Colony, the oldest in time, the nearest in

space, the purest in blood, has alone among the dependencies of the Crown been able to send home seamen in response to the call of the Imperial Navy. For myself, if there is anything which I would have altered in what the Colony has done, it would have been that more of our energy and attention would have been devoted to the Naval Reserve. The Colony has assumed a heavy burden, not alone financially, but also in flesh and blood. What are we who stay at home, who have perforce to send others to do our fighting for us, to say of those who have fallen and to those who have offered them selves? When we contemplate the steadfast heroism of the British army displayed upon a hundred fields of death, the terrible warfare of the trenches, the daily horrors of sights and sounds amid which they face their work, when we contemplate the untiring and splendid work of our seamen upon whose vigilance civilization itself seems to hang, I think we may say that if ever the familiar words of Macaulay were applicable,—if ever they held new meaning—they do so to-day:

For how can man die better
Then facing fearful odds,
For the ashes of his fathers,
And the temples of his gods?

Where are the ashes of our fathers? They have risen again in the most wonderful Empire the world has ever known. It has risen upon their ashes—it is their monument,—an Empire whose past has been wonderful beyond imagination, far beyond the dreams of those who founded it; whose future is the hope of humanity. The men of Dorset and Devon, the men of Scotland and Ireland, direct forbears of those who inhabit this Colony today, built that Empire upon foundations of Freedom, Truth

and Christian Honor. Those principles the Empire has planted round the world, and it is not the cathedrals and the fanes, however beautiful, that the barbarian has been able to batter with his guns and destroy, but it is these same principles, the principles of Freedom, Truth and Christian Honor that are in reality the Temples of our Gods. Of those who have fallen, and of those who risk their lives, we may surely say that never has there been since the world began, never will there be in the time to come, a cause more glorious, wherein a man shall spend his life.

HON. MR. McGRATH—In seconding the motion, Mr. President, so admirably presented by my hon. friend, in an address that in the clarity of its presentation of local conditions, and the high tone of patriotic spirit which it reaches, in its references to the war, has never, I should think been exceeded here, I am fully conscious that I can but poorly perform the task assigned to me, and do but very inadequate justice to the outstanding theme of this occasion. We have entered upon a new era in our colonial history, one calling for a summary which none but a master mind should essay, for Newfoundland has in the past few months attained, for the first time, her full status as a partner in the family of daughter nations under the British Crown, by her participation in the war; and has sealed the patent of her new dignity with the lives of sixty of her sons who have died on the sea in battle-harness to help pay the price of Admiralty, while 2,000 others, by flood or field, stand ready to do likewise, when the moment comes which shall demand the same sacrifice from them.

These are times that try men's souls. A year ago we met in the very shad-

ow of the sealing disaster which cost the lives of 250 of our hardy seafarers, the most appalling in our island's annals. Half a year later we met again in the first shock of the most momentous international conflict the world has ever seen, or, let us hope will ever again see—our purpose being to rank our ancient and loyal colony with its sister Dominions beyond the seas, in support of the Motherland in this cataclysm, the magnitude of which few could even more than dimly discern, though today it is so crystal clear that he who runs may read. Now we meet once more with the greatest nations of Europe locked in a death grapple, to which those who love liberty, and freedom, and what these stand for, clearly recognize that there can be but one outcome, and that the utter and complete destruction of the German militarism that has overspread the world like a cloud, growing in density and awesomeness with each succeeding year, until it broke last July in a storm that has ravaged and laid desolate the fairest portions of the European Continent, and caused the world such an excess of sorrow and misery as nought in the history of human kind had yet approached.

So much has been spoken, and written, and printed, in parliaments and pulpits, in lecture halls and public assemblages, in daily prints and historical volumes, by statesmen and preachers, and scholars and journalists, the ablest men of every civilized country, regarding the causes of this convulsion, that it would be as presumptuous, as it is unnecessary, to say more here to-day than that, at bottom, the war which now involves all Europe and menaces the whole world, is humanity's own life struggle, a struggle for freedom, for national integrity, for free citizenship, in a free

democracy of the nations. It is the old struggle of the spirit of humanity, liberated and impassioned, against arrogant and privileged autocracy, based on the assumption of "the divine right of Kings to rule wrong," and the exercise of terrifying outrages by the mailed fist of military power. It is a new stage in the world's fight for liberty, which has gone on from age to age with varying success at different periods, but always gaining a new goal along the pathway that leads to democratic freedom as against autocratic despotism; and from the world-wide shadow of the horror now flooding Europe with blood and bringing sorrow and suffering to millions of innocent, inoffensive souls, we can see emerging a new sanity among the nations, a new conception of the rights of peoples, new limitations to the powers of monarchs, and probably such a reaction after the existing struggle, as will end for all time an appeal to the sword in the settlement of international grievances.

In the words of Burke the attempt of Germany in this war "represents the most odious and formidable conspiracy against the liberties of Europe, and of mankind, which history records," and fortunate for Britain was it that in this extremity her destinies were entrusted to men who were giants in their respective spheres, and whose presence at her council-boards may almost be held to have been a design by Providence for the saving of the nation. With full confidence in the capacity of Asquith, "the grey-haired Atlas whose unwearied hands hold up the burden of Imperial state," the British nation met the shock of battle, in his own words, "united, calm, resolute, trusting in God." The direction of her foreign policy was in the competent hands of Sir Edward Grey, of whose state-craft

it truly may be said, "whatever record leaps to light we never shall be ashamed." Conducting her fiscal affairs she rejoiced in Lloyd-George, magnetic, resourceful, and seer-like in his vision, whose measures are "watched by the concours of unnumbered lands." To the War Office at the first sign of danger came Lord Kitchener, organizer of victory and creator of confidence, inspiring as no other could, tested in Egyptian desert, and Boer-land veldt "steadfast and firm, despite all dread alarms, no threats can make him flinch." And at the Admiralty our Motherland fortunately had the far-seeing and sagely-audacious Winston Churchill, who had the silent victory won for his country before even war was declared, by the masterly dispositions of the British fleet which doomed the German navy to the ignoble role of lying hidden in harbor while the German flag was swept from the seas.

Assuredly, sir, our motherland never showed to greater advantage than in the days when, after striving for peace until such was seen to be hopeless, she unsheathed the sword and ranged herself beside the Allies who bravely bore their part in this most righteous of wars, and assuredly never did British statesmanship approach as high a plane as in this dark and peril-swept period, when German diplomacy, through its blunders and incapacities, brought that empire to undisputed shipwreck amid the outspoken contempt of press and people of all neutral lands, while the plain, unvarnished tale of the singleness of purpose of British diplomacy in its efforts to avert hostilities, earned for Britain's leaders the admiration of the world, and formed the completest justification for her cause.

Likewise, never did British patriotism as nobly shine forth as in the

abandonment of all partisan warfare by her political groups and the swarming to the colors of her young men of all classes; and when will the deathless story fade or the moving tale of British valor cease to thrill, of the achievements of Gen. French's "contemptible little army" against fearful odds, once more establishing the fame of the British as the finest fighting men of Europe, and adding a new chapter to the imperishable record of the nation's army renewing the glories of Agincourt, fought 500 years come next October; of Blenheim, fought 211 years ago; and of Waterloo, whose centenary the Empire will celebrate in June.

Still, it is no holiday task that confronts the Motherland and the Empire, but a prolonged and desperate struggle with one of the strongest and best armed empires in the world; and one, moreover, preparing for this for well-nigh thirty years. There will neither be emulation nor despondency in the British race at the inevitable vicissitudes and changes of fortune which the war will involve. Britain has learned to face heavy losses and refrain from rejoicings; she is running a stern race and will neither exult nor lament till the final victory is won and due punishment is meted out for what Mr. Balfour described as "the accumulated infamy of the Belgian transaction." The time is one for deeds. As a nation she has to translate her sympathy with the oppressed, and her passion for righteousness, into vigorous and unrelenting action, and so, whether the end comes swiftly, or, as many capable critics believe, only after long months of battle and suffering, the nation will go forward steadfastly until the final deliverance of Europe is achieved, sparing neither sacrifices nor exertions in

the glorious cause she has espoused.

How history repeats itself in the present crisis is seen by recalling that of Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, whom the present German Emperor is ambitious to eclipse. Macaulay wrote in a celebrated passage: "On the head of Frederick is all the blood which was shed in a war which raged during many years and in every quarter of the globe. The evils produced by his wickedness were felt in lands where the name of Prussia was unknown; and in order that he might rob a neighbour whom he had sworn to defend, black men fought on the coast of Coromandel, and red men scalped each other by the Great Lakes of North America." So, today, we see the war occasioned by Prussia's ambition to dominate Europe, involving peoples in the world's remotest regions, and threatening to envelope with its devastating influence, nearly all, if not all, the countries of Europe which are still trying to maintain some semblance of neutrality against outrages of a power which regards international treaties as "scraps of paper" to be repudiated at will.

But we know that whatever the suffering, whatever the loss in store for her Britain will meet the peril to her own and the world's liberties, not indeed with a light heart, but with that same sober and fixed resolution with which in another age she confronted similar dangers, and confident that to-day—as one hundred years ago, when Bonaparte bestrode Europe like a Colossus, as two centuries ago, when the Grande Monarque sought domination; and as a century previously the Spanish Armada was crushed—victory will come in time to those who fight to prevent a single power dominating Europe. Ranke, the German historian in his great work says, "but whenever any prin-

ciple or power be it what it may, aims at unlimited supremacy in Europe, some vigorous resistance to it, having its origin in the deepest springs of human nature, invariably arises and as invariably succeeds." The thought to which the historian here gives utterance might well have formed the subject of study by the Kaiser, since it is no less true of the present hour than it was of the days of which Ranke was writing. He wrote of Spain and the Great Armada that Spain launched as the first step towards the conquest of Europe, but the thought in the quotation just made is perennially sound.

The present war is just as much a war of liberation as was the American Civil War, and the Allied Powers can no more agree to an inconclusive settlement than President Lincoln could have compromised with the Southern rebels. The Germans, in a very literal sense, are rebels against civilization, against public law, against all the securities of a tolerable existence, and every fresh development of "frightfulness," as Frederick the Great, who conceived this system, describes it, must only nerve the civilized powers of Europe more determinedly to the task before them, the stamping out of this barbarous creed and all its hateful accessories, even if it involves an appalling sacrifice in blood and treasure, in a struggle of terrible proportions calling for long patience and the highest patriotism. The pity of it is that a nation should be so led astray and that the German Fatherland, after rising to unprecedented heights of prosperity and power, has been betrayed to its own destruction, and all its fine ambitions brought to ruin; so that she appears ready to go down to utter defeat in a blaze of doubtful glory, and after a display of combined recklessness,

courage, and inhumanity, unequalled in contemporaneous annals.

Among the happiest and most inspiring features of the war was the splendid and spontaneous rally of the whole Empire to the side of the Motherland. Autonomous Dominions, Crown Colonies, India and its appanages, all alike animated by but one spirit, promptly rose to the occasion. They all realized that this is a life and death struggle, not only for Great Britain but also for Greater Britain, and all British ideas of liberty and justice; all saw that it concerned them as directly as it did the parent Isles, and that the Empire must either survive it or perish; and all, too, were fired with a single determination that the Empire should survive it and not perish. So they responded to the unspoken appeal of the Mother Country almost ere it was conceived, and this response will go down to history while the world remains a world, as the most marvelous manifestation of the unifying influences of a colonizing race of which the human family has any record.

The onrush of this tidal wave of patriotic enthusiasm through all the realms over which the Union Jack flies, saw offers of ships and troops, of foodstuffs and money, of help in every conceivable form. These poured in unceasingly and were accepted with gratitude; they strengthened the natural consciousness that in this struggle Britain fights as the champion of the world's liberties and that all neutral countries know the situation is such today as it was a century ago, and the position of England now is the same as then when the younger Pitt delivered his dying message: "England has saved herself by her exertions, and will, I trust, save Europe by her example." At that time, history tells us, England did

not sheathe the sword until, after nearly twenty years of fighting the freedom of Europe was secured, and the same end must be attained now, though we hope and pray that the struggle will not be so prolonged.

We rejoice with His Excellency that Newfoundland, the oldest and loyalest dependency of the Empire was quick to range herself beneath its banner. Gems nor bullion we had not to give, nor golden grain, nor fatted stock; but we offered full toll of our best and bravest, and my hon. friend across the House, who proposed this motion, enjoys the proud distinction that the first of the sons of Newfoundland to make the great sacrifice in this war of liberty, was his brother. Lincoln says that 'He who lays down his life pays the last measure of devotion to a country or a cause;' and Ruskin emphasizes that "the willingness to die, not the willingness to kill, is the reason for the honor in which the defender of his country is held."

On the subject of colonial participation the golden books contain no more prophetic lines than those of William Watson to England and her colonies in 1905:

"She stands a thousand-wintered tree,
By countless morns impeared;
Her broad roots coil beneath the sea,
Her branches sweep the world;
Her seeds, by careless winds conveyed,
Clothe the remotest strand
With forests from her scattering
spade,
New nations fostered in her shade,
And linking land with land.
'O ye by wandering tempests sown,
'Neath every alien star,
Forget not whence the breath was
blown
That wafted you afar!
For ye are still her ancient seed
On younger soil let fall—
Children of Britain's island breed
To whom the Mother in her need
Perchance may one day call."

The call came, and surely the world, since time began, never witnessed any such magnificent spectacle as the rally of Britain's sons from over the seas to defend the Flag and the principles for which it stands. Even if all Europe is at war and the echoes of the struggle reverberate through the whole habitable world, even if hundreds of thousands of men have died since this gigantic war began, if men are dying to-day, and if men will die to-morrow, we see it daily shown that the British race does not count the cost:—

"For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land, or life if freedom fail."

We are not downhearted. No! Rather do we rejoice to-day in the priceless value of what we have already won by this war. The units of Empire, roused from the sloth of recent years, taught to distinguish the true from the false, are knit together by the pressure of a common danger, by a new sense of fellowship by new realizations of duty and endeavour, to achieve new glories for the common heritage, as Lowell says: "Proving that the gospel of peace is neither falsified nor lost in strife that has a high purpose and sanction."

When the fateful hour struck some hundreds of Newfoundland bluejackets were already assembled or hurrying to St. John's to answer the call from the Navy, and within a week steps were being taken to enroll a regiment for land service abroad. I need not multiply words to tell with what promptness and enthusiasm our young men came forward, with what prideful feelings we sent them on their way; though it may not be amiss to emphasize that on the 30th of March just past, we had put down in England a thousand bluejackets and a thousand soldiers—representing proportionately the largest contribu-

tion of fighting men from any of the Overseas Dominions. With 250,000 people in Newfoundland and eight millions in Canada, these two contingents would be equal to 54,000 men sent forward from the neighbouring Dominion, whereas Canada had then sent only 40,000. It is not in the sense of decrying the efforts of our neighbor, but rather that because we are small the magnitude of our effort should not be overlooked, that I emphasize this fact, and likewise the conviction that as the months go by Newfoundland will still maintain the pre-eminence she has thus achieved.

This would be a creditable undertaking from even a country where militaristic or, at any rate, defensive doctrines were inculcated, but Newfoundland, as we all know, is a country where we lacked a man who had heard a shot fired in anger, or knew the handling of a battle-brand. Yet we tried to do our part, and, I think, succeeded. Nine-tenths of those who went forward if not, indeed, a larger proportion, were natives of this Colony, flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, and they could say with the Canadian poet:

"A thousand leagues from Albion's shore,

In newer lands I saw the light,
I never heard the cannon's roar,

Nor saw a mark of Britain's might,
Save that our people lived in peace
And blessed the harvest sun,
And thought that tyranny would cease
And battle days be gone.

"And still the flag of England
And twice two hundred ships of war,
Were surging through the seas,
And still the name of England,
Which faithless tyrants scorn,
Could thrill my soul, it was to me,
A very bugle horn."

And if today, Sir, we look in imagination beyond the sea-rim, and picture the gallant fleets in their un-

sleeping patrol of the watery wastes that are the theatre of the naval portion of this appalling struggle, our sturdy sailor sons can be found in every class of British war-craft, from submarine to super-dreadnought, doing their part to maintain the supreme object of the Allied powers, the destruction of that Prussian militarism which, as Lord Haldane recently said, "has driven all Germany into courses that are incompatible with the freedom of Europe and the growth of civilizing influences." Already our seafarers have paid in generous measure the price demanded by all, and by none, or at no time, more than in the shock of battle by land and sea, proving their manhood and verifying anew the great saying of Carlyle's that: "Never pleasure, but suffering and death, are the lures that draw true hearts."

Our soldiers have not yet taken their place upon the battle line but when they do, their fellow-countrymen are confident that they will acquit themselves like men, standing shoulder to shoulder in defence of what we believe is right, and for the maintenance of the best that is in the world; and Motherland and daughter nations united in this conviction will go on in the spirit once expressed by President Garfield, "A nation is not worthy to be saved, if, in the hour of its trial, it will not gather up all its stores of manhood and life, and go down into the conflict, however bloody and doubtful, resolved on measureless ruin or complete success."

The manner in which the work of ensuring the Colony's participation in this struggle was enterprised merits the warmest commendation. The Government and Opposition co-operated splendidly and every class and element amongst us likewise lent its support. The enlisting, training and

despatching of the naval force lay with the Admiralty, but the efforts of volunteer speakers were secured to stimulate enlistment. The organizing of the First Newfoundland Regiment was taken in hand by a non-partisan concern, the Patriotic Association, widely representative, and which, through its various committees, performed its duties most creditably. His Excellency the Governor did excellent service, ably seconded by Sir Joseph Outerbridge in the organizing work, while in the financial department, Hon. E. R. Bowring supplemented his efforts here last season by giving close personal supervision to the work in England the present winter. As every member of this House knows, the gentlemen composing the various sub-committees labored earnestly and unselfishly in their various departments, making the whole most creditable, while the splendid gift of Mr. W. D. Reid, of two machine guns enables our Regiment to take the field with an equipment as complete as that of any battalion in the regular army.

Moreover, provision was made for the dependents of our soldiers and sailors and thanks to the liberality of our citizens of every class, among the most generous being several members of this House, a Patriotic Fund has already been raised to assist the families of those who have gone on active service, and to provide help for those who may return disabled, or for the cherished ones of those who may lay down their lives.

And while the men were doing their part, the women, under the equally capable leadership of Lady Davidson, were proving no laggards in their department; and in providing materials for the sick and wounded in the war, and comforts for our own soldiers and sailors, they achieved what I think the

records will in time prove to be an undertaking that, in the results, no other portion of the Empire can exceed.

I should like here to briefly pay tribute to others of our women—to the wives, and mothers, and sisters, who have seen their loved ones go forth to war without murmur or complaint, though it involved substantial sacrifice to themselves. It has fallen to me, in the work of the Patriotic Fund, to hear the stories of those of them who have sought assistance from its resources, and I say there is no more splendid or inspiring phase of this Colony's part in the present struggle than the quiet heroism of these womenfolk, the reasonableness of their requests and the fair appreciation of the all-too-pitiful trifle it is proving possible to allow them.

This is a phase of such a period that, it seems to me, always gets too little recognition. We speed the warrior on his way with cheers and handshakes and every manifestation of popular enthusiasm and well we may, for he goes to risk, or may be, to give his life on behalf of his country; but we should not forget those he leaves at home, the wives, and mothers and sisters, the children who are often doomed to misery and privation. Let us remember that life is in itself a great battlefield, that victories and defeats are won or lost in the woman's walked-up heart who sees her son or husband take his place among his country's defenders, and that they deserve a word of recognition in any enumeration of those who are doing their part in such a crisis; and that equally deserving of a word of praise are the fathers who are sending forward their sons to play their part in this war.

That this Colony should suffer in its overseas commerce and in its in-

ternal trade as a result of the war was inevitable. Not alone are the countries engaged in it, and their dependencies, even in the remotest parts of the globe, similarly affected, but neutral countries are also suffering severely, and the United States has had to make provision for an expected deficit of a hundred million dollars in its annual revenues this year, in consequence of the dislocation of trade resulting from the war. Our attitude, however, in this matter should not be one of complaint, but one of thankfulness that we have not faced worse than has been our fortune. Our fish is being carried with virtually no interference, to every market we possess, and although one cargo was sunk, yet, as against that, we have to set off the fact that this winter we sustained no losses of local shipping from stress of weather. We might have seen the ocean unsafe and our fish supplies rotting in our stores; but, thanks to the British navy, the seas are as free to us as ever. We can better appreciate what this means by pondering on the confession embodied in the memorandum justifying the German Naval Law of 1900.

"An unsuccessful naval war of the duration of even only a year would destroy Germany's sea-trade, and would thereby bring about the most disastrous conditions, first in her economic, and then, as an immediate consequence, in her social life. Quite apart from the consequence of the possible peace conditions, the destruction of our sea trade during the war could not even at the close of it, be made good within measurable time, and would add to the sacrifices of the war a serious economic depression."

That the present season promises to be profitable for those engaged in this staple industry we are encouraged to hope, and

though the seal fishery promises to be a total blank yet we may reasonably expect that as the war progresses towards a conclusion and the clouds begin to lighten matters amongst us will take on an improvement and our people be able to enjoy a return for their labours similar to that which they secured in previous years, and the Colonial Treasury benefit accordingly.

I do not propose to follow my hon. friend in his review of the local situation to the consideration of which he brings the knowledge and experience resulting from his active identification with the staple industries of the Colony, but I certainly agree with him in the view he takes as to the absolute necessity of economy both on the part of the State and of the community. Some years ago Hon. Mr. Fielding, then Minister of Finance for Canada, sounded a warning to that country that the time had come to "shorten sail," and I think there is equal need for us in Newfoundland to hearken to a similar warning and begin to live less expensively both as individuals, as communities and in the administration of our public affairs. We have enjoyed seven years of plenty, and while I do not suggest that we are in for seven years of adversity, I think we will be well-advised if we see in the present occasion a period when economies can be judiciously practised, and steps taken to husband our resources to the fullest extent.

The Speech from the Throne indicates a decided shortage in the revenues and I should think there is little prospect of an improvement while the war lasts, but in this respect, also, our Colony is not singular, because the Mother Country, Canada and Australia, are confronted with the same state of affairs, and neutral nations

as well. We can only trust that a solution of the struggle may be ensured before many months, so that it may become possible for the energies now being expended in slaughter and destruction to be turned to the production of articles and objects which will make for the comfort and advancement of the world, and that our country may enjoy the benefits of peaceful progress.

Hence it is encouraging to note that a constructive measure of much promise, in the way of immediate employment and comprehensive development is stated to be embraced in the undertaking to which reference is made in the Speech, for the establishment of an industry of exceptional magnitude in this Colony and Labrador, involving the outlay of many millions of dollars, and I am sure that at any time, and especially at the present time, when the need for new industries is so imperative, such a project will receive the most sympathetic consideration of both Houses of this Legislature.

Not alone are labor-giving enterprises desirable now, but it is even more desirable that we should, if possible, set on foot such enterprises in order that we may be able, in some degree at least, to solve the greatest problem that this war is going to present for the Colony; and that is, how we are going to re-absorb into the industrial life of our country the 2,000 or 3,000 men who will return here after the struggle is ended, to take up the peaceful battle of life amongst us again and to carve out for themselves an existence in their native land where new conditions will confront them and new obligations will have to be met if we are to retain them here permanently and not see our Island home suffer the permanent loss of virtually all these

fine young fellows.

Upon the other matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, I shall not dwell at length. Regarding the Duke of Connaught's visit I would only say that I hope it may be possible to induce him to return here after the war and see for himself into what excellent soldiers and sailors the lads developed whom he saw parading as cadets on St. George's Field when here last summer.

Regarding the Dominions Royal Commission and the information it was able to secure as to our natural resources and possibilities, I trust that it may be turned to good account when a revival of capitalistic interest follows the end of the war, and for the same reason we will await Professor Dunstan's report on our mineral possibilities.

That the views of Mr. Duff, of the Scotch Fishery Board upon the chance for developing our fisheries may prove of fruitful interest will be the hope of all, and that the Legislative Commission on Fisheries may find itself able to submit measures calculated to enhance the value of our leading industries is equally desirable; and there can be no question that the spirit of the Legislature will be to give its best thought to the report of the judicial Commission which inquired into last spring's sealing disasters and which is recommending important reforms for our consideration.

Finally, sir, in re-echoing the fervent hope of His Excellency that Divine Providence may guide us in our deliberations, may we not also pray that the blessings of honourable peace dictated by the Allies shall soon be vouchsafed to the world to ensure the democratic countries a continuance of the freedom they have thus far enjoyed, and to the British Empire pro-

tection from the menace of German aggression which has been a nightmare for Europe for a generation. We can realize now, as never before, that there are no people so free as the British people, and all will subscribe to the declaration of His Majesty the King that "we are fighting for a worthy purpose and shall not lay down our arms until that purpose has been fully achieved." Britain has shown the world what it is to be free, and in the present war she is proving that freedom begets men. In this great crisis, therefore, let us find inspiration in Lord Rosebery's words: "Above all we are going to win because we have a high power and just cause, and we can appeal with humble but I think earnest confidence, to Him Whom we recognize as the God of Bethel by Whose Hand His people still are led."

COMMITTEE ON ADDRESS.

The motion was then adopted and the President named Hon. Messrs. Harvey, McGrath Skelton, J.D. Ryan and Robinson as a Committee to draft the Address in Reply.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Hon Mr. Bishop then tabled a memorandum from His Excellency the Governor, covering a certified copy of the memos of the Hon. Executive Council, appointing the following to be the Commission of Internal Economy for the Legislature the present session:

The Hon. The President of the Legislative Council.

Hon. R. K. Bishop.

Hon. P. T. McGrath.

His Honor the Speaker House of Assembly.

Rt. Hon. Sir E. F. Morris.

Hon. J. R. Bennett.

Hon. C. H. Emerson.

Hon. Mr. Bishop also presented reports of His Excellency, Sir W. E. Davidson, as President of the Patriotic Association, on its work up to March 31st; also the annual report of C. E. Schools for 1914.

On motion the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, at 4.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, April 9th.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. Harvey submitted the report of the sub-committee on the Address in Reply, and moved that it be read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The address was then read as follows:

"To His Excellency Sir Walter Edward Davidson, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Governor and Commander in Chief in and over the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies.

May it please Your Excellency:—

We, the Legislative Council of Newfoundland in session convened, beg leave to thank Your Excellency for the gracious speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of the Legislature.

(Sgd.) JOHN HARRIS.

President.

Council Chamber, April, 1915.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Harvey the report was read a second time, passed, engrossed, and ordered to be presented to His Excellency by a deputation of the Whole House.

REPORTS.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled the Fourth Interim Report of the Dominions Royal Commission relating to Newfoundland.

Also the report of the Resident Physician of the St. John's Asylum for the Insane for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1914.

Also the report of the Schools of Newfoundland under the Salvation Army boards for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1914.

Also a report of the examinations held by the Council of Higher Education for the year 1914.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned till Monday next at 4.30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, April 14.

House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

PATENTS AND TRADE MARKS BILL.

Hon. the President informed the House he had a message from the House of Assembly acquainting the Legislative Council that they had passed the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting Patents and Trade Marks," and requesting the concurrence of the Council in the same. On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop begged leave to lay upon the table of the House the Report of the Internal Economy Commission and asked that it be read by the clerk.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until 12.15 p.m. to-morrow.

THURSDAY, April 15th.

The House met at 12.15 p.m. 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 Colonial Chamber, the Hon. President informed the House that a deputation of the whole

House having waited on His Excellency, had received the following reply:

ADDRESS OF THANKS.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present session was opened.

(Sgd.) W.E. DAVIDSON,

Governor.

15 April, 1915.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned till Tuesday next, the 29th instant, at 4.30 p.m.

TUESDAY, April 29th.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

PATENTS AND TRADE MARKS

BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP—On August 26th of last year the Secretary of State for the Colonies forwarded His Excellency the Governor, copy of the Imperial Trade Marks Act of 1914, passed by the Imperial Parliament on the 7th August, 1914; also a copy of the Imperial Act referring to patents and designs, passed by the Imperial Parliament on the same date; also an Act to extend the powers of the Board of Trade during the continuance of hostilities to make rules under the Patents and Designs Act of 1907 and the Trade Marks Act of 1905, passed by the Imperial Parliament on the same date. These communications were not received by His Excellency the Governor in sufficient time for a Bill to be drafted dealing with this matter at our special war session, held during the first week of September last. This Bill has for its object the carrying out of the suggestions of the various Imperial Acts above referred to in so far as it may be necessary to deal with the matter of patents, trade marks and designs in Newfoundland.

The object of the Imperial Legislation was to set free British manufacturers and others from having to pay royalty on German discoveries patented in the British Empire.

At the present time there are some fourteen Newfoundland letters patent in force granted to German and Austro-Hungarian subjects, and this Bill now before the House empowers the Governor in Council to make rules and to do such things as may be deemed expedient for avoiding or suspending in whole or in part any such letters patent. The Bill is strictly in accord with the policy of the Imperial Parliament, as set forth in the Imperial Acts passed on the 7th August, and consequently should commend itself to the favorable consideration of the House. I beg to move its second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Mr. President informed the House that he had received the following messages from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills entitled, respectively:

An Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens;

An Act to amend the Act 4 Geo. V., Cap. 17, entitled: "An Act respecting the operation of Saw Mills," and

An Act relating to the Sale of Codfish on the Labrador;

in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

ALIENS AND CODFISH BILLS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill respecting the Naturalization of Aliens, and the Bill respecting the Sale of Codfish on Labrador, was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SAWMILLS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill relating to the operation of Saw Mills, was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till Wednesday at 4.30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, April 21st.

The Council met at 4.30. When the Order of the Day was called, the Hon. R. K. Bishop rose and proposed the following Resolutions:—

RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE.

The Council, having learned with great sorrow of the very recent death of the Hon. John Bray Ayre, hereby records its unfeigned regret for the sad occurrence.

This event has deprived this Body of a sagacious and sound Councillor, the business community of a progressive and prosperous Merchant, and the whole Island of a friend.

The deceased gentleman was highly regarded in Church and social circles, and was one who ever contributed bountifully and in a sincere spirit, not only when public emergencies demanded philanthropic action, but every appeal for any deserving person or object met his ready and generous response.

RESOLVED—That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to Mrs. Ayre, expressing the sympathy of the Council with her and the family of the late Hon. Mr. Ayre in their bereavement.

RESOLVED—That the Council do now adjourn as a mark of respect and esteem for their late brother member.

HON. MR. BISHOP said:—

I rise for the purpose of moving the foregoing resolutions. At the present time, Mr. President, I could

wish to say a great deal. I find it difficult to say anything.

In moving these resolutions, referring as they do to a Member whose seat has been next to my own for many years, I am impressed with the thought of a closer connection, for during the past forty years or more I have been honoured by the friendship of John Bray Ayre—a friendship intimate, unbroken, and upon his part manifested so spontaneously and sincerely on more than one occasion that with one possible exception I could not but regard him as the truest and closest friend it has been my privilege to possess. Mr. Ayre occupied his seat here when the present Session was opened, but the condition of his health, which has been failing for sometime, was known to all of us, and we felt that his recovery was not to be expected. Mr. Ayre was no ordinary man, his genial disposition made everyone his friend, and his kindness gave scope to his unusual talents, for it was mainly for the public benefit that he employed the time he could secure from his business engagements.

As the Senior member for many years of one of our largest, most enterprising and successful mercantile firms, and as director of several of our manufacturing concerns, his ability was marked, and his public spirit was genuine. He was a believer in his country, and in the value of its enterprises. He was also an architect, an artist, and a musician of no mean order, and all those gifts were employed unstintedly and gratuitously for the benefit of all who needed them. All such work was performed by Mr. Ayre as a labour of love.

His benefactions were many and important, but not because of these will he be best and longest remembered, but because of his genuine,

sympathetic, and attractive personality. "He was a man take him for all in all—we shall not look upon his like again."

I feel sure the deepest sympathy of the Council goes out to-day in fullest measure to Mrs. Ayre and all other members of the family.

After the resolutions had been formally adopted, the House adjourned until Friday afternoon.

FRIDAY, April 23rd.

The Council met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

PATENTS AND TRADE MARKS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee on the Patents and Trade Marks Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MR. SQUIRES—This legislation is a special legislation desirable because, and only because, our Empire is at war. Under this Bill certain powers are vested in the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations which might have the effect of modifying or cancelling the rights and privileges given under the Newfoundland Law to persons who are now Alien Enemies. On August 7th, 1914, the Imperial Parliament dealt with this matter. A copy of that legislation was sent by the Secretary of State to His Excellency the Governor, but was not received in time for a bill to be laid before the Legislature at our special war session of last year. The effect of this measure is to empower the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations governing these matters, which rules and regulations should certainly be in conformity with the policy of the Imperial Parliament in connection with this matter. In view of the fact that our Empire is at war, it is most reasonable

that the Legislature should empower the Governor in Council to conform with the policy adopted by the Imperial Parliament to deal with patent rights which alien enemies may have under and by virtue of British Statutes.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amendment, whereupon it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time to-morrow.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill, like the one just passed through Committee, was sent by the Imperial authorities in August to His Excellency the Governor, and repeals all local legislation, and substitutes for it a copy of the Imperial Act with some modifications to suit local requirements. These can be pointed out in Committee. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, was referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

LABRADOR CODFISH BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In moving the second reading of this Bill I wish to point out to hon. members that its object is to appoint a Board for the purpose of fixing the price of fish shipped off the Labrador coast. The first section of the Bill defines the name of the Board; the second makes provision how that Board is to be appointed and who shall compose it. The third provides that if appointments or any of them be not made by the first Monday in July, then upon application to the Supreme Court or a judge of it, such an appointment shall be made within ten days of the application. This is a very necessary provision, because unless the power of this kind were included in the Bill it would be of no value and inoperative. The fourth section makes provision that

the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall be notified of the persons who constitute the Board, and then he causes this to be published in the Royal Gazette, and the publication of the names of the Board in the Gazette shall be conclusive evidence of the appointments under the provisions of the Act. The next section deals with the question when the Board may proceed to fix a fair and reasonable price for cod sold on the Labrador, and as hon. members will see, it is not obligatory on the part of the Board to fix a price within the time limit there specified, viz., two months. They may postpone their action in this respect if it appears desirable and in the public interest, but they cannot postpone it for any later period than the 1st of October. This provision, I think, will commend itself to hon. members, because it may not be in the interest of the trade or the fishermen, that the price be fixed within two months from the date on which the appointments are published in the Gazette, for the reason that the trade conditions or markets may be of such a character that too high a price may be fixed within a period of two months, and therefore by having a provision of this kind, that the time for fixing the price may be postponed until not later than October, when it can be shown that it is in the interest of all concerned that this be done. The next provision deals with the possibility that if the Board do not fix a price (because it may happen that the Board may not fix a price at all) for that purpose we want machinery whereby some procedure may be followed for the purpose of compelling the Board to fix a price, in order that the objects and aims of the introducer of the Bill may be accomplished, and for this purpose, that if the Board does not fix a price, it may be done on application to the Supreme Court or Judge thereof, and by any member of the

Board, or in view of a sale, a person who has sold fish without any specific price having been agreed upon, and within 30 days after application, the Supreme Court or Judge thereof may fix the price by which fish on the Labrador is sold. The next section simply provides the form of procedure, and it is done upon application to the Court on motion before a Judge, either in Chamber or by summons, and the summons shall be served upon the President of the Board of Trade and President of the F.P.U., both of whom are entitled to be present at the hearing (by counsel), but no costs are allowed in connection with the application to the Court. Section 8 gives power to the Supreme Court, when necessary, to appoint counsel to assist in the examination of witnesses and allow proper remuneration therefor, the amount to be paid out of the revenues of the Colony, upon the certificate of the Judge of the Court. It may happen that quite a number of witnesses may be examined as to facts or what is fair and reasonable price for fish, and that would necessarily bring about the introduction of counsel in the matter to have the examination conducted as expeditiously as possible and according to the rules of evidence. For this purpose this section is introduced. It also gives power to enforce the attendance of witnesses and compel them to give evidence, but witnesses attending the Court are not entitled to fees or travelling expenses, must do so at their own cost. If a witness gives false testimony with regard to the subject matter before the Court, it is punishable as a misdemeanour. Section 10 refers to the circumstances under which prices may be fixed. It is only in certain events appearing that this Board shall be called to fix a price for fish, if there is no satisfactory agreement between buyer or seller when a contract is made. If the fisherman on one side and mer-

chant on the other agree to a price, there is no necessity, nor can the Board or Court intervene, but if the price named when the sale takes place is the current price, or if the agreement made is not clear in its terms, then the Board may be called upon to fix the price. The next section deals with the question of a bonus. Hon. members engaged in trade will know, that often men are promised a bonus in addition to the price, and often come to seek for it, but can't get it. In some cases they have to sue for it, and the question of contract, price, bonus and other questions have to be adjudged upon, involving expense and delay. This Section provides that where the agreement is current price for the fish or some such indefinite phrase, and fishermen are promised a bonus in addition, he shall have the right to receive the bonus in addition to the price of the fish fixed by the Committee or Board. The next Section (12) provides that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be notified of the price under the Act, and shall issue a notice to be published in the next issue of the Gazette, and when published to be taken as conclusive evidence of the price fixed by the Board. These are briefly the substance of the provisions of the Bill. Hon. members are, no doubt, fully conversant with the troubles and difficulties with which all persons engaged in the Labrador fishery have to deal with in relation to fish shipped off the Labrador coast. A man goes to a person buying fish and says he has fish to sell. The prospective buyer says: "I will give you the current price," or "as much as another." These are indefinite terms. The parties at the time may have in mind what they mean by current price or as much as the highest price paid, but it is not expressed, and consequently one man has one idea of what is intended to be

meant and the other, the contrary, and the result is trouble and difficulty and litigation. There is no such thing as "current price" in law. You can't interpret clearly what is meant by "as much as the other man" or "the highest price paid." Courts of law cannot determine what is meant by contracts of that kind, and the object of the Bill is to find a remedy in the trouble, and the difficulty which continually arises year after year in carrying on the sale of fish on Labrador. This, I believe, is an honest and sincere attempt to find a way out of the difficulties. A man may sell 39 or 40 quintals fish at "the current price" or "as much as the other man gives," but, in order to find out what the "current price" may be, it might cost the whole of the 40 quintals to do so, and even then no one is satisfied. But when matters of the kind are submitted to a Board, the personnel of which is composed of the Board of Trade, the President of the Union, and if they cannot fix the price a Judge should be called upon to do it, then the object of the Bill will, I feel assured, commend itself to hon. members of the House. Therefore, I beg here to move that the Bill be read a second time.

HON. MR. JOB—This Bill, Mr. President gives us an opportunity of considering what must certainly be designated our most valuable industry. It is an enterprise which cannot be compared with anything else here. In it is involved no imported labor and no great subsidy and when we consider the drawbacks to the people, who go to the Labrador to fish and at a season when ice, fog and snow are their companions; I think contemplation of the industry is a matter that should merit the earnest consideration of these Houses and that we should strive to make the marketing of their produce as simple as

possible. For the last 20 or 30 years I do not think much consideration has been given this industry, but strange to say after so many years it is left to lawyers to bring in such a bill as this and I must say it is a reflection on the trade generally that they had not attended to this duty themselves. Now before I refer to the objects of the Bill, I want to mention the fact that this fishery has fallen to a very low ebb. This great industry that in 1884 was about its heyday exporting no less than 536,000 qtls. direct from the coast, this year is only 91,000 qtls. Now at that time there were regularly 400,000 qtls. exported. The firm of Munn, a single exporting Company in 1882 shipped 128,000 quintals themselves; in 1883 182,000 qtls.; in 1884, 124,000 qtls.; in 1885, 172,000 qtls. besides what was brought home. In other words one firm was responsible for 200,000 qtls. and nowadays not one firm can claim to be exporters of 30,000 qtls., even while last year the biggest Labrador exporter shipped only 20,000 qtls. This is what has happened to the industry and it is hard to find a reason because conditions to-day are far better for everyone engaged than then. Now there is the Marconi, plenty of motor boats, two mail boats, hospital accommodation and better schooners in addition, and last but not least large equipments of twine not to be had in these old days. This last year was not the only year recently when we had such a small fishery. The year before was as bad. About 111,000 qtls. only were exported, a state of affairs which affords people interested in this fishery no satisfaction. Then, again, the price is better now. In 10 years from 1878 to 1889 the price averaged \$3.04 per qtl.; the last ten years current price averaged \$3.50. The weather conditions have partly accounted

for the difference, but only partially because we find unfortunately it has been difficult to get statistics previous to date of Mr. LeMessurier's going to Custom House but since that date most useful information is available. The number of people engaging in the Labrador fishery for 1894 was 14,590 persons as against 10,000 for last year so that there were about 4,000 people less than twenty years ago. People have other avenues of employment, which no doubt took some away, and less men have been available the past two or three years while there is less credit available to-day than ever before in the history of the fishery, for the reason I think that it does not pay to export fish from the coast. It is not a paying venture and older exporters have got out of it. The direct object of the Bill is to protect the fishermen and that is why it is brought in. But I think at the same time that it does not harm the exporter I can see nothing in it to object to and indeed if there was anything in it that would discourage the fisherman or exporter at present it would be bad then to bring in such legislation having in view the low state of the industry. There may be some present who do not realize how this current price is fixed and I will explain it. The seller in exchange for his fish is given a fish receipt, the price being left blank but the words current price being on the receipt and this receipt or blank cheque becomes current coin. There are few people doing business who are not interested in the value of this receipt as it therefore is not only a matter between fishermen and merchant but every small shopkeeper and trader is interested. It is important that this should be made complete instead of which we find that for months the price is unsettled and the people may hold back the

receipt and in fact all the receipts of last year are not disposed of and some are now the subject of annoying litigation. I do not know how this current price has been decided on. One man says the price should be such and such a figure, another man another and the thing is crooked from beginning to end and it is about time that some means of settlement was originated. Another view to take is that it is a most ridiculously one-sided affair for the purchaser to have the settling of the price while the seller has no say. I think that each party should be represented in the fixing of this current price and therefore I think the measure is a good one as far as it goes. But there are difficulties which will be apparent, when it has to be applied, because the fish shipped in the early part of the season may be more valuable, some years and fish shipped in the latter part of the year may be more valuable another season so that it may be necessary to make more than one price in future. I want to make mention of the statement made in the other House that an unfair advantage has been taken by the merchants in fixing this current price. I think the records will prove that such is not the case. If you look at the list of shippers of 10 to 20 years ago and compare them with the list to-day you will find the old shippers not there. The Labrador used to be supplied by Water Street largely, all took an interest in it but now the names are absent from the list of exporters because the losses were more than they could stand. I look to a settlement of the price to help the exporter. We all agree that the man who ships the fish from Labrador should get a commission and he will be able by representation to the Commissioners to claim that a commission is procured and in this way to put a little

life into the fishery. Some say the large supply and demand should settle it. But this is impossible with those far from the haunts of men and the knowledge of markets; therefore some fish will be always shipped at current price.

The question of date is an awkward matter. It was first intended to fix the date earlier in the season and I understand, that some wanted it in July or August. This is absurd. First because the extent of the catch must be considered and the conditions of the market must be known before the price can be arrived at. The personnel of the Board should be beyond suspicion and the fishermen, as well as the shipper, should be well represented in the selection of the Commission. The question of clause 9 is a somewhat serious one. It is the only clause that I can say I have a doubt about. I ask you to imagine three Commissioners being appointed, who are competitors of mine and ask me to expose my private prices. These can call upon a merchant or shipper (it does not matter whether he bought at the current price) he is hauled before the Commissioners his books must be exposed, else he will be penalized for contempt. Whether this can be modified, I do not know, but when the Bill comes to the Committee Stage it should be very carefully considered. I want to say in conclusion if we are going to improve matters on the Labrador, if things are going to be better and fish caught and sold at good prices, the people who know most say that something must be done to improve the cure or else to increase the value of the catch will be futile.

The Iceland people have driven us out of some of the Italian markets on account of our cure. These Commissioners are likely to have a difficult task, but, I think we ought

do all we can to assist them and I propose to heartily support the Bill.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE.—Mr. President, before we pass the second reading of this bill I think we should have some time to consider it, as it is adopting legislation almost unprecedented, viz., the pricing by law of any commodity which should be fixed by supply and demand only. I would, therefore, ask the hon. mover to adjourn the second reading. Surely if, as Hon. Mr. Job states, 550,000 qtls. were shipped from Labrador in 1884, and priced without legislation, there should be no difficulty in pricing the smaller quantities lately shipped from the Labrador Coast—only 91,000 qtls. last year. The bill, in my opinion, is unworkable. It provides for the appointment of two gentlemen to settle a price for Labrador fish shipped off the coast and such price to be fixed not later than 1st October. The one is to be appointed by the President of the Board of Trade, the other by the President of the F.P.U. It provides for no remuneration, and I doubt if any one competent or desirable will accept such a position and be exposed to the dissatisfaction that would exist either from buyer or seller or both. The price for the season is to be settled before 1st October. Now the early shipments generally sell at good price, and the price for the season would no doubt be based on sales effected thus early. No doubt the promoter of this legislation is desirous of protecting the fishermen from what may have been an injustice in the past, but whatever there may have been previously, it is certain that of late years, the fishermen have received full value for Labrador fish shipped off the coast, and I am of opinion that this Bill, if passed, instead of protecting the fishermen's interests, will result in injury to them. What exporter is going to charter ves-

sels to proceed to the Labrador, load late in the season with a knowledge that he has to pay a price probably fixed on a basis of early cargoes sold, and instead of getting off their catch, the fishermen will have to bring it home, and possibly some of them have to leave it on the Labrador for want of tonnage. There are certain foreigners who have of late gone to the Labrador to buy cargoes, but it will be found that fishermen will not sell at any fixed reasonable price, but will insist as at present on current price and a bonus thereon. I am strongly of opinion that this bill—a species of legislation almost unprecedented—should not pass, but will ask the mover to defer the second reading and give it further consideration.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I would move the order stand deferred in order to give hon. members a chance to study the bill.

SAWMILLS BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time, and avail of the opportunity to point out to the House that the last session of the Legislature a law was passed regarding the operation of saw mills on what is called the three mile limit, and under that act free licenses were given to bona fide fishermen who had mills there and cutting not exceeding ten thousand feet per year. Notice of application had to be published in the Royal Gazette for three months and the owner was also required to take out an annual license and the renewal of it was at the discretion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. The license did not confer upon the owner of the mill an exclusive right to the three mile limit, but only a right in common with the public, and the license was subject to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, except that no royalty was paid on the timber manufactured. Of

course there were other mills operating there of greater capacity, and the Act dealt with them. They were contributing nothing to the general revenues of the country, but under the Act passed last year they became subject to the payment of royalty. The number of mills operating was, I think 277, of that number 129 were fishermen's mills, the remainder were of greater capacity. The Act of last year made provision as follows: "The Governor in Council shall have the right to reserve by proclamation in the Royal Gazette such sections or areas of Crown lands as may from time to time in the public interest be deemed expedient, and to prohibit the cutting on such lands for milling purposes, and the penalty for cutting timber on such lands shall be fixed and determined in such proclamation; provided, however, that no such reservation shall be made until public notice has been given to those residing in and near the locality in which the land proposed to be reserved is situated. Mr. Jennings, the member for Twillingate, introduced this Bill in the Lower House and hon. members will see by section six that the object of the bill was to prohibit the cutting of timber on the sections which may be reserved by proclamation of the Governor in Council, but people have been evading the object of that section and have gone in on those reserves and have cut logs and have afterwards taken them to the mills to be sawn into lumber, and thus some areas which have been reserved may be denuded of timber. This bill then is introduced for the purpose of preventing persons from doing so. Now hon. members are no doubt aware that it is a common practice in the country for people to go upon Crown lands and cut large quantities of logs with the object of disposing of them to mill owners or some other person,

and when they have not been able to so dispose of them, the logs are left in the woods to rot and decay, and if some other person finds them and has use for them he cannot take them. This section provides that if any person cutting timber on Crown lands, except, of course, he has a license, to cut, he shall lose the right of property in the logs if they are not removed within a year from time they are cut.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I am not opposing this Bill because I do not understand it, and shall require further explanation. I do not understand section one as it stands, and section two as explained. Section two admits the right of any person to go on Crown lands and cut timber if he takes it away and saws it. I thought there was a very heavy penalty for cutting wood on Crown lands without a license. I do not want to oppose the Bill, but would like some information as to it. I should like, personally, to hear the Minister of Agriculture and Mines on it and if he is not prepared to say anything now, perhaps he could do so when we meet again.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD.—As far as I am concerned at present I know nothing whatever of this Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—Being a private bill it has not had the consideration of the Government, and it is for that reason that I refused to take charge of the bill. I know nothing whatever about it, and I am more in doubt since the explanation of the gentleman in charge of it than I was before, and cannot help thinking that he is misinformed. I therefore think that the suggestion of my hon. friend on my left, that the second reading be deferred is a good one, therefore I would suggest that the gentleman in charge of the bill have it deferred.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I beg to move that the second reading of this bill be deferred.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received messages from the House of Assembly that they had passed the bills entitled respectively, "An Act to Amend the Customs Act, 1898," and "An Act to Amend Act 5, George V., entitled, "An Act to increase the revenue by the Imposition of certain duties on the estates of deceased persons," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop these bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until Monday next at 4.30 o'clock.

MONDAY, April 26th.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

PATENTS AND TRADE MARKS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Patents and Trade Marks Bill was read a third time, passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee on the "Naturalization of Aliens Bill."

Hon. Dr. Skelton took the Chair.

Committee rose and reported that they had passed the Bill without amendment, which report on motion of Hon. Dr. Skelton, Chairman, was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that this Bill be read a third time to-morrow.

LABRADOR CODFISH BILL.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs moved the second reading of the Labrador Codfish Bill.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I want to refer to the very interesting remarks we have had from my hon friend on my left, (Hon. Mr. Job), at our last

meeting, because I think that some deductions which are liable to be drawn from his remarks are perhaps not such as he would wish himself or intend. He quoted Mr. LeMessurier, and I endorse all he said with regard to that gentleman and his statistical work; I wish we had more like him. But, I think the figures quoted by my hon. friend, unless further explained, are liable to give anyone not personally familiar with the conditions a wrong impression about the Labrador fishery. I understood the quotations given to be that in 1884 536,000 qtls. of fish were shipped from the Labrador, and 14,000 people went down there, and that in 1914, 10,500 people went down and we only exported 91,000 qtls., showing a reduction in export of about 400 per cent., and a reduction in number of people of about 30 per cent. Those figures given without explanation appear to me to be liable to an interpretation which I don't think the hon. gentleman meant. Of course, these figures given, 536,000 in 1884 and 91,000 qtls. in 1914, refer to bulk shipments off the Labrador, and the catch for the people going down now and those who went down then does not begin to show any such difference as these figures indicate, that is to suppose that people caught in those days five times as much fish as they do now, is erroneous. I do not mean to say that my hon. friend intimated that, but that was the impression which might be drawn. Of course the business of the Labrador, the method of handling has changed considerably. Instead of fish being sent off in bulk very much of it is now being brought home and cured hard. A great deal more than used to be handled is brought home green and cured and shipped from St. John's in casks. The fact of the matter is that the whole export business here is changed. Instead of

most of the fish going away in bulk the tendency has been in the direction of cask shipments by steamer. Some of this has been due to the direct lines operating here and perhaps even more to the more regular services across the Atlantic via New York and Liverpool which has greatly stimulated cask shipments, and enabled the fish to get across more quickly and helped consumption on the other side. The figures from 1884 do not show either a steady decline in exports or in the number of people going down. For instance in 1884 we had a large export some 14,000 people went down to the Labrador, but it is interesting to note that in 1905 14,000 people went down and in 1906, 16,500; in 1907, 16,700 and in 1909, 14,900. The figures drop then in 1912 and 1913 to nine and ten thousand, and last year 10,500. The decline has not been steady since 1884. It is also worth pointing out that in 1884, 1885 and 1886 the business was a most disastrous one on the Labrador owing to the large catches and the competition of the French, and on the other hand to the local conditions at that time on the coast. It was in fact these large shipments on the Labrador which laid the foundation of the Bank crash in regard to these statistics. I wish therefore, to point out that the inference should not be drawn that the decline has been anything approaching the comparison as given by his figures. What it has been no one knows but nothing approaching that.

Another matter to which he referred and which might conceivably create a wrong impression, different from what he intended, I am sure, is in regard to the fixing of price. He stated that it was totally unfair that the price should be fixed by a combine of persons, representing one side only. The inference should not be

drawn that it was unfairly fixed, and that Labrador fish had been bought at prices far below its value. That, of course, has not been the case. The question has arisen, every year what has always been the highest competition price paid on the Labrador, and that price generally made the current price, has just as often as not been fixed, not by the merchants in St. John's at all but often by foreigners and by shippers outside of St. John's. The fact of the matter as to the price of Labrador fish is that year in and year out the full value has been paid. We know that nearly every firm operating on the Labrador, excluding the Straits, has been either ruined or gone out of the business before they were ruined. Look at the history of Munns, Duder, Tessier's and others. Take the case of my own firm. We were some ten years past, very large exporters, on the whole, year in and year out, but the business was so speculative and uncertain that we ship no fish from Labrador today. If there had been a margin on the average year of 25 cents a qtl. is it likely that we would not be in the business today? From year to year the price paid has been the full average value. I am not criticising my hon. friend's remarks, but only want to correct the impression that it seems to me, might have been created.

In regard to the Board I have not much to say. I am in favour of some such Board of arbitration to fix the price of fish on Labrador, as there is always friction about it, and many times it was either brought before the courts or very nearly so. I think the price of Labrador fish is one that is worthy of being upheld, and I am prepared myself to endorse it. There is one point in the Bill that I think needs serious consideration although I have no alternative to suggest at

present, that is the constitution of the Board. I would like to see some other board appointed rather than the representative of the Board of Trade on one side, and the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union on the other. While the Board of Trade is a recognized body the Fishermen's Union is not an official or a publicly recognized body here, and while to-day it is a very influential body and represents a large number of fishermen there is no guarantee that the Fishermen's Union will so continue, or will not have a split, or as to how long it will last. It is quite possible that it will break into half a dozen unions in the future. It seems to me to be doubtful legislation to put upon the Statute Book of the Colony a permanent act, nominating a private and unofficial body of the nature of the Fishermen's Union as a permanent member of this proposed board. However, the clause in the bill to which I absolutely object is one that my hon. friend has already animadverted upon, that is as to forcing unwilling private persons, under penalty, to give evidence as to their private business, it may be to produce private correspondence, books and papers, before a board of this kind. Disclosures as to methods and customers, as to individual profits and losses, and it is often a more serious matter for a business concern to have to disclose its losses than its profits, are I think quite undesirable. The Board can get its information without any such inquisitorial machinery. When I first learnt of this bill being brought in, I had expected that it was a bill simply designed to arbitrate upon the prices which had been fixed by competition upon the Labrador, and thus to avoid disputes, law suits and delays. I don't believe that it is possible for any Board to name in October or possibly at any time, what is a fair

and reasonable price for Labrador fish. I should not like to be a member of a Board charged with any such duty. Shipments from Labrador vary enormously and often unexpectedly in value. Early fish is often worth a dollar more than later fish, and quite often later fish is worth more than early fish. I think and I rather hope that the effect of the bill if it becomes law, will be to do away with current price altogether, and that receipts will in nearly every case have the price stated definitely, and it is partly because I rather hope this will be the result that I favour the second reading. But to permit a Board such as this to overhaul the affairs of any private concern, it looks surely as unjustifiable.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Mr. President, so many disputes have arisen in connection with prices that the establishment of an arbitration board may be desirable, and to that extent the principle of this bill commends itself. In other respects, however, it is both impolitic and unworkable. That it is the latter is evident from its involved and complicated character. The numerous contingencies in connection with appointments suggest that no appointments may result. To meet the wishes of the fishermen the minimum current price must be known during the season. Under this Act, if all its terms and intentions are carried out, it may be well into November before the decision is arrived at. Incidentally it is difficult to understand how prices can be fixed in July for commodities which depend upon the conditions of four months later. But the most objectionable feature of the bill is found in section 2, which provides that two members of the projected board shall be appointed, one by the Board of Trade President, and the other by the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union. The

Board of Trade has done useful and valuable work since its inception, and has done it in the face of the erroneous, but popular belief that it is dominated by the merchants of Water Street, and its only interests are to protect the interests of the fish trade, in other words that the Board of Trade was a Fish Exporters' Association. Now, we are asked to lend legislative endorsement to a view which is calculated to seriously injure the usefulness of the board, by vesting in its President the appointment of a representative to fix the price of Labrador fish. It is worth remembering also that the President of the Board of Trade may have no interest in or knowledge of the fish industry, and any nomination he would make might be open to the same objection. The more serious objection is to the granting of a right of appointment to the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union. The hon. gentleman, (Mr. Harvey), has said, in effect, that the Fishermen's Union is not a recognized body, that there is no guarantee of its permanence, that it may become disorganized, and split into factions, or separate sections. This may or may not be; though the probability is, that in some shape or form, the union will continue, and, if it were what its name purports, its influence on the fisheries, and on behalf of the fishermen, might be abundant in good. But it must be remembered that in its present form the F.P.U. is primarily a political organization. It is admitted so to be, by its President, who leads a distinct political party in the Assembly. And we are seriously asked in the face of the notoriously partizan character of that organization to give its President, by solemn Act of Parliament, a powerful, if not a controlling influence in the commercial life of the Colony, to place in the hands of one political

party out of three or more such parties, powers which the supreme tribunal might well hesitate before accepting. It is difficult to conceive a proposal more opposed to the principles of democracy and elementary justice. The suggestion that the country's chief industry should be controlled by the leader of a sub-section of the Opposition in the Assembly is so extraordinary and so illogical that the mystery is it should ever have passed the House of Assembly, unless in a facetious mood, or with a feeling that execution elsewhere was assured. As to the Bill itself it cannot in its present form be administered. All it would result in would be the addition of another to the many chapters of inoperative acts now on the statute books. But the limit is reached when it is proposed to endow any political party with perpetual powers. This is a serious matter and not to be lightly regarded. To grant such powers to a political organization is to strike a blow at the constitution, unwritten though that constitution may be. Any such proposal, whether it refer to the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party, the People's Party, the Fishermen's Union Party, or any other party, past, present or to come, calls for condemnation. I shall not, Mr. President, vote against the second reading, as the principle of arbitration commends itself to my judgment, but may find it my duty, if it reaches the committee stage, to propose an amendment to the second section.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—Mr. President, I would suggest that this matter be deferred. We all know that there is a Legislative Committee sitting, and about to make its report with regard to the fisheries, and I think that when that report is received it will no doubt cause a certain amount of legislation which may em-

body the principle of this bill. Under these circumstances, I would ask the gentleman in charge of the bill to defer the matter.

HON. MR. BISHOP—Mr. President this Bill comes before us after having received a great deal of consideration both before its introduction to the House of Assembly and during its passage through the Committee stage in that branch of the Legislature.

If the Bill meets the approval of hon. members here it will mark a distinct departure in legislation in this country, but whether it will prove advanced legislation or retrograde legislation none of us I think can determine, but I anticipate much argument and diversity of opinion upon it.

I am prepared to admit that the settlement of price of fish shipped to market off the Labrador coast is often unsatisfactory and difficult, but I strongly suspect all difficulty and dispute will not be obviated by the passage of this Bill.

A previous speaker already referred to, quoted figures showing the great falling off in the catch and shipment of codfish from Labrador, but I submit that such shortage of shipment has not been occasioned because of difficulty in arranging a settling price, but arose from entirely different causes.

It may be most desirable to have knowledge of what is to be the price which will be paid for coast fish as early as possible in the season, but I do not consider any price difficulty or delay in arriving at it is so vitally important that it calls for legislation, unless it should be to provide for a Committee or Board to decide as suggested by the Hon. Mr. Harvey what is the current price paid upon the coast.

Now, in connection with this Bill there are various matters to be considered, and I should like to be informed what is intended within the meaning of this Act as Labrador. Will it include the whole coast from the Canadian boundary to the most northerly port of shipment? In the absence of any defined area, we must I think, assume that the Straits of Belle Isle is included.

Now, it is known that the shipments from the Straits are usually made early, and before any great portion of the Labrador fish is caught. This Straits fish is almost invariably profitable to the shipper. Let us suppose then that a steamship is dispatched from Blanc Sablon or Bonne Esperance in July, and the markets are found quite good, but later in the season, because of a very large catch or other causes, markets are bad and the Board when called up to fix a price find they must name a comparatively low price, why should that low price apply to fish which has been sold long before and realized it may be exceptionally high prices?

The Labrador fishery will not be stimulated by the passing of this Bill and it is quite probable that it may result in great disadvantages and loss.

The provision in this Bill for securing a Board is peculiar and it may be found that a Judge of the Supreme Court must be called upon to lay down a price at which buyers of Labrador fish must settle. Could anything be more absurd than an appeal to our Supreme Court to fix the sale price of codfish?

Everybody knows that the all important matter in connection with the Labrador fishery is to improve the cure. Will the provisions in this Bill tend to improve the cure? No Sir, but the tendency will be the other way.

for it decides that all fish shipped off the coast must be at the same price no matter what its quality, and it will destroy the chance of a man with exceptionally good fish getting more than his neighbor who has bad fish.

Now section 10 of the bill may be quoted as preventing this unfairness, but I submit it does not, for the man with inferior or badly cured fish will not fix a price with the buyer, it will be to his interest not to do so, and self interest influences most people whether they be buyers or sellers. A lower price for inferior cure is the only incentive for improvement of cure. I contend, Mr. President, that under the existing conditions when we have frequent communication with the Labrador Coast by steamer, and to most of the important shipping harbours by telegraph, the fixing of a price for the whole season is an absurdity and destructive of competition. Let us suppose that the Board meets and fixes a price which is proclaimed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the Royal Gazette, but cash buyers desirous of getting fish offer a higher price and pay a higher price, in what way will the bill afford protection to the fishermen who cannot put off their fish to such cash buyers, and what will happen? Will the promoters of this bill find that several cargoes of fish have been purchased at prices beyond that fixed by the board, stand by the board and insist that all must abide by the fixed prices, even though their neighbors received more?

But suppose again that being aware of the fixed price and their neighbors getting more they refuse to ship to the vessels provided to take their fish, with the result that the vessels are recalled and the people left with no means of getting their fish to market. What then will be the advantage of

your legislation? The last state of such men will be worse than the first.

We notice, too, that the members of the board must act without pay. I doubt, Mr. President, if the President of the Board of Trade will find it easy to secure his nominee. The President of the F.P.U. will, of course, have no difficulty in that respect, but I find nothing in the bill compelling any person appointed by a Judge of the Supreme Court to act; therefore should that happen there could be no board, and the price of Labrador codfish will have to be considered and settled between the buyers and sellers, which is the only sensible and proper course. Failing to get a board of three appointed there will be no board, and consequently no person to apply to the Supreme Court. This is surprising when we remember by whom the Bill has been introduced, for surely we might expect any legislation emanating from that source would be unmistakably clear and free of ambiguity.

I am not going to vote against the bill, nor am I considering the proposal of any amendments, but I repeat it is extraordinary legislation, and I believe it will be found unworkable.

HON. MR. WINTER—Mr. President I should like to make a few remarks on this Bill. I consider the Bill a very dangerous and undesirable one, and I believe we would have heard nothing about it, but for the fact that last year the shipments from Labrador turned out profitable to the shipper. For the last eight or ten years, with perhaps one exception, shipments from the Labrador have proved unprofitable to shippers, and while such was the case there was found to be no need for this legislation. Last year the shippers made a good profit and they were entitled to it, for a great many of them required

it to offset the losses of previous years, and now there has arisen a need for this legislation. It may be of interest to some of the members of this House to know how the current price was arrived at last year. In October when the shipments were about to be made from the Labrador, a telegram was received by the Minister of Marine & Fisheries from a fisherman on the Labrador saying they would refuse to sell their fish unless they received \$4.75 a quintal. The Minister of Marine & Fisheries called a meeting of the Labrador Fish Exporters, produced the telegram and asked what answer he would give. The meeting discussed the matter, and the price that the majority of those present were prepared to give, at that time, was \$3.60. At that time I may say the war was on, there was no such thing as foreign exchange, and it was impossible to sell fish in the foreign market, we could not sell to Italy, Greece, Spain or Portugal, the markets to which we usually send our Labrador fish. Under these circumstances it was almost impossible to mention a fair and equitable price. It is impossible for anyone to put a fair price on an article which he is unable to sell or get an offer for. Many did not know at that time whether the fish would be worth 2, 3, 4 or 5 dollars whether, in fact, it would be worth anything at all. Many thought \$3 would be the figure it would be the wisest to offer, while others would be willing to take the risk of giving a little more. I may say it was running a great risk, it was impossible to sell or know what you were going to get for it, and \$3.60 was assented to by most of those present. There was no agreement, but it was understood we were all willing to give \$3.60 and no more. The Minister of Marine & Fisheries telegraphed that the price for

fish shipped off the coast was \$3.60 per quintal, and after some delay that price was accepted by the fishermen, and it was shipped in the usual way. I may observe here that while fish was being shipped off the Labrador at \$3.60, very large quantities were coming into St. John's and selling at \$3.50, (and more than that, I believe more fish was sold in St. John's than was shipped off the Labrador altogether at \$3.60.) Anyone who understands shipping fish off the Labrador will know that fish shipped from there at \$3.60 is equivalent to \$4.00, because it costs 40 cents or more to bring it to St. John's, therefore, those who sold in St. John's sold for from 40 cents to 50 cents less than those who shipped off Labrador. For the shippers off Labrador in sailing vessels, I believe there was a difference of from \$1 to \$2 per quintal between what was shipped from St. John's in cask and what was sent in sailing vessels from Labrador. As I have said before, the impression got out here among the fishermen that shippers here made more than a legitimate profit, and they think this has been going on year after year. The Bill as the Hon. gentleman on my right has stated is a dangerous one, and most undesirable, and so far from having a good effect, I believe it will have a contrary effect. Some of the provisions in the Bill are outrageous, some are ridiculous. A section here provides that a Board shall be appointed to put a price on the fish. Looking at it casually one might say it is very reasonable, and as far as the fishermen are concerned it is very reasonable, but what about the shippers? The President of the Board of Trade may or may not be competent to appoint a good man, and the man so appointed may not fully represent the Labrador interests. Why not the shippers from the Labrador

appoint a man? The fishermen are represented on the Committee but evidently the shippers are not entitled to consideration at all. Section 5 provides that the Board or a majority thereof must fix a price and that within two months after its publication in the Royal Gazette. This is in my opinion an utter impossibility. You are asked to fix a fair and reasonable price by the 1st of October before you have any idea what it will sell for in the foreign markets. The sailing vessels usually leave Labrador about the 15th or 20th of September, last year they left about the middle of October, and it was not known what their cargoes would sell for until they arrived over, which was sometime in November. How can you fix a price in October for shipments if you do not know what you will get for them until the middle of November. Whoever framed the Bill did not know much about the mode of shipping fish from Labrador, or the mode of getting paid for it. Suppose for the sake of argument that the first one or two cargoes get away early, the chances are that you will get a good price for these, but everybody knows that when the markets get supplied, the prices begin to drop, and when they do it is impossible to say where they will stop. You must wait till the bulk of the fish is marketed, otherwise you cannot put a fair and reasonable price on the fish. If this Board does not act, you can appeal to the Supreme Court and the judges of this tribunal are asked to put a price on Labrador codfish. I do not know how they will look at it, or what they will think of it, but I think they will not care about acting. I think the Judges of the Supreme Court are about as competent to fix the price of fish as I would be to interpret some knotty legal problem in international law. The whole Bill is objectionable

and ludicrous from beginning to end and I cannot but feel that this Bill (if such event will occur) will have a very bad effect on the business of the country. As to whether the Labrador shippers in the past have been getting larger profits than they were entitled to does not demand much explanation. For the past thirty or forty years the business has been so bad that all the men who had been in it either failed or went out of business, while those in business at present are younger business men mostly, and it is my opinion, after a few years more experience, that these will be likely also to drop out. As far as the business people in St. John's are concerned they have little interest in the Labrador fishery. Many years ago, as Hon. Mr. Harvey has stated, a few of our merchants carried on considerable business on Labrador, but they found it unprofitable and dropped out. This shows that the merchants have been paying the fishermen more for their fish than it was worth, and if such is the case what is the necessity for this Bill? If the method we have has worked fairly well during the past 30 or 40 years, why should it not continue? It is a very difficult matter to arrange a price that will in all cases give satisfaction, but the shippers have been the sufferers in the past, not the fishermen. The whole thing has been conceived in the interest of one class and it strikes me forcibly that we have seen too much of this class legislation. It seems to me that persons can bring in any sort of Bill, no matter how outrageous and put it through the Lower House provided it benefits a certain class, and it were better that we in this Chamber should watch closer the legislation coming up here for our endorsement, and see that nothing is rushed through unduly and without proper consideration. When

the Bill goes into Committee I may have more to say.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN.—Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks in connection with the Bill now before the House, and might say that its passing would only injure all concerned and aggravate present conditions and make matters worse than they really are.

No matter what the object of the Bill might be it can do nothing better than trip up a law abiding people, who are anxious to keep the peace, and whose purpose is to be equitable and just.

I look upon the Bill, Sir, as nothing short of an attempt to fool the people, which, unfortunately, has been the case of previous fishery rules.

We would all like to see a law on the Statutes to regulate the price of fish, if such were workable, but is not within the powers or means of any person or persons to fix the price of this article when we realize that every food commodity is regulated in price by the law of supply and demand.

It would be just as reasonable, Sir, to appoint a board to fix the price of foodstuffs in the different stores of the country and surely this House would not consider such a Bill emanating from a sane mind.

You will observe, Sir, that the Bill before the House only attempts to fix the price of fish shipped from the Labrador coast but in no way refers to the Labrador fish that is brought from the coast and sold in St. John's and elsewhere, where very often it is sold for 25 cents or fifty cents per quintal less than that paid for it on the coast.

Last year the price of Labrador fish offered on the coast was \$3.60 per qtl. which was accepted and besides this the buyers in most cases had to pay freight to collect and insurances while abroad, collection and other incidental

expenses bringing the cost of the article up to between \$4.25 and \$4.40 per qtl. while at the same time the same quality fish was brought to St. John's and sold to buyers here at from \$3.25 and \$3.50 and some of the buyers only bought it for \$3.50 but sold it again at the same price as will be seen when the case now threatened comes before the Courts.

Apparently according to the Bill all the merchants buying fish and shipping it off the coast are considered unfair and the merchant who buys it in St. John's at much less cost is alright.

The people are always crying out about the treatment they receive on the Labrador coast and then come to St. John's and sell their catch for \$3.25 and \$3.50. This was the cause of one fisherman last year to my own knowledge who, after refusing to sell at Labrador for \$3.60 came to St. John's and after walking about the street for several days trying to sell his fish came to me and said he was only able to get \$3.50. I also understand that some men took their fish home again not being able to find a purchaser.

All the trouble is with the man who purchases off the coast, nor is there anything about fish being purchased at \$4.00 in the Straits for which a better price can be obtained being in the market earlier than that bought on the Labrador coast.

All that the Bill shows is the unfairness of certain people in criticizing the Labrador buyer only off the coast and it is not the wish of the fishermen themselves.

I repeat here, Mr. President, that the Bill is not the work of the fishermen of this country, and should it pass this House it will be unworkable and unfair, and one of the most unsatisfactory bills that ever was placed on the Statute Book.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I beg to move that the second reading be proceed-

ed with, and that the Bill be referred to the Committee stage, until such time (as Mr. Goodridge has asked,) that the report of the Commission reaches us, and which I understand will be tabled shortly. I therefore ask, if the Hon. gentleman has no objection, that the Bill be now read a second time, and that the further hearing be deferred until that report comes in.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—While I am strongly opposed to the principle of the bill, it is not my desire to ignore the wishes of the Lower House, and I therefore beg to withdraw my motion.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs, the Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday. All the other items on the order paper were, on motion, deferred.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Before the motion for adjournment is put I would wish to suggest that as the Newfoundland Products Bill debate in the Lower House is set for Wednesday afternoon, and as it seems the Bill as foreshadowed is a most important one, and as we will not have the published reports of proceedings for weeks to come, I would suggest that no sitting of this House be held on Wednesday, so that those of us who may care to attend at the Lower House that afternoon, to hear the discussion, pro and con, may do so, so that we may have an intelligent understanding of its provisions when it reaches this House, and I would suggest that the House adjourn until Thursday.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till Thursday at 4.30 p.m.

THURSDAY, April 29th, 1915.

The Council met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Naturalization of Aliens Bill was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs motion for committee on the Labrador Codfish Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop second reading of Saw Mills Bill was deferred.

CUSTOMS AMENDMENT BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP—In moving the second reading of this bill I would say that the purport of the bill is to facilitate the handling and delivery of goods arriving at the principal piers. It is found that considerable trouble arises and delay is experienced in delivering because of overlapping of cargoes from time to time, and is occasioned frequently by consignees neglecting to have the goods removed within reasonable time. Those who are anxious to get their goods and who require them hurriedly are often prevented from this cause. Their goods are found stowed away under goods of other people who do not require them so quickly, and much confusion and sometimes difficulty arises from this cause. This is the object of the Bill and it is framed with the object, as I have said of permitting such goods as I have referred to being removed to another sufferance warehouse and held there under Government control and authority until they may be passed for by the consignees. It also provides that the expenses necessarily incurred shall be a charge against the owner of the goods.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Before the bill is read a second time I want to say a few words on it. In section 6 it provides eight days for the removal of the goods. It is a pity that was not made seven days for this reason, namely that in the case of

the New York steamers they run every seven days and in order to do the work of the town properly one cargo ought to be out of the way before another arrives; otherwise when a lot of freight previously shipped is left in the steamship premises it is apt to make difficulty for the rest of the season, owing to goods getting blocked. However this matter has been thoroughly thrashed out in the Lower House and I am not going to raise any objection, more especially as my objection would be put down to interested motives, but I would say that in New York and Liverpool the time allowed for the removal of goods is respectively two, or three days as against eight days down here as now proposed. What I want more particularly to draw the attention of the House to is the question of wharfage as it has been publicly stated in the Lower House, that wharfage under the present law cannot be legally collected; indeed it was stated that the trade should take the position of refusing to pay wharfage, and at the risk of being told that I am using my position in the House for private purposes. I want to say that that law ought to be amended so as not to allow this. Anyone who knows anything about the matter must know that it is absolutely impossible to provide steamship sheds and keep them up without charging wharfage. While the new plea may be correct, no good can be gained by taking such a position, and I submit it is unreasonable to expect that concerns can keep large sheds etc., without being able to charge wharfage. I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill that it might be well to change the section which precludes the charging of wharfage and amending it so that wharfage might be charged for it has got to be charged whether legally or illegally and if this section is passed it will simply mean that the wharfage

will be added to the freight. The Bill in the main is on the right lines. It is time that something was done here.

HON. MR. J. D. RYAN—There is another matter in connection with this that appears to have been lost sight of. While some owners of premises take the goods and put those for each consignee together when landed, others do not, and when one sends down for say a hundred packages of goods the man may see one in one part of the shed, but cannot find any more, and the people in the shed cannot give any information. Now if these people would do as others do in other premises and put those for one firm together there would be less fear of having them stay over for some time. Of course some people leave their goods there and take up the room required for those who have charge of the premises. If they would put sufficient labour there and put goods in particular spots of the sheds then there would be no difficulty in getting them away. I know the public is often inconvenienced by that particular matter, and hope that it will not be lost sight of. I have been told and believe it is the case that the reason is that the steamship agents will not pay for the labour required to remove them. I hope that when more expense is put on that will be looked after. There is one premises here when goods come in they are looked after, and all for one consignee are put separate, but they do not all do that.

The Bill was read a second time, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop was ordered to be sent to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

DEATH DUTIES BILL.

HON. R. K. BISHOP—In moving the second reading of this bill I do not know that much is required to be said in respect to it. Every member understands the meaning of the

Bill. It is of course a Bill for providing revenue, and until the present time nothing was exacted from the estate of deceased persons, excepting the usual charge for probating wills. It provides that the full estate of a deceased person shall be chargeable with certain fees, and refers not only to individuals but to companies. The Bill I assume, is in fairly good shape and has passed the Lower House after a great deal of criticism. I beg to move the second reading.

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

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned until Tuesday next at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

TUESDAY, May 4th.

The Council met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the second reading of the Labrador Fisheries Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the second reading of the Saw Mills Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Committee stage of the Customs Act Bill was deferred.

DEATH DUTIES BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Death Duties Bill.

Hon. Mr. Anderson took the chair of Committee.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Might I ask the gentleman in charge of this Bill what is the object of all these provisions. I understood originally that the Bill was introduced to make provision for remedying the Bill of last year, curing a defect in that measure, whereby the estates of parties who die shall be held to include any bequest or provision in the nature of a disposition of his property unless made within two years of his death.

But there are seven clauses here, and personally I should like to know why all these various matters are included, and what is to be the effect of this Bill in supplementing the present Death Duties Bill. Also whether it is intended that estates that have come under the notice of the Treasury since September last are included. In other words, whether it is retrospective in its action.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —

Section 1 of the 1914 Estates Duties Act imposes a tax on the estates of deceased persons. This Bill enlarges and defines in part the word 'Estate' and provides that it shall include seven classes of property, enumerated in sub-sections (a) to (g) of section 1 of this bill.

Sub-section (a) is the general and broad provision: All property in this Colony of whatsoever description. Sub-section (b) includes a "donatio mortis causa," which is a gift of personal property made by one who apprehends that he is in peril of death. Sub-section (c) includes a "donatio inter vivos" unless the gift was made at least two years before death. The object of this is to prevent people from evading the estate duty by disposing of their property by gift during their lifetime and within two years of death. A donatio mortis causa is given in the immediate fear of death. The donatio inter vivos would, if it were intended for the purpose of evading the Act, be in the fear of death, but not in the immediate fear of death. These sections are very clear.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Yes, clear to a lawyer, perhaps. There are one or two additional questions which I would like to ask the Attorney General. Is this Act retrospective? Does it apply to all estates in respect of which letters of probate or administration have been issued since the

passing of the War Session Act.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — It is not retrospective. It comes into effect on receiving the sanction of His Excellency the Governor, and does not affect prior probates or administrations.

HON. MR. McGRATH—In sub-section (c) the time limit is two years before death. In sub-section (f) it is one year. Why the difference?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — I know of no reason why it should be two years in one case and one year in the other. So far as the principle of the matter is concerned there is no reason for any difference. The distinction is purely arbitrary. The Bill as it came from the hands of the Solicitor of the House of Assembly read one year in each case. As we have it before us, it is two years on one section and one in the other. It might reasonably be two in both, or one in both, or as it is.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I think it ought to be made uniform.

HON. MR. KNOWLING—Is not this a money Bill. If so, we cannot amend it.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It certainly is a money Bill. I would move that the Committee rise and report progress. In the meantime Mr. McGrath's suggestion might be considered.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would also point out that Banks should be included within the scope of this Act as well as Companies. The Canadian Government requires Banks to give a statement of amounts on deposit by persons deceased whose estates are being probated. There may be parties here who have money in the Banks, and when they died their executors may not know it.

Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received a message from

the House of Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively, the Seal Fishery and the Act relating to the Employment of men engaged in Logging, in which they ask the concurrence of the Council.

SEAL FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Seal Fishery Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

LOGGING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill relating to the Employment of men engaged in Logging was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a communication from Mrs. John Ayre thanking the Council for the resolutions of condolence presented by the Chamber relative to the death of her late husband.

HON. MR. BISHOP tabled the first Report of the International Grenfell Association. On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till Thursday next at 4.30 p.m.

THURSDAY, May 6th.

The House opened at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion Committee on Labrador Codfish Bill and second reading of the Saw Mills Bill were deferred.

CUSTOMS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Customs Amendment Bill.

Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

DEATH DUTIES BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill. Hon. Dr. Skelton

taking the Chair of Committee.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This is the well known hardy annual coming up to us again. The Bill, or the first section of it, arises out of the report of the Commission appointed to consider matters relating to the sealing voyage. The latter part of the Bill does not arise out of that report, but embodies the views of members of the Lower House which moved amendments and they now come before us in their present shape for consideration of this Chamber. I beg to move the second reading.

HON. MR. JOB—In reference to this Bill I would point out that there are several very good clauses, but there are some which show the matter has not been considered from the viewpoint of the owner or the industry itself. In fact, Sir, I think some clauses are calculated to make the industry well nigh impossible. I do not think it was the intention of those who brought in this Bill to make this difficulty, and I am sure the most humble sealer in the Island would not like to have seen some of the clauses before us today. Nobody can benefit by the crippling of this industry, and in case it is retarded in any way we all will suffer. Now those of us who can recall the legislation of the past two years on this subject must admit that the owners have made an effort to meet the demands made upon them, and that they have all been met in a liberal spirit, and the extra expenditure incurred has been ungrudgingly agreed to. I would point out, Sir, that in 1906 there were 25 steamers employing 4100 men at the fishery, and this year we had only 13 steamers and

about 2900 men. Furthermore it looks to me as if this number of steamers would be still further reduced, so that this is not the time to give any great discouragement to the industry. In 1897 there were about 4600 men employed in consequence of the larger crews carried then, and it is to be deplored that now less than 3000 have a chance of a berth. These steel steamers cost a lot of money, and when one or two of them drop out it may not be very easy to replace them, and therefore we should act with great caution in passing legislation that will drive them out of the business. There is another point that should not be lost sight of. These steamers are not only realers but are used for the general trade of the port, employing firemen and seamen, and working in the foreign trade which is likely to encourage business with the countries they go to, and therefore it should be the pride of everybody in Newfoundland to see these steamers increasing, and make St. John's instead of a port of small sailing vessels as in the past, one of steamers. Capital is elusive and we all know that it takes very little to discourage people from putting money in an industry of this sort. Now, Sir, the objectionable part of this Bill is the making the owner responsible for acts of men over whom he has no control. That refers specially to clause 11 and 12. Clause 11 is specially unsuitable, to put it mildly. The owner is to be fined five thousand dollars if one young hood is put over the side of the ship. Now, Sir, we can imagine 270 men in a steamer coming in, and in the rush and bustle of discharge ten young hoods being landed on the wharf without anybody being the wiser. The Captain may not have been able to check the thing himself, and they might have been brought on board malletously. Now I think the

owner ought to be blamed if he encouraged the taking of those hoods but not otherwise. The hoods ought to be confiscated, but to fine him five thousand dollars because some man chooses to bring in a hood seal is not fair play.

I am not going to refer to this Bill at length because we shall have a chance in committee to discuss it, but I would like to say that I believe in the first two clauses, the second especially. It is one that has always appealed to me and to the people interested in the industry, and I hope there will not be any doubt about that clause when we come to the committee stage. As I know the Hon. Mr. Harvey is going to refer to clause 5 and 7 I shall have nothing more to say at present.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I do not want to detain the House much on this Bill. The Bill has in detail a number of objectionable features such as we always set our faces against in this Council, and which I have not the least doubt will receive amendment here, and I have no doubt the principles under which these minor amendments are made will commend themselves to the justice of members of the other branch. I refer to clauses providing fines recoverable by any person who may sue for the same without discretion. Then again take section 12 which my hon. friend has referred to. It is conceivable that a dishonest man on board a ship might bring on board that ship a few young hoods and how in the world can the master ever know, and his reward for doing such a thing and breaking the law would be that he could recover from the owners five thousand dollars. Of course such a position is simply monstrous, and I have no doubt when pointed out to the other branch of the legislature they will agree with this Council that any such

provision as that requires modification, to say the least. A number of the clauses require changes in detail and verbiage on these lines. Section 14 does not say who is to pay the fees required by that section. I have not the faintest idea who is to pay them. As regards the fees to be paid by second hand, and master watches and masters I do not quite see myself how that stands. The section to which I would more particularly call the attention of the house is number five. This section provides for compensation in case of injury or death. As it stands in my opinion the section will require complete alteration. It is the most important section in the bill. The principle of it has of course been recommended by the Commission consisting of the Supreme Court Judges who sat upon the sad case of the Newfoundland, and it is far from my wish to do anything to prevent men being properly protected, but this clause as it stands is not a protecting clause to me at all. To begin with it vitiates every principle of insurance. It calls upon the owners of the ship to pay one thousand dollars for every man who has been out after dark and loses his life, and provides for compensation to be paid by the ship. Now take the case of the Newfoundland herself. It may be known to members of this House that the Newfoundland has just been sold for \$4,000. There were 78 men who met their death in the Newfoundland case and this Bill calls for the payment of one thousand dollars for each man besides payment for injuries. In other words, \$78,000 would have to be paid by a ship which has just been sold for \$4,000. Now that obviously defeats the objects of those who brought this section in. I consider, apart from that, that the entire onus of insurance cannot be fairly put on the ships. It is a risk absolutely impos-

ible for them to take. The ships can only do it by getting an insurance company to take the risk. There is not a ship that dare go out with such a liability not covered by insurance. I am not prepared here to suggest anything, but I think an amendment is required by which insurance companies shall be held liable for the death and not a ship which may not be worth sufficient to pay the losses, and which may be unable to prosecute the sealfishery with such a danger hanging over her head. Why should we limit the insurance for such accidents and deaths which might occur only after dark? This can be done away with by changing this clause in such a way that a regular and proper insurance be taken out by every one of these men. I do not think it quite reasonable that the ship should have to pay the entire cost of insurance for all these men. They can probably afford and be quite willing to pay a substantial part of the premium, but to pay all I do not think it fair. Whether the Colony pays part which I think perhaps the best way, or whether the men do, I think a substantial portion of the premiums should be paid by the men or on their account and not all of it by the owners of the steamer, which, as my hon. friend pointed out are going out of this business fast enough. In any case the protection of the men is not covered by that clause as it stands, and however it may be altered it ought not to stand in such a way that the insurance is not good. The first principle is to see that a company bound in insurance is able to pay the losses. In this case no guarantee whatever is given. In the case of the wooden ships, there certainly will not be enough money forthcoming to pay any large number of claims.

HON. MR. ANGEL—Before passing this Bill, I think that by the time we

have altered the bill and amended it, and some of the clauses have to be seriously amended, it seems to me that it will be impossible to make it workable or satisfactory for the men themselves, for the steamer owners, for the general public or anyone else. It seems to me that we are going to legislate the sealfishery out of existence as far as Newfoundland is concerned. But what about the steamers sailing from the jurisdiction of other countries, the Norwegian steamers, for instance? They adopt different methods than we do; the men supply labour, and the owners of the ship and the men are paid \$15 a month and get a certain share of the seals. There is no law in connection with the sealfishery pertaining to these vessels at all; they are perfectly free to prosecute the fishery in whatever way they choose. If we pass this Bill now before us, we are simply legislating to put Newfoundlanders out of the sealfishery altogether. Sydney and other Nova Scotian ports have the same opportunities of prosecuting this fishery as we have, and ships can go from port to port and prosecute the fishery without such disabilities as we labour under here. They have no such laws by which steamers are made liable for large amounts. They have no laws in relation to the food which shall be supplied on board the ship, nor do they require to have the Marconi system on board so that they can prosecute the fishery for very much less than we can. It seems to me from past experience, that the Bill which it is now proposed to put on the Statute Book will have the effect of putting an end to the sealfishery of this country and I would have no hesitation in throwing out the Bill.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I do not intend, Mr. President, that my remarks should be lengthy, but I would

say that I hope hon. gentlemen who have advocated the rejection of this measure will reconsider such an idea. The major portion of this Bill comes to the Legislature with the endorsement of the judges of the Supreme Court, who in their capacity of Commissioners to investigate the sealing disasters of last year, made recommendations, now embodied in this Bill, tending to lessen the risks our sealers have to face while engaged in that pursuit. For instance, section 5, to which Hon. Mr. Harvey has referred, is I think printed in this Bill, exactly as drawn up by the judges; and that being so, I think for this House to reject the measure would be to put itself in an exceedingly false position before the country. I do not say that the Bill does not require amendment, but I do assert, without any qualification, that so far from any proposal to amend the sections providing protection of the lives of the sealing crews, I would be sorry to see any amendment even suggested. It is all very well to say capital must be protected and that established industries must be safeguarded, but I maintain that even standing above all of them, must be more than either of these things, protection of lives. It is barely a year ago since 250 men engaged in that industry were swept into the other world in a twinkling of an eye. When the country recovered from the sense of horror with which it was stricken by the disaster, there was a universal demand that steps should be taken to avert as far as possible, similar calamities in the future. I do not say that any human provision could prevent such a catastrophe as the loss of the Southern Cross involved. As all hands perished with the ship it is impossible to know under what conditions she went down, but if we put her case aside, there remains the case

of the Newfoundland's crew and the evidence in that case has been taken at great length and given wide publicity, and every man can form his own conclusions. Not all will agree in these conclusions, for even the judges themselves differed, but few will question that if all the sealing steamers had been compelled to provide wireless equipments there would have been no tragedy in that case. Those who go down to the sea in ships have to encounter perils so varied and extreme that we cannot give them too much protection, and while I would not have it supposed for a moment that I imply that any member of this House is less willing or desirous to see such protection afforded than I am, I would emphasize that where Commissioners of the experience and standing of the judges of the Supreme Court have put it on record that in their opinion certain reforms are desirable to safeguard the lives and the health of the men engaged in the industry, the members of this House should be the last to raise any question as to the propriety of enacting these recommendations into law. I can quite understand the view point of those who may fear that too drastic legislation may drive the industry from our shores, but I do not think that even the suggestion that such is possible should influence us to abate one jot any measures which are thought to be essential for the saving of life and protecting the health of the sealing crews. I quite agree that we should not impose too heavy financial burdens on those who own sealing steamers, because I freely admit that from all the evidence available, it does not appear that the venture is any bonanza, especially of late years. At the same time, the judges, after having considered the whole problem, recommended that the provisions of the Workman's

Compensation Act be extended to cover this industry, which means, in other words, that the owners of the ships are liable for the death or injury of the crews in certain contingencies and up to the extent of \$1,000 per man. It is represented here that this is the tax which it is impossible for the owners to bear. That may be so, but I would point out that, alternatively, the judges provide in another section that this provision shall not apply where the Government are satisfied that the owners and the crews have agreed to an insurance scheme whereby the same result is effected. As against this it is argued that even the insurance ought not to be a tax solely on the ship-owners, and this contention is put forward with much strength and with no small show of reason. If hon. gentlemen feel that the burden is too heavy, I think steps may be taken, if this Bill is sent to a Select Committee, whereby some other compromise can be reached, as I am sure nobody aims to ruin the industry or drive it from our Colony, and that any reasonable representations from the capitalists interested in the industry, will receive the very best considerations.

Having said this much with regard to the Bill in its more important aspect, I would express my concurrence with those speakers who have preceded me, who have claimed that the rest of the Bill calls for radical amendments. Section 10 gives certain bonuses to the cooks, and if the cooks are to get bonuses why should not the firemen and engineers also. To fine a ship \$5,000 because a hood seal is brought in, seems absurd, and I suggest that possibly it may be that \$50 was intended, and that it is a mistake in printing. One or two dissatisfied men could always put a few hoods aboard a ship after night

and thus break the law, and they could collect the fine when the cargo was brought in and the seals were found. The proposal that no hood seals be killed for three years comes from the Legislative Commission on Fisheries, but the Commission never fathered the imposition of a \$5,000 fine. The provision that no seals be killed by the crews of wooden steamers after April 15 also comes from the Legislative Commission on Fisheries, and while I do not say that the killing of one seal after that date would call for exemplary punishment, I do assert that where a flagrant violation of the law results, the fine should be the same as that imposed for killing before the 13th of March. Section 13 also is from the Commission. It did not provide, however, that there should be only fifteen rifles aboard any wooden ships, but that not more than fifteen should be used on any given day, it being contemplated that a few others might be taken in case some got out of order. Provision for a board of examiners is desirable enough in its way, and the final clause which enables ships to return and land part of their crews and then resume the voyage is one that was rejected last year, but that is met again, and apparently is regarded as a settlement of a question that is becoming an increasingly difficult one to deal with.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—It is not my intention to weary the House with any lengthy remarks, but I desire to ask the hon. member who represents the Government in this Chamber, whether there has been any correspondence or communication with the Government at Ottawa, with reference to the Sealing question. The reason for the question will be obvious to every member.

HON. MR. BISHOP—In answer, if I understand the hon. gentleman

right, there has been no communication with Ottawa respecting the Bill or any of its provisions.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the second reading of the Loggers Bill was deferred.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I beg to present two petitions from the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., and the A. E. Reed Co. on the subject of the Loggers Bill, and request that they be laid on the table of the House and read to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I give notice that I will, on to-morrow, ask the leader of the Government for particulars of payments made under the Saw Mills Act of 1914.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Administration of Local Affairs Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop laid on the table of the House the report of the Postmaster-General for the year ending June 30th, 1914.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until 4.30 p.m. to-morrow.

Friday, May 7th, 1915.

The Council met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. Mr. Harvey to ask the Hon. leader of the Government for particulars of payments made under the Saw Mills Act of 1914.

HON. MR. BISHOP tabled a reply to this question.

DEATH DUTIES BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop this Bill was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the

Assembly with a message to the effect that this House had passed the same without Amendment.

SEALING BILL.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs moved the House into Committee on this Bill, Hon. J. D. Ryan taking the chair of the Committee.

HON. JOHN HARVEY—I would suggest to the consideration of this House the desirability of this Committee nominating a special committee to go through this Bill. A number of detailed alterations which would take a long time for the general committee to deal with have unquestionably got to be made and I think the matter could be more expeditiously dealt with by a select committee, and I beg to move that a select committee be appointed to deal with this Bill and report say within four days.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would suggest that we might improve on that amendment by having a Joint Committee of both Houses. Our difficulty here is that we are not more familiar with the details of this measure, nor do we know much about it except that some of the paragraphs embody the suggestions of the Judges of the Supreme Court. The Bill it is quite evident from what was said yesterday, is regarded as of very serious moment by influential elements in this community, and it seems to me it would be desirable to secure uniformity of action by both houses. If a Joint Committee were appointed, a bill ought to be evolved within a reasonable time which could be got through both houses with comparatively no difficulty. As it is now, if we sent this bill to a Select Committee, changes may be made that will not be acceptable

* to the lower chamber, and this would cause further delay whereas if we had a Joint Committee we could have this Bill put in such shape right away as it would make it acceptable to all.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—With regard to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. McGrath, I would suggest to the mover instead of four days he should make it forty days.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I am rather afraid when we consider that this Bill has already been passed by a Committee of the other House that when it comes before the Joint Committee named by the Hon. gentleman, if such a committee be appointed and they were unable to agree, we would be in a worse position. It seems to me the consideration of the House should be given to the Bill as it stands. I think something could be arrived at better by the appointment of a Select Committee as named by Hon. Mr. Harvey. Not much time can be lost by not reporting till Wednesday, as we are not likely to meet more than one day in between.

The Committee rose and reported that the Bill had been referred to a Select Committee.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ryan the report was read.

Hon. Mr. President appointed the following to the Select Committee: Hons. Job, Winter, Harvey, McGrath and Gibbs.

LOGGING BILL.

Hon. Mr. Harvey asked that the petitions presented by the A. N. D. Co. and the Albert E. Reed Co. in reference to the Logging Bill, be read.

The petitions were read accordingly.
HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move the second reading of the Logging

Bill and in doing so I desire to point out to the House that the first section of the bill provides that a logger shall have no right to terminate his employment except by giving a week's notice of his intention and if he fails to give such notice he shall forfeit a week's wages. This section is in the interest of the employer. I understand that heretofore men may leave work without giving notice and this section was inserted in order that those engaged in logging may have due notice when men were leaving and an opportunity afforded them to replace them with others, if necessary to do so. There is the section dealing with the question of payment of wages in cash. This provides that payment shall be made on the day when time tickets are presented by the men at the place where payment is usually made, and further that if the employer fails to pay the logger then he incurs a penalty of \$1 per day for each day he keeps him waiting for his wages. I might say that this provision with regard to the payment of wages is not a new law. It is already in an Act governing the employment of fishermen engaged in the fishery.

Section 3 deals with the furnishing of a statement to the logger of the rate of wages which he is to be paid for his work. It calls upon the operator to supply this statement of account within two weeks after the engagement of the logger and then every two weeks thereafter similar statements must be furnished. This will be a benefit not only to the men but to the employer because it will prevent trouble in the future. Those of us who have been practising law know that not many years ago it was next to impossible for a logger to get a statement of his accounts. This

section is embodied in the Act to prevent a repetition of the difficulties heretofore frequently arising from this cause. It will not operate as a hindrance to the carrying out of the the work, but it is simply a measure of protection to the employee and no injustice is sought to be done thereby to the employer

Section 5 has reference to living accommodation of the loggers and provides that there shall be separate compartments for sleeping and eating, and that these shall be constructed in a manner satisfactory to the Government Inspector. There is no reasonable objection to that provision. These apartments must be fitted up in accordance with what the Government Inspector may require.

The necessity for it arises from the fact that men engaged in logging operations are at work many miles from the settlements or towns and unless some such law and inspection be enforced the men would be compelled to put up with conditions that would not be tolerated if they were engaged at work near towns or settlements. The next section gives power to the Government Inspector to prescribe the manner in which sleeping quarters shall be fitted up and notice of such improvements as are deemed necessary by him is to be given to the employer not later than the first of September. The publication of such notice in the Royal Gazette shall be conclusive evidence of its having been given. The question of the fitting up of sleeping quarters is a matter upon which there should be no two opinions. That laboring men should be given suitable places to sleep will not be questioned by any Hon member. It is absolutely necessary to the health

and strength of men engaged at such arduous work that they be provided with comfortable and sanitary sleeping quarters wherein to rest and recuperate after their long hours of labor. The absence of such provision for our laboring men's comforts in the past has been the cause of much suffering and has been the indirect cause of sending many of the prime of our country's manhood to an early grave or left them prematurely broken in health. The conditions under which our men toiled and lived in the past cannot be allowed to continue, and must not be tolerated in any part of this Island again.

What is Newfoundland's greatest asset? Is it her fisheries worth about \$10,000,000? Is it her pulp industry worth many millions? Is it her mines that produce a million or more tons of ore? No, Newfoundland's most valuable asset is her citizens, her men, women and children. Capitalists and legislators sometimes forget this. Dollars are apt to be accounted more than human lives. The country that allows employers to wax wealthy at the expense of the labouring classes is on the downward path that leads to destruction. Every industry or enterprise that does not provide for the comfort of its employees and that robs men of their health, also robs the State, crippling it. I have no doubt to-day the employers of labor are not only willing but anxious to provide suitable sleeping and living accommodation for men employed at the various centres of industry and will readily provide quarters of such a kind as will be approved by the Government Inspector. I may add that I feel safe in saying that no Inspector will impose vexatious or unfair regulations in this matter upon employers.

The next question deals with the question of food to be supplied to the loggers. A schedule of foods is to be arranged by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines after he has made investigation and enquiry from the employer as well as from the employee. This will be published in the Royal Gazette so that there will not be any question during the logging season as to what the schedule of food may be.

The next section, 8, provides that the employer shall upon the request of the logger supply him with the necessary bedclothes at cost and expenses. The reason for inserting this clause is that in some cases when loggers have gone into the woods many miles away from settlements they were compelled to pay exorbitant charges for goods of this kind. The object of this section is therefore to safeguard the men against extortion of this nature.

I do not say the Anglo-Nfid. Development Co. have done this. I may add that I am satisfied that they have not. It has, however, been done and there is no reason why it will not happen again in the future. It is to prevent a recurrence of this practice that this provision is placed in the bill.

The next section protects the employer as well as the employee, with regard to axes and axe handles. If a logger loses an axe or breaks more than one axe handle the cost of these articles can be deducted from his wages.

Section 10 deals with the construction of camps and there can be no good reason why men engaged in work of this kind should not be provided with proper places in which to live. We make laws for the protection of cows, dogs and horses but little concern has been shown in the past for him, who is the superior of the ani-

mal creation. If companies are not willing to equip camps in the logging industry or have knowingly neglected to provide for the comfort of their workmen in this respect they must be held liable. Abuses have existed which in the interest of the men and of the families depending on them should not be permitted. There are, moreover, in prospect new and extensive operations in the forests; men, unknown to us who may not as humane as the present employers, will take charge of them and we have got to look to the future and protect those who may be engaged in the work.

The next section makes provision for a doctor to visit the logging camps where more than 100 men are employed in the industry and permits 40c. per month to be deducted from the loggers' wages where medical attendance is provided. It is not so much with the small logging operations carried on near towns and settlements that this section deals, but with companies operating in the interior carrying on operations upon a large scale. In the latter case there is greater danger to life and limb and also to the health of the operative, and I think the companies should have no objection to this provision. The next section makes provision for the appointment of inspectors. The inspectors are to be appointed by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. The reason for this can be readily understood. Unless it is some responsible person's duty to see that the law is carried out impartially evasions and infringements of the Act will make legislation ineffective. In order to safeguard against dishonest government inspectors this bill gives the right to loggers to appoint a representative whose duty it should be to see that the provisions of this bill in their entirety are not rendered abortive. It may happen that the employees' re-

representative would not be afforded accommodation in the way of food and lodging while performing his duty and the bill makes provision in this respect by making it incumbent upon those in charge to provide accommodation of this character, not, however, free of charge. Hon. members may see grounds for objection to this but we must remember that we are living in a materialistic age when the possession of wealth is very often the synonym of power. The logger is very wisely safeguarded by the provision that he shall have the right to appoint some person who will be in sympathy with the aims and objects for which this bill is introduced.

The next section deals with inspectors who are remiss in their duties and provides that on the protest of 50 loggers, the same to be verified by affidavit an inspector may be removed and another appointed. The next section provides for a report to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines by the inspectors who will be connected with his department. The next section deals with penalties for violations of the Act. Section 17 makes provision that all breaches of the Act shall be reported by the inspector to the agent of the company, and unless the grievances are remedied, proceedings may be instituted.

The last section deals with the definition of a logger. Now the A. N. D. Co. have presented a petition raising certain objections to the enactment into law of this bill and one of the objections raised is to the payment of wages in cash because it may happen that the supply of cash might run out and if the men are willing to accept cheques the employers should be at liberty to pay labourers in this manner. There is nothing to prevent that, if the men agree to take it. The next objection raised with regard to payment of cash is that the company may be called upon to make large

payments without sufficient time to provide specie. The bill stipulates that they shall not be suddenly called upon for payment of wages in cash. It provides that at least one week's notice be given of intention to quit work and that ought to be sufficient length of time to enable the company to provide cash. Every employer of labour in this city has to pay the wages right up to the hour when work ceases, and why should not the same principle apply to companies operating in other parts of the country. Another objection is to the keeping of time. If this were enacted into law it would keep men out of employment. If men's time be not properly kept how are they to receive what is justly due them? Where 50 or 60 men are engaged in certain sections of the country logging, should not the company provide some means of keeping their time. It is as necessary in the interest of the company as well as in that of the logger that their time be properly kept.

With regard to sections 5 and 6 that matter should be easily remedied because if the time limit in the bill is too late, then there is no objection to an amendment. The next clause to which they object is that which authorizes the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to draw up a food schedule. It is not contemplated that this should be done by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines alone. It will be only after the proper investigation that a schedule would be prepared and, I have no doubt, it would be as much to the benefit of the employer as well as to that of the men. The company have entered an objection to camps being fitted with board roofs because their operations are a long distance from the mills. That is no reason why the men working miles from their camps and coming back in zero weather to uncomfortable and cold sheds should not be provided with proper

ones. If we are going to look at this bill from the standpoint that it is not right to provide for such comforts, then we are placing a higher valuation upon the industry than upon the individual, without whose aid it ceases to be profitable. Why should not men who work in the woods in the winter demand comfortable quarters, and why should they not be provided with those things necessary to safeguard their health and strength? Why should they be compelled to get out of their bunks and step on the frozen ground, while they put on their clothes? With regard to clause 12, there would not be any objection to that because I can see the force of the argument that any man may represent himself as agent of the loggers and there should be provisions as to the form of his appointment. Section 14 is objected to upon the ground that the loggers who are conversant with the facts, otherwise signatures might be obtained from anybody. Of course they look at it from their own standpoint, but we have got to look at it also from the standpoint of the men. I have known men who have suffered in body and mind simply because the obligations of home and family compelled them to suffer hardships which they otherwise would not endure; and I have often had it impressed upon me that it was the fear of losing their employment which made men to submit to it. They realized the necessity of trying to improve their conditions in this respect, but were deterred by the fear of losing their employment, and that is one of the reasons why a provision of this kind has been put into the bill.

I think I have pretty well dealt with the objections raised by the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. in their petition relating to the Bill. This legislation is only of a kind which has

been enacted over the civilized world. The principle outlined in this legislation is the same as that which has been enacted into law in England, the United States, Germany, Austria and every other country, and it has for its object the protection of those without whom these industries would be valueless. What has Newfoundland to protect? Any industry which is not prepared to protect the lives of those who work in it should not be established here, and if so established should not be allowed to continue; if the logging companies are solicitous for their employees' welfare, then they will have no objection to seeing this Bill passed into law. If we put ourselves in the position of the loggers living in camps, which are not properly protected overhead, we would not tolerate such conditions for one moment. This is the way to look at it, put ourselves in the position of the loggers, and ask ourselves the question are we prepared to put our sons there and have them work under such conditions, or would we not have legislation enacted by which proper living accommodation would be provided? We are rapidly approaching the parting of the ways. Many hundreds of people are forsaking the fisheries and are going to work in industries established in different parts of the country, and heretofore unknown because the vast bulk of the people engaged in the one industry. But now that they are being established, and the work engaged in is dangerous to health, it is our duty as legislators to see that legislation is enacted and put on the Statute Book to protect them in the pursuit of their calling, because there can be no greater loss to the State than the ill health of its people. There are forces today in the country which must be met; there is no use in ignoring them.

A campaign is being conducted to redress certain grievances complained of, and it is our duty to meet those charges and answer them. If there is no truth in the statements made, it is our duty to refute them. From the forces operating here today for better conditions this Bill comes. Men were content to work under conditions years ago that would not be borne now. Men were then content to live a merely physical existence, but they will not do so today. They want something more and must know the reason why they can't get it. He looks for it and is going to get it, and we must make up our minds to that fact. We are prepared to grant concessions to companies who establish industries here. The Anglo Nfld. Development Co. got rich concessions from the people of this country they obtained part of the national heritage, 200 square miles of the country free from taxation of every description. If we are prepared to make concessions of that kind to bring capital into the country, surely we ought to be prepared to see to it that our people are protected in their work. The Companies say they are carrying out the conditions outlined in the Bill. Perhaps they are. If they are then they should not object to have enacted into law the provisions of this Bill, because after all, we are not dealing with the Companies operating here but those to be operating in future. We must be prepared to meet the altered conditions of industrial life in the country by the enactment of suitable laws. In other countries it was looked upon as only fitting that employees should be fed and provided with all things necessary for their life and health, but here it was regarded as bordering on anarchy. We see the absolute necessity of it now, because there is no greater

loss to a community than its workmen or population suffering from ill health, because of industrial conditions that can be prevented. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. KNOWLING—I think it would be wise if the petitions of the two companies in this subject were printed and placed before the House before we go into Committee on the Bill. They employ largely and up to the present time we have not heard complaint of the manner in which they treat employees, but they are worthy of consideration, although we are bound to do what is right as regards employees and their interests. But they certainly know more about it than we do, as very few here have marked connection with the lumber business. The petition which has been read in a rather perfunctory manner may have points in it worthy our consideration, and I therefore would again suggest that it be printed for the House before the Bill goes to Committee.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Before the motion is put I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill if this is to apply to every logging enterprise in the country, great or small?

HON. MR. GIBBS—It applies to all.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Then the Bill will need amendment in one essential particular, and that is, that if there is a logging enterprise employing less than 50 men, there is no machinery by which any grievance can be remedied, because you cannot act on a grievance that has not the signatures of 50 loggers. If the Inspector is not doing his duty in this particular camp, where there are less than 50 men then under the terms of the Bill you have no remedy. The Inspector cannot be dis-

missed if he fails to do his work. The Government cannot dismiss him unless the petition is signed by 50 people. What machinery have you got to get any attention to this matter at all?

HON. MR. GIBBS—If one logger draws the attention of the Minister to the fact that the Inspector does not do his duty, the Minister will investigate. But this is giving an arbitrary right to 50 loggers to sign such petition, setting forth the facts, which, if proved, will cause the dismissal.

HON. MR. McGRATH—If you can achieve the same result from one logger where is the necessity of having the 50 sign? When the 50 loggers sign the petition the signatures must be certified or proved by affidavit, and that means going before a Justice of the Peace. I would like to say I think this Bill should also go to a Select Committee. I have no objections to the Bill on some features, but I think as we have it here, it is the best justification that could be provided of the action of this House last year in declining to put on the Statute Book the Logging Bill then introduced here. There is no provision in the Bill for baths of hot water, or the number of men required to keep tally of the number of baths being taken or provisions of that kind. If the House had not asserted itself last year that Act, an Act imposing such obligations on logging companies would have been put on the Statute Books. With many of the provisions of the Bill no one can quarrel. If there is any injustice being done in the nature of ill-treatment of the men employed in the camps, then I think everybody is willing to ensure that all the necessary legislative machinery shall be provided to lessen these grievances. But in connection with the Bill there are several of the particulars that it seems to me,

we ought to consider seriously before the Bill goes through in its present form. For instance, section 6 provides that the Government Inspector shall each prescribe the manner of fitting the sleeping berths and shall notify the employer by the 1st of September, is he to be Chief Inspector or is he to be only one of several Inspectors, for section 13 says the Minister of Agriculture shall appoint one or more Inspectors to see that the provisions of the Act are observed and enforced. It seems to me that if the work called for by the Bill is to be done properly we will want a small army of Inspectors, not one. In the Bill last year a provision was made also that bunks and mattresses must be supplied by the Company. That clause is cut out now, and logging men are obliged to get these materials themselves at their own cost. Section 15 provides that Inspectors shall report once a month to the Minister of Agriculture as to the number and condition of camps, number of men in them, wages per month, quality of food supplied, particulars of all breaches of complaints and other information upon camp life. Unless he gets that information from the men themselves no obligation is cast upon the Company to supply it. If there is any object in securing that information, a clause should be inserted by which companies shall be obliged to supply it. With regard to the question of an agent representing the loggers, that is a provision we should have some further information about. The loggers have no organization that I am aware of, then how is any person to be recognized as their representative? Who has the power to appoint him? What is to be his status? Next, there is the matter of doctors for camps of over 100. Why limit this to 100? Why not apply

this to camps where 70 or 80 are employed. These men surely are as much entitled to medical assistance as the men in camps of 100 or more. In the Sealing Bill it is provided that every ship carrying 150 or more men shall have a doctor. It seems to me that where men are in the lumber woods there ought to be a doctor for at least 75 or more. That ought to be the minimum, not 100. I should say that most of the lumbering concerns in the country employ less than 100 men. When you say 'three miles from the sea shore' you must remember in our outports medical men are not easily accessible, especially in winter outside of St. John's, and there are not 40 certificated physicians around the whole island; certainly not in the city. There is one clause not in this Bill on which we may congratulate ourselves, and that a year's postponement has secured. That is that part of the fine is not given to the informer as in last year's enactment. We should deal with these matters on their merits. Inspectors will make complaint when there is genuine cause for it, but under the Bill proposed last year, every possible encouragement was provided for men to complain and share in the fine. I should not oppose the second reading of the Bill in view of the fact that it is an improvement as compared with last year's, but in Committee possibly we shall have to amend it considerably.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill, Mr. President is an attempt to secure legislation which I propose to show from the speech of the introducer of the measure is not alone sectional, but unnecessary, and requiring the serious consideration of hon. members in this House.

The ostensible object of this Bill is to improve the condition of men

engaged in the winter and spring months in cutting and driving timber for manufacture at Saw Mill or Pulp Mills.

A Bill was passed during the last regular session of the House of Assembly, but was rejected by this Chamber, and very properly so. I had left St. John's before that Bill came up, but I take this opportunity of saying that had I been here, I should have been in accord with those who opposed it.

Now we are confronted with the Bill again, not including all the provisions embodied in the last year's bill, but with some of the least objectionable provisions eliminated.

Just at this point, Mr. President, I would ask why any alteration has been made, why anything considered imperative last year is unnecessary this year?

We have no explanation which is clear or convincing respecting these changes, and the inference is that had the bill of last year become law, those responsible for it would now be seeking amendments just such as they will be seeking next year if this House does not save the men engaged in the lumbering industry from their friends or their professed friends; but, Mr. President, serious damage may have been done in the meantime, and I think I disclose no secret if I say will be done to the men it is said this Bill is to protect.

I submit, Sir, that nothing whatever has been shown to justify any legislation. No evil exists, nothing is contemplated which requires preventive measures.

The introducer of the Bill said when moving the second reading in the House of Assembly on April 12th, as follows:—

(From Daily News, April 26th.)

"MR COAKER—Mr. Speaker, in mov-

ing the second reading of this Bill I do not intend to delay the House with any lengthy remarks. This Bill is very much like the one presented last year and that passed through this chamber with one or two slight alterations. Last year's Bill provided that each man should be supplied with a mattress. That clause has been taken out, and we are leaving the matter of beds to the discretion of the Government Inspector, who was to be appointed under the 4th Section of last year's Bill. I do that because I find that the employers are anxious to do all they can to fit sleeping bunks as comfortably as possible, and I think it better to leave that to the Government Inspector. Another thing I discovered while up visiting the camps and that is that mattresses were provided in several camps, but at the end of the season they had to be thrown away. They could not be used again. The system of employing men in the camps was such that it would be unsanitary to keep mattresses there. One crew would come there and stay until February. Then another lot would come. The same bed would be used by three men in succession. That was a matter which last year caused some friction amongst employers.

"The Anglo Nfld. Development Company have agreed with me to provide a canvas bottom in the bunks. If they do that, all the trouble and discomfort will be removed. At the present time there is trouble similar to that in regard to the sealing steamers. The bottoms of the beds are formed with rough lumber. The men put down green boughs. The A. N. D. Co. provide a canvas covering, on which the men can put material, either hay or spruce tops or birch bark which they can always get around the camps. Then when a man leaves, he leaves the covering, and the next man

coming along can make a new covering for himself. This covering is taken from the camps at the end of the season and washed, so that it is used again next season.

"There is also an alteration in Section 4. This Section now gives ten days after any complaint is made by the Inspector before any action is taken. Last year's Act provided that the Inspector should complain, and if there was no remedy for it, he could take action. Now, 10 days are given before action is taken.

"The clause about a minimum wage was taken out last year and it can stay out.

"All the other clauses are exactly similar to the Act of last year.

"I do not think there is anything in this Bill that employers can object to. It is very clear and very reasonable. When we consider that there are such a large number of men engaged in logging, we must come to the conclusion that it is important to have the industry properly run. These companies have made it a permanent industry. They intend to go on from year to year cutting logs and so they must see that it is to their own benefit to make the men comfortable. The men are more content than ever, and are getting more used to the business.

"They find the food is improving, accommodation is improving, and there is an improvement in the camps throughout the past twelve months. Many of the camps built since last year have been fitted as laid down in this Bill. They have put in board flooring and board roofs. No one could complain of the food I found in the camps at Badger. I held a meeting there one night, and asked the men if they had any complaints. Some of the bosses were there. One or two thought that they should

have some change from beans at breakfast. It was a continuous feast of beans. If they could get potatoes it would be a change, and the Companies are going to give the men fish and potatoes for breakfast. Some men thought they should get a little cheese for tea. The Companies are doing all in their power to make the men content, because they will not be able to get the men to do the work unless they make the camps comfortable.

"They get a good wage. The men are promised \$25 a month but many get \$28. Some men who go up with a promise of \$28 get only \$24 because they are a little slack. There were very few complaints, and they are not having as much trouble as in the past. I do not want to have any friction between the Companies and the men.

"They are doing their best to help the men out. But the men are of opinion that the Legislature should take the matter up and something should be done. We found tremendous feeling at Council meetings against the Upper House in not passing this measure. I hope we won't have any trouble this year. The members of the Upper House ought to realize that we do not send a measure up from this House unless there is cause for it. We know the situation, and we do not introduce a measure unless we know there is reason for it. I beg to move the second reading."

I think, Mr. President, it will be evident to any member of this House that while Mr. Coaker can state publicly that the wages are good, the accommodation is improving in the camps that no one could complain of the food as he found it in the camps last season, and all the complaints he could find were that

one or two men thought they should have some change from beans for breakfast, though they said it was always a bean feast, and some thought they ought to get a little cheese for tea.

The companies, he says, are doing all in their power to make the men content. They are doing their best to help them out. Mr. Coaker says he does not want any friction between the companies and the men. He does not say there is any friction or any suggestion of friction, but that some of the men thought the Legislature should take the matter up. Take what matter up? If there is any necessity for legislation it has not been shown by the introducer of the Bill or anybody else.

Legislation affecting established industries should surely be remedial or preventive, but it has not been shown that there is anything connected with the logging business that calls for either and yet interference is sought with an industry admittedly well-conducted, and where perfect harmony between employer and employed exists.

Legislation should always be fully and carefully prepared, so that it may merit the co-operation of all classes and particularly of those who have been, and still are and desire to remain law-abiding. It should not be provocative of antagonism, it should not be such as to compel persons either to seek means of evading the law, or to abandon their business. Either one or the other of these courses must follow if the assent of this House should be given to this Bill.

It is not, however, concern for the companies and individuals who will at once be seriously affected by the Bill which induces me to so strongly oppose it, but it is the damaging effect such legislation will have upon other

existent industries, and more alarming still is the certain effect upon persons who may be considering other industries or developments in this country. Let there be no doubt about this that every capitalist who may be approached with a view to interesting him in any of our resources will ask almost immediately what are your laws, and what is the attitude of your Government. Place a Bill like this upon the Statute Book and who will be likely to come to this country to embark on any business enterprise?

Now, Mr. President, let us glance at the sections of this Bill which I submit is senseless, impracticable, involving very large expense if any attempt should be made to enforce its provisions, and impossible of attaining any beneficial object, while on the other hand it would create suspicion, discord, and injustice, with less comfort and less privilege to the men than they now enjoy.

Let us glance for a moment at the sections of the Bill. Section 1 reads:—

1.—No logger shall during the logging season terminate his contract of employment unless he shall give to his employer or his employer's agent, at least one week's previous notice of his intention to do so. Any logger leaving his employment without giving notice shall forfeit to his employer one week's wages.

Is it conceivable, Sir, that a logger who intends to leave his work will give any notice? He will get his time slip, and the following morning he will not be found at that camp.

2.—The employer shall pay in cash to the logger the amount of wages due under his contract of employment on the day on which his time slip is presented at the usual place of payment of such wages. If the employer shall fail to pay such wages on that day, he shall pay to such logger, in addition to the wages so due,

a sum of one dollar for every day during which such default shall continue, to be recovered as part of such wages in an action against the employer at the suit of such logger.

I do not suppose, notwithstanding the remarks of my hon. friend regarding this section that it is really seriously intended that the employer must have a logging camp to carry through the season sufficient actual cash to pay the men, but I would suppose there would be no serious objection, if the bill is to be passed, calling for payment by cheque, or any negotiable paper which would be satisfactory to the men. Section four appears to be fair, and I would not take exception to it. Section three seems to be unnecessary but amusing; a man knows without waiting two weeks the rate of pay he is going to get.

3.—Each logging camp shall contain a sleeping compartment and an eating compartment, and the sleeping compartment shall be comfortably heated, and the sleeping berths shall be fitted, subject to the approval of the Government inspector.

Well, as far as the companies are concerned at which this bill is aimed, their camps are built according to this schedule, and it is because somebody has seen these camps that there is this new endeavour to make a law that all should so construct their camps. These camps have compartments and many of them are built according to this schedule. But as regards the remarks of the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill of the necessity as to seeing the men are properly housed, I submit that in this very city you can find hundreds, if not thousands of people at our doors who have not such comforts as men in the woods. The camps are water-tight and beyond that are exceedingly comfortable. Some here have no doubt been in them; I have and would desire noth-

ing more comfortable. The objection to the bill is not particularly in regard to the building of camps, although if insisted upon and carried out it will prove a hardship in many cases and is unnecessary. As regards the sleeping berths, last year the demand was that every man should be provided with a mattress. Now the introducer says this is impracticable, that it is unhealthy; that the Government Inspector shall prescribe the manner in which berths shall be fitted, and suggests in his remarks that the Inspector shall decide what is the proper bed for the loggers to lie upon. They can get shavings or birch bark or spruce boughs. We all recognize that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is a fairly allround man; if we want information on law or land we can get it from the Minister, but I do not think he would be able to prescribe proper diet for the men logging in the woods. Section 8 is too trivial to insert in a Bill.

9.—Employers shall supply loggers with axes and axe handles free of cost. If an axe be lost the value thereof shall be deducted from the wages of the loser. A logger breaking more than one axe handle during a week shall pay the cost of handle or handles supplied to him in place thereof.

The companies are doing this now and have been all the time. Some have adopted the wise practice of charging a man's axe to him, for their own protection but if he breaks twenty axes they are not charged to him.

11.—Employers shall cause a physician to visit each logging camp at least once in each month when loggers are occupying the same except in case of employers with less than one hundred employees. No charge shall be made the loggers for medical services of a doctor so supplied, unless such employers own and operate a Hospital at Headquarters, in which case forty cents per month shall be

paid as a doctor's fee by each logger.

This has been touched upon by the last speaker. I wonder if the members of this House have any idea how many logging camps there are on the Island. I have no doubt it might be a surprise to them to know there are at least 600. How many doctors would you want to visit these camps? The employers must pay for the doctors unless they operate a hospital. It is not very clearly defined as to what class of hospital is required and this is only one section of the bill that we would have to try and get around. The owners would be compelled to seek means of evading the provisions of this bill or otherwise they would have to be got out of business.

13.—The Minister of Agriculture and Mines shall appoint one or more Inspectors whose duty it will be to see that the provisions of this Act are observed and enforced.

You would want to employ at least fifty.

15.—Once each month Inspectors shall report to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines upon the following, in writing:—

- (a) The number of camps visited.
- (b) The condition thereof.
- (c) The number of men occupying the same and wages paid them per month.
- (d) The quality of food supplied.
- (e) Particulars of all breaches or complaints under this Act and the action taken in connection therewith.
- (f) All further information bearing upon camp life and its operation.

That means that the Inspector must remain some time in each camp. He has to enquire as to how many men are employed there, and the next month has to check that. It may be more or less, and he has to write that report of every camp and send it in. Therefore you would want an

army of inspectors instead of an individual one.

The report of the Select Committee appointed at the last winter session to consider the Bill, which had been sent up, reported as follows.—That owing to the absence of evidence before the Committee and the impossibility of securing evidence during the present session, the Bill be not now proceeded with. That report was adopted by this House as all will remember. Well, Mr. President the only additional evidence before us to-day is that given by the introducer of the Bill, who finds that what he considered most important last season it is not now necessary to include in the bill of this year, and who admits that the circumstances, as he himself found them, are excellent.

If inspection of the camps is thought to be necessary I am of opinion no employer would raise any objection, but you must remember there are not less than 600 camps, and if they are to be visited and reported upon once a month, which in all cases would mean not less than six visits, and in many cases eight visits, during the season, how many inspectors will you require? I have no hesitation in affirming that the work cannot be carried out by less than fifty inspectors, and where are you to find the men competent to undertake this work, and how they are to be paid?

This proposition coming from a person constantly attacking the Civil Service and clamouring for decreases in public expenditure, is amazing. Any man competent is unlikely to take a position which he may be thrown out of a month later if he refuses to agree with some few men who would be incited by this Bill to make unreasonable demands. Now as regards the agents representing the loggers, for it must be assumed there will be many, these are to have no defined

duties, they are not to be responsible to anybody, and can be regarded only as agitators. Moreover, and what is, I submit, more objectionable still, we are asked to give legal status to irresponsible men.

We are asked to compel employers to provide board and lodging accommodation at all the camps for men who are admittedly only spies and agitators, responsible neither to the employers nor to the loggers.

Who are these agents, by whom paid, how appointed, and how to be recognized? It has been said they will be appointed by the loggers, but when it is remembered there is no loggers' organization, and no aggregation of loggers at any one place with any authority, it will be seen that appointment by the loggers is impossible. It is not intended that the men shall have any voice in the appointment of these agents, and I make the statement with full knowledge of the real intention, not from hearsay, for I have the documentary evidence in my pocket.

Now, Sir, what is the history of the lumbering business in this country?

Without going back beyond fifteen years, a very short time, permit me to name persons and companies engaged at some time since the year 1900, in operation of Lumber Mills, under License, in a large way.

Saw Mills operated Since 1900.

C. Fisher—1, Bay of Islands.

C. L. Phillips—2, Gander Bay, Pt. Leamington.

Nfld. Timber Estates—3, Gambo, Glenwood, Gander Bay.

J. J. Murphy—1, Gambo.

Glenwood Lumber Co.—1, Glenwood.

Lewis Miller and Co.—2, Millertown, Glenwood.

Newland Lumber and Pulp Co. — 1, Norris Arm, Indian Arm River.

St. George's Lumber Co.—1, St. George's.

H. J. Crowe—2, Botwood, Point Leamington.

Exploits Lumber Co.—1, Botwood.

Union Lumber Co.—5, Come-by-Chance, North Harbor, Gander Lake.

Terra Nova Lumber Co.—1, Terra Nova.

Davey Brothers—1, Grand Lake.

Harvey and Co.—1, Badger.

George Clarke—1, Springdale.

Highland Lumber Co.—1, Norris's Arm.

Horwood Lumber Co.—2, Horwood, Campbellton.

Wood Barker Co.—1, Botwood.

Parrishore Lumber Co.—1, Notre Dame Junction.

Gambo Lumber Co.—1, Gambo.

Howard Lumber Co.—1, Deer Lake.

Total number of Mills—31

Of these 31 mills how many are operating today? Only the two mills owned by the Horwood Lumber Co.; the others have gone out of business and nobody has taken their places.

Why did they go out of business? Not because they made fortunes and retired, but because they could not operate profitably, and this is the business which it is now intended to hamper with exactions and expenses, which if enforced, will drive not only the two remaining large mills out, but a great many of the other mills which have been growing from small dimensions, and which now afford a great deal of profitable employment to our people.

We have already seen something of the evil effects of enforced sectional legislation, and I hope hon. members here will not be deterred from expressing their opinions freely and recording their vote for the rejection of any measure which their judgment tells them is vicious, and which seeks to take from any proprietor the control of his own business. Because they may subject themselves to vilification and offensive threats is a

reason why members should, rather than should not, reject what they know to be discriminative legislation.

I believe that every member of this House will see the injustice that is underlying the Bill, and refuse his assent to it.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—At this hour I have no desire to delay the House but I wish to make a few observations. We have before us the Order of the Day, and while I support the suggestions made by the previous member that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee, I should like to call the attention of the House to a few matters. We have before us on the order seven Bills,—three of them most important, and dealing with our most important industries— which have been sent to this House to be dealt with. They have been deferred for some time particularly the Labrador Codfish Bill. We have had different expressions of opinion as to the meaning of this Bill to the people and to the country. We have deferred the Bill re Sealfishery, another of the most important industries of the country, and while to these Bills objections have been pointed out by this House from time to time by hon. gentlemen on both sides, they have not been found by the Lower House, but were passed unanimously. The other is the Bill which my hon. friend who has just sat down has referred to. I entirely concur with him that this House and every member of it should take it into consideration, and vote in the way he believes will be the best in the interests of the country. It has been pointed out that these Bills will require very serious consideration, and I entirely concur with that, and I hope that whatever their fate is to be they will not be deferred from time to time but be taken up and dealt with as they should be.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Though the hour is late, I beg to support the proposal. At the present moment there are in town Mr. Harris of the Albert Reed Co., and Mr. Scott of the Harnsworth Co., and as these gentlemen have already been interviewed by the Select Committee of the Lower House I think we too should hear what they have to say. Reading over the Bill, I am very glad to see the adoption of one principle in it at least. Suits cannot be taken by any Tom, Dick or Harry on the street. That is the principle we have been fighting for here, for a long time, and I am glad to see it is now placed there and that a limitation is put on the status of individuals who are going to sue. I cannot help feeling that the addition to a Government Inspector of another person to represent the men, even if he can be got, is a principle which should not be allowed, and for this reason among others. Hon. Mr. Gibbs said that if one single logger in any camp wrote a complaint to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that the Minister would no doubt immediately investigate and dismiss the Inspector if the complaints were justified. Under these circumstances what in the world is the object of having a special agent going around if the men can at any time lay their complaints before headquarters. Now the question of food which we have up so often in these hills, is a matter which might very well, I think, be left to the Government Inspector and no hard and fast rules with penalties for trivial and possibly unavoidable breaches attached should be enacted into definite law. In connection with this view I might call the attention of the House to a real *reductio ad absurdum* that has recently transpired in connection with the S. S. Bonaventure, where, notwithstanding that it was shown that the

requirements of the law as to provisioning the ship with fresh and tinned meat had been fully complied with, the Captain—who was Capt. Robert Bartlett, perhaps the most distinguished Newfoundlander alive to-day—has been subjected to harrassing and unpleasant suits amounting in fact to petty persecution and in circumstances for which he could in no way be held responsible. Captain Bartlett had other things to attend to in that ship besides looking after the meat, but what happened was this, that a large quantity of fresh meat in order that it might be kept in good condition was placed upon the lower bridge. It was found that it was being stolen, and it was thereupon moved to the upper bridge where, however, stealing still went on, with the result that there was towards the end insufficient remaining to comply with the letter of the law. Captain Bartlett has accordingly been subjected to vexatious suits and is liable to, and is threatened, with claims from every member of the crew representing a total personal liability of around six thousand dollars because some of the crew deliberately made away with the supply. Could there be a more apposite illustration of the absurdity of such provisions as we are being sometimes asked to enact into the permanent law of the land? I desire to echo what has been said here this afternoon that we have in the Bill now before us the fullest justification for our previous action in postponing the consideration of the Logging Bill. Not only does this changed Bill fully justify that action, but there are other things that justify it too. Anyone who read the interesting diary of Mr. Croaker, as printed recently in the *Mall and Advocate*, must have recognized from his experiences how entirely erroneous in the main were the

statements put forward in the press and elsewhere previously as to the deplorable conditions which the loggers employed by the big logging companies were called upon to face in the great lumbering industry. There were those in this House who had frequent personal experience of life in many logging camps and who knew that these accounts were erroneous. But in any case the action of this Council was constantly misrepresented through the country, and it has been most unfairly pilloried for the very proper action it took at that time. I wish to say, Mr. President, that apart from the evidence of the true facts as now generally admitted and apart from the changes that reconsideration by its framers has induced them to make in this Bill the responsibility for what occurred in connection with that Bill could not—except unfairly—have in any case been laid at the door of this House. The fact is that if the horrible conditions which were stated to exist in the logging industry, if as we heard afterward, the camps were places where no decent man would keep his dog, then Sir, I say the responsibility for what occurred lay solely and only with those who, knowing that these conditions existed, failed to make any move, failed to do anything until the very last days of the session, failed to provide any information, to this House, at least, regarding these evils and finally sent up a Bill of the type of last year's Logging Bill requiring in any case close study before the responsibility was taken of putting it through its various stages as it was without examination or proper discussion, a responsibility which the House very rightly refused to take especially in view of the many protests made against some of the details of the Bill. If those who were responsible

for the Bill had really thought that conditions were so bad then they might have taken the trouble to have brought the Bill in at the time that its supposed importance demanded, and it would have received the fullest attention and so far as justifiable, the co-operation of this chamber, just as the present Bill will receive our best attention. Referring to what my friend the Hon. Mr. Gibbs has said about trying to improve conditions, the Hon. gentleman knows of course, that there is no man in this House who is not very keen and anxious to see and to help them improve, and I would point out that one way among several and perhaps the most effective of all is to stimulate and to multiply industrial operations, to help as well as to curb the employer, and to create such a demand for men's services that they will be able to dictate their own terms and to impose conditions by natural means upon employers.

The time is late and I will not continue except to repeat that I approve the motion for a Select Committee.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the debate on the proposed amendment that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, was adjourned.

The remainder of the Order paper was deferred and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till Monday at 4 p.m.

MONDAY, May 10th, 1915.

The Council met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee stage of the Labrador Codfish Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the second reading of the Saw Mills Bill was deferred.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee Stage of the Customs Amendment Bill was deferred.

LOGGING BILL.

Second reading of the Logging Bill.
HON. MR. GIBBS—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of the Logging Bill I might say that several objections have been urged by Honorable members why this Bill as taken here should not be passed by this House, and one of these objections is that it is sectional and unnecessary. It cannot be said that Legislation which has for its object the benefitting of such a large body of our people is sectional. Legislation of a sectional character applies only to rights which private individuals seek to obtain from the public or to the taking away of some public right which a section of the community enjoy or to the granting of some franchise which enables the individual or corporation to do something for which it is necessary to obtain legislative sanction. But Legislation which aims at the protection of the great mass of the community is not sectional. This legislation applies to the whole country and not to one or two individuals and is consequently not sectional or unnecessary. It is very necessary, it aims to protect the health of the workman, the man who has to risk his health and limb in logging work, and when protecting his health we also protect that of his off-spring. Surely that can't be classed as unnecessary or sectional. Then again why should not the time which he works in that industry be supplied him every fortnight. If hon. members will peruse the legislative records of other countries they will find that not only are men to be provided with certificates of their time, but also the manner in which it shall be kept and entered in the books of account. Therefore, other countries do not look upon legislation of this kind as sectional or unnecessary, because if they did they would not have laws of the kind

referred to upon the statute books. It would appear that there is a great deal of alarm in relation to this Bill. I remember when the "Workmen's Compensation Act" was first introduced some twelve years ago, it was then predicted that if it were enacted it would paralyze industry, that it would be no use for people to carry on industrial work if an Act of the kind was to find its way on our statute books. All industries, big and small, took alarm; the result was, it scarcely obtained any support in the Lower Chamber and was rejected. What then happened? Some years afterwards the very men who denounced that measure in the strongest terms helped to have it enacted. The men who regarded it as revolutionary afterwards passed it and nobody will now say that it has not been a good act. And the same thing applies to all classes of legislation which leave the beaten path and strike out upon a new field. This is what we are doing in this Bill, simply leaving the beaten path, the path of suffering and misery, and doing something for the labourer, which heretofore has not been done. The arguments advanced against this Bill being enacted into law are somewhat similar to those urged in this and other countries against legislation of the kind. Every advance made by the toiler for more recognition of his right to a greater share of the produce of his toil, for protection of his life and his health while engaged at work have met with the most bitter opposition. Some think that which the workman produces is of more value than himself. This has resulted in the widening of the breach between employer and employed and unless wiser counsels prevail the world will one day look upon a struggle between capital and labor only rivalled in its intensity by the war that is now devastating the fairest portions of Europe. The English coal baron opposed

legislation which aimed at the emancipation industrially of the boys, girls and women who worked his coal mine. If Hon. members will take the trouble to peruse a report of a commission appointed by the British Government of which the late Mr. Chamberlain was Chairman, they will read therein that the English coal operator worked his mines with the labor of women and children who toiled from ten to sixteen hours a day. The women hauled the loaded trucks, like animals with a chain fastened about their necks, and crawled on their hands and knees through dirt and mud while semi-nude boys and girls worked under brutal overseers from ten to sixteen hours a day. When the owner of the mine, who lived like a prince, and cared nought for those who toiled for him, was asked why he permitted this serfdom his answer was that he could not work his coal mine at a profit except by employing this class of labor. But there were in England many high minded men and women who told him that they would compel him to do so. They succeeded in their endeavors and the production of coal has not been thereby lessened but has been vastly increased through more humane methods of employing labor.

When the English Army and Navy Department asked for men of a certain physique they could not get them. Why? Because industrial conditions in England were ruining the health and physique of men and women. One of the things that England suffers from, is that it has permitted its factory and industrial life to undermine the health and physique of its population. If some person in England then were to propose legislation to make it unlawful to employ child labor in the mines the answer would have been: "It is unnecessary," but such a law if passed would have saved England

many a heart burning and averted many disastrous strikes. This is necessary legislation, and we in Newfoundland are not going to wait for injury to be done to apply the remedy. Loggers in this country did not work under the conditions prevailing to-day, a few years ago. Conditions have improved because of the agitation which was carried on four or five years ago among them, and which forced the operator to give them different conditions of labor. What was the condition of affairs ten or twelve years ago. Loggers went out in the morning and returned at night very often with clothing saturated with water, dried his clothes where he ate his food, and slept in the same apartment. The agitation which followed, forced the operator to provide separate sleeping and eating apartments. It is to prevent a return to such conditions that this Bill aims at, and we are not legislating solely in connection with industries that are at present established, but this legislation will apply to future ones. It is not because injury is being done that this legislation is necessary but to prevent it in future. I remember a case where many of the loggers under charge of a foreman were coming down Gander River and got about 10 miles from headquarters, when the foreman apparently had forgotten something and sent a young man of about 15 years of age back to camp, 10 miles away, to get it. It was a cold day, when not wishing to disobey the foreman, and not knowing what his rights were, because the law had given him no protection, he started off up the river and five days afterwards was found frozen to death. This is only one instance of many that happened in logging camps in this country because we did not have rules and regulations to prevent brutality of this kind being inflicted. One hon.

member has asked: "Why is not the Bill of the same kind as last year?" and he deduces from that an argument against it. My answer is, are we not amending Bills every session but we had passed the previous session. Are we not every day of our lives reconsidering and improving something that we did the previous day? It is for the purpose of having legislation as near perfection as possible we amend it. Nothing is perfect in this material world of ours. The quicker any man who believes he is perfect, dies the better. The seal of imperfection is stamped on every act. No matter how much thought or study we bring to bear upon doings or acts, someone is sure to see something wrong in them, and next day we are sure to see some way to improve on them. It is this mental state that impels the endeavour to improve. That mattresses must be thrown away is used as an argument against their use. The fact of their being thrown away should be no reason for their complete abolition. If a man eats too much meat is that the reason why others should abstain from it? Is it because some abuse things that others must suffer, and if some do not treat mattresses properly, that is no reason why others should suffer through their neglect and indolence. What are we doing, who are supposed to be the leaders in the intellectual life of the country? Are we doing anything to educate these people as to the necessity of certain things in their homes or camps? We are doing nothing. We are forgetful of the fact that we must not live for ourselves alone, but must live for others, and make their lives in so far as we can, as happy as possible. Then another argument noticeable is that because no complaint has been made to the legislature we should not pass upon it. Do we wait for a neighbour to build upon our land before putting up our fence? We

do not wait for complaints to appear to remedy them. We should not wait for such complaints to arise before beginning to legislate. Suppose next winter or the winter after, camps of an improper kind were supplied men, are thousands of men to suffer for six months of the year, simply because this year we refuse to legislate in order that things of the kind may not happen. Another argument used is that this is an interference with an industry well conducted. If the industry is well conducted then legislation of this kind can do no harm, but will be a notice to others engaged in it what the law expects of them with regard to those employed in the industry, and the conditions under which they have to be employed. We do not know when there will be a change in existing conditions. We do not know what a change in managers may bring about, and we must anticipate by our legislation how we are going to protect the interest of the labourer. Another argument put forth is that this will have a bad effect upon future industries. How can it have such effect if the industries to-day are well conducted and are observing all the provisions in this Bill? Then surely those about to be established can conform with the conditions in an industry which is being carried on now. Capital coming into the country is another argument used. Its representatives it is held, will ask as to the laws we have bearing upon the industry, and if such laws as we are discussing are put upon the statute book capitalists will not come in. If such be the case then I say, let them stay out, because if we are going to permit the establishment of industries here which will not give a reasonable and fair protection to our people employed in them, that will not protect their health and strength while they are at work, that will not furnish them with a

correct statement of the time they are at work and will not do those things necessary to protect their work; then the quicker such people stay away the better for all concerned. If I had my way I would serve notice upon every capitalist of this kind that he would have to conform with conditions existing in countries whose legislation is more advanced than our own. Still another argument is that this Bill would compel the operator to carry cash through the season. It would not compel anything of the kind, because where a workman is about to leave he gives a week's notice and during that week cash can be provided to pay him. Industries in this town carry cash all the year round and do not find it a burden. Employers in the city, whether on Water front, or fishing work pay the men in cash when they want it, and consequently there is no hardship for the logging people to hold cash to pay their men when they (should men want to leave) get proper notice. After all, there is nothing to prevent the operator of the industry to make a contract to take him out of the provision of the Bill and if this is done it is the men's and operator's business only. There is no law passed but a way is found to get around it. But the majority of the men will take advantage of laws made to protect them and will work in conformity with such laws. People right here are living under conditions far worse than in the logging camps but this is no reason why men should live in camps not properly built and protected. If people are living in this city under conditions which do not make for human decency and for the comfort and safeguarding of life, then it is to our shame to permit it.

We point with pride to any industry about to be established here in

St. John's with big newspaper headlines dealing with the capital invested and the employment to be given but the bad housing system does not receive such flowing advertising. If it were made a regulation of the Municipality or other such governing body that as soon as such industry were started, side by side with it should grow up, the building of superior houses for operatives, then we should not have the unfortunate conditions that now exist here. One of the good things that this Bill does is the making provision as to the way in which wage earners like the loggers are to be housed. If we apply the same principle in establishing new industries here then we will get rid of the vile housing conditions existing, for not alone do such conditions inflict a loss to the people but a loss to the whole community because if the people suffer through impaired health their offspring suffer as well and there is no greater loss to the community than the ill health of its citizens. The argument is also made that no complaint has been made to render it necessary to fix a scale of food. I have no doubt but that after due investigation we will be able to fix a scale of food to meet the approval of the owners of the industry as well as the workmen. Some people imagine that because a man fills the office of Agriculture and Mines and has had no experience or has never been engaged in logging or fishing he is unable to form rules and regulations governing such industries, but look around the world and you will observe men who never had any training handling the latest projects and solving problems of a tremendous character. One of the brightest pages in British history refers to the manner in which Lloyd George

handled the commercial and other business problems when the present great war broke out. If people were told this a few months before the war, they would say "what does he know about it, he is a lawyer." The same applies to the United States. There a University professor, the President of the great republic has demonstrated to the world that though travelling an gorgeous path, he is doing it carefully, properly and with a great deal of skill, although we may not agree with the manner of his doing it. Then take that other silver haired silent man, the present premier of England. Can anybody say that this man with the great responsibilities which rest upon his shoulders, is not doing his work well and nobly. I merely point to these happenings to show that my hon. friend can draw up a scale to meet the approval of the operator and all concerned, and when he does the logger will be able to do a greater amount of work because of this scale than he is to-day. Then again, other objections are raised because of a number of small camps asked for. True, the greater number of camps are of a small character and it will be unfair to saddle on these the expenses of a doctor, because they would not be able to meet such an obligation, but it is not unfair that small operators shall have separate eating or sleeping apartments according to the provisions of the Act. We do not expect small operators to provide medical aid. It would be unfair. As to the pay of the agent of the men, this does not concern us, the Government will not pay him, the logger will, and will see that he is appointed. Another argument is that the history of lumber operations here has not resulted satisfactorily. With that I cannot agree, because

men have come here, secured areas, operated them for a while, and sold them later at a large profit. The Wood Barker Co'y., is an instance of that. The St. George's Lumber Co. never had enough lumber to supply their mills which were of too great a magnitude. If they knew what they were doing, which I doubt, their mills would not have been so large. Several enterprises started operations over there and it was because of inexperience and faulty business methods that they closed. The Horwood Lumber Co. is an illustration of the fact of local men being successful in this work. Another argument is that it seeks to take from the proprietor the control of his own industry. It is not so in the sense that we want to interfere with his capital or to take his lumber or pulp. We are going to interfere with the manner in which men will be employed, in which they are going to be fed and housed, for this is a public matter and that is a justification of our interference. No man has the right to steal or destroy the property of a company or individual, neither has the company or individual the right to steal the health of the operative or ask him to work under conditions which may endanger his health. He has no right to give him food which is not sufficiently self-sustaining and nutritious in the legislation of other countries they go to the extent of having houses of rest, and provide that the air of such shall be renewed so many times during the hours of rest, that men should live in a certain temperature, and that tools handled by them shall be kept in a certain temperature so that the cold weather may not affect them. You talk about legislation elsewhere. Why you will find legislation which lays down how many cubic feet of air opera-

tives are entitled to, and how the walls and ceilings are to be covered to protect not the machinery but the men who work in such places, and that is the principle underlying this Bill. The State has a right to interfere on behalf of its citizens to regulate the conditions under which work shall progress and the right to protect the people. The same applies to landlords in this city. They are compelled to do certain things that are necessary, and if he claims undue interference with what he considers his privileges we hold that we have a right to protect our citizens. In effect, we say we do not represent you. We represent the citizens and are here to protect them. One hon. member cited the case of the "Bonaventure" whose crew stole the fish beef, etc., and an instance of that kind is cited where men might be sued and fined for a breach of the law. I beg to point out that the prosecution will not be sustained in such case, because where the owner or agent has done all that the law requires him to do, and puts food enough on the ship necessary for the voyage, and those on the ship afterwards steal it, he is not responsible. The breach of the law is not even a technical one. He has done all that a reasonable man should do, and he is not asked to do impossible things.

Another argument made use of to insure proper conditions of work is to increase competition by increasing the number of companies and by making companies compete for men. Now the hon. members could not have given much consideration to an argument of this kind, labor conditions are governed by the law of supply and demand. That is the axiom that was once and is now by some, accepted, that the law of supply and demand governs the wages of the workmen and the

conditions under which they work. If you examine that a little more closely you will see how that operates. Man has a natural right to live from the bounty of the earth to get for his toil that which will enable him to live as a decent member of society and anyone who prevents him from so doing is depriving him of this right. To do otherwise is to reduce him to the status of the lower order of animal life. If fresh meat be plentiful and the demand great, then the price is going to go down; if the demand is great and the supply not plenty, up goes the price. If there are plenty of horses and the demand not great, down goes the price of horses, and vice versa. According to the argument the only way for a man to keep up the price of labor is to prevent the propagation of his species, to kill off enough of his brothers to prevent workmen from overcrowding the labor market. Could anything be more materialistic. Man has right to live from the fruits of his toil as a decent member of society and you cannot consider any question of an industrial or economic character without considering the right to live from the fruits of his toil as a decent member of society and you cannot consider any question of an industrial or economic character without considering the right of the workingman in connection with them. What are his objects, his ambitions? He is not satisfied with conditions as they were 20 or 30 years ago, and it is just as well for us to make up our minds that he is going to get what he wants, and we have to make up our minds also that if we do not pass this Logging Bill somebody else is going to be here who will some time in the future. Twelve years ago the Workingmen's Compensation Bill was thrown out of

the House of Assembly, and passed there five years later. If we study the history we will find we are only travelling a path that was beaten seven hundred years ago. Baths were provided then in certain forms of industrial employment for workmen.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—Why were they discontinued?

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Because of wars and disturbances which were taken advantage of by the powerful to enslave industrially the many. I hope the day will come when baths will be provided. We have to start in on a campaign of education and show the people the benefits and necessities to be derived from their use and we are not doing our work if we do not educate the people up to their needs. In many of the industries carried on seven centuries ago regulations were made whereby food prices should be fair and reasonable, and it was forbidden to buy up raw material thus preventing monopolies, but apparently in this twentieth century we have outlived these conditions when master and man lived on good terms and each represented the rights of the other, and each endeavoured to do his part. In this twentieth century dividends are of more importance than the health of the operator.

With regard to the motion that the Bill be referred to a select committee, I must object, Mr. President, to this Bill being so referred, because I think the principle to begin with is wrong. We have no power to refer this Bill to a select committee. This Bill is a public one, not a private one, not one for conferring rights or concessions upon individuals, promoted by individuals, not a Bill by which individuals seek a franchise from the state whereby a committee would examine as to how far it would affect the state. Select committees are not appointed to look into matters of this kind. Bills

of this kind are not referred to select committees elsewhere; only bills of a private character where it becomes necessary that investigation and research be held in order that members may make up their mind as to how far that which is asked affects the individual or the right of the individual are so referred. They have in other parliaments what are known as standing committees, but I think we would search in vain where a bill of this kind which affects the Colony as a whole was referred to a select committee. On these grounds I must object to the motion.

I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time. The House is not committed to the principle of the Bill until it is read a second time, therefore if the amendment carries how can it be referred to a select committee when the House is not committed to the principle. If the Bill is lost on the second reading then the Bill is lost, and there is no more second reading about it.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—I think the hon. gentleman is absolutely correct in that. The only course is that the leader of the Government in this House should withdraw his motion and let the second reading go through.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—As a matter of fact I think that on reflection both hon. gentlemen will find they have taken the wrong position. In many cases a bill is referred to select committees before the second reading because the House is not prepared to accept the principle of the Bill as it stands, and the Bill is sent to a select committee in order that it may be modified. At the same time I do not think we ought to stand on any strict construction of the rule at the present time. I suggest that the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment withdraw it and give the Bill a second reading and the same object which

he desires may be attained to-morrow. I think it better to let it go into committee of the whole and deal with it there. The motion for select committee can be made after the second reading passes.

HON. MR. SQUIRES.—I understand that the motion is that the Logging Bill be now read a second time, and to that there is an amendment that the Bill be referred to a select committee. I propose to vote for the second reading of the Bill. I feel that this House should endorse the principle of the Bill and pass it. If it is the will of this Council that the Bill be then referred to a select committee that is a matter for the Council to consider on a subsequent motion. I am of the opinion that the present procedure although it was the procedure followed last year with regard to the same Bill is irregular. Let the Bill be now read a second time. The following motion will be that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow. The amendment now moved by Mr. Bishop to the second reading could then be moved and debated but at this stage the amendment should not be put. I consequently propose to vote for the second reading because the principle of the Bill has my endorsement and support.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I shall not oppose the second reading and ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I think my hon. friend is still wrong. I speak now merely out of my experience in the Lower House. The motion now is for committee of the whole to which an amendment is made for a select committee and not committee at present time. Let us assume the motion is carried. The select committee reports back in due course to the House and then the House refers its report to a committee of the whole. When the select committee reports the Bill after giving it consideration then my

hon. friend can move that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow. Let us follow the thing a little further. If we go into committee of the whole and we decide for a select committee and then decide the Bill be sent to a select committee, the select committee is appointed by the President in full House; the select committee takes the Bill and comes back and reports not to the Committee of the Whole but to the House. The Committee has no power to appoint select committees; that power rests only with the House and when the select committee makes its report to the House the House refers that motion back to committee of the whole. It is perfectly clear to my mind; it occurs every week of the session of the Lower House.

The motion being put, was carried those in favor of the motion being Hons. Harvey, Bishop, Robinson, Winter, Goodridge, Squires, Jas. Ryan, Blandford, Templeman, Ryan, McGrath. And those against: Hons. Gibbs, Skelton, Knowling, Job, Milley, J. D. Ryan, Anderson.

Hon. the President appointed as the select committee Hons. Bishop, Knowling, Harvey, Anderson, Winter, Gibbs.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Second reading of Local Affairs Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—This Bill refers to the administration of local affairs. It is not greatly changed from the law as it now stands on the statute book. A bill was passed a number of years ago giving authority to different sections of the country to elect Boards for the management of local affairs. The machinery is found to be cumbersome, and the present Bill is to simplify and make easier the election of these Boards. How far the lower branch of the Legislature has succeeded in simplifying the bill I am not prepared to say, but we will partially discover what its present provis-

ions are and how they are going to be carried into effect, and possibly it may be found that it requires some amendments. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

HON. MR. SQUIRES.—I rise to support the second reading of this Bill. There are some sections in it which it is exceedingly difficult to understand. There must be some misplacement of paragraphs or similar error as some of the paragraphs do not make sense. This is a matter which can better be discussed in committee rather than at this stage.

The principle of Local Self Government must commend itself to every member of this Chamber. Any one who has any personal knowledge of the administration of district affairs knows that the present system is capable of very great improvement, and I am convinced that this Bill is an honest endeavour to improve conditions. District representation should have nothing whatever to do with the allocation of money. It is not fair either to the representatives or the people that such should be the case. For a representative to secure personal knowledge of a large constituency containing 150 or more settlements scattered over a very large coastline is almost impossible unless he devotes his whole time to district affairs, and has an office in St. John's with at least one stenographer to handle correspondence.

It is not fair to the people because the present system has brought many persons to look upon road money as Government money for distribution among the people without having any regard to the fact that road money should be as honestly spent and as honestly earned as any other money. The present system has developed the idea that road money is akin to poor relief; any change that will help to abolish that idea must be welcomed by

all who desire to see value secured for money spent.

This Bill is based upon the Act of 1898. That Act remained on the Statute Book ever since with one or two amendments. It has been inoperative because of the extreme difficulty of working out any self government measure in small communities of comparatively poor people.

I feel, however, that this measure is a substantial improvement on the 1898 Act and any effort to develop the idea of local self government is well worthy of encouragement. Democratic government is based on the people themselves. Under our system the districts speak as a body. Why not let the town speak for itself on its own local affairs? If in the small towns around our coast there can be got public spirited men who will be prepared to make a sacrifice in the interest of the general welfare of his town or settlement then an improved condition must follow. It is a natural development of the principles of democratic government to extend the system to local affairs. It may be doubtful whether an elected board will be able to be as firm with the people who elected them in enforcing value for money spent as a board not subject to the popular will. I know of places where I am sure the money will not be as well spent. I know of places where I am sure the money will be better spent. As to whether the matter on the whole will be improved time alone can tell, but I believe this experiment should be made. It can not cause the people to get less value for road money than they have been getting and it may by the development of public spirit improve conditions. In my opinion it matters not who has control of the expenditure provided the money is paid out for value given. If the money is spent at the proper time for road repair under intelligent

supervision by those who not only plan for the year's expenditure but plan years ahead in the interest of the roads and bridges, it matters not who appoints the person in control. I am hoping that this local affairs act will so encourage local interest and develop public spirited disinterestedness which will improve local conditions. I consequently heartily support the principle of the measure.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled an "Act Respecting the General Hospital" in which they asked the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop this Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—In last sitting but one, question was asked by Hon. Mr. Robinson whether any communications had been exchanged with the Dominion Government respecting the Sealing Bill to which I replied that there had not been, which was correct. But as there had been a communication from the Government of Newfoundland with regard to the Gulf sealing, I desire to read for the House a copy of that message of 25th March, 1915:

"Have been informed that Norwegian sealing steamers which cleared from Canadian port of North Sydney, to prosecute the sealfishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and vicinity intend remaining out till June. If this be so, destruction of old seals by guns of these ships will have a very detrimental effect upon the fishery, as not alone will they capture a large num-

ber of seals but will also injure large numbers, which will afterwards perish. The law of Newfoundland prohibits killing of seals after May 1st. Would recommend that your Government would enforce same in connection with Norwegian steamers."

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House adjourned until 4.30 p.m. on to-morrow.

TUESDAY, May 11th, 1915.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

LABRADOR FISHERY-BILL.

Committee on Labrador Codfish Bill.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Bill, Hon. J. D. Ryan in the chair.

HON. JAMES RYAN.—I would like Mr. President, with the permission of the House, to make a few remarks upon the measure before the Chair and at the outset I cannot refrain from asserting that while proceeding with the consideration of this measure we should give it most earnest attention before entering upon any definite course of action. It is in my opinion a very difficult matter for any person to fix the price of fish shipped off the Labrador coast so as to satisfy the sellers and buyers, and I cannot see how it is to be done unless a satisfactory figure is arranged between the buyers and sellers themselves. In my opinion it would be more in accordance with the fitness of things if the buyers and sellers would fix the price at the time the goods are being delivered. The fixing of the price is an impossibility too great for anyone person to assume, before the goods are sold or even an offer can be drawn from prospective buyers. In my opinion two prices should prevail; one for fish shipped from the Labrador without any allowance to the sellers for bonus or freight as this would leave an open door for

litigation. The Straits fish is undoubtedly better than what is caught on the Labrador coast more particularly what comes from the northern parts of it. Those interested in the industry know, that buyers of fish abroad who understand their business properly sometimes refuse to treat for shipments of fish from Northern Labrador. It is certainly a poor article when taken out of the sea; the livers are poor and yield very little oil. Experienced buyers are aware of the quality of the fish and I myself have seen fish taken from the northern parts of the coast though well treated and properly cured, that was hardly fit for human food. It was so thick and dark and of such a generally inferior quality that possible purchasers looked askance at it and it was most difficult to obtain a market for it. I have heard a great deal about the necessity for new markets, but, Sir, we shall lose the markets we have unless the cure is improved. As I view it, the cure effects prices and unless it is improved we will be compelled to take much lower prices in the future for this fish. Good fish is more valuable than heretofore and unless we endeavor to improve our cure of Labrador cod we very shortly will have our catch, as well as prices greatly reduced, for we must face a fact which is quite apparent, and that is the keenness of outside competition. We have had only French competition until recently, but now we have not only French but Norwegian, Icelandic, Shetland Island, Faroe Islands, Gaspé and other people as competitors, and I may say that Italian merchants have established plants for buying and curing fish on the east coast of England and send it to Italian houses to sell. In former years hundreds of thousands of quintals of fish were shipped off the Labrador coast to foreign markets, but the industry has been dwindling, is becoming

more and more unprofitable, and a couple of years ago the industry had almost reached its nadir, while last year only 91,000 quintals were shipped from the coast. The cause of this unfortunate condition is imperfect cure. We must readjust as it were, our views on the price, and must give particular attention to cure if we are to get even fair prices for our catch, and it seems to me that unless we improve the cure we will run the risk of losing the markets which we possess already. Not many years ago ten or twelve steamers were chartered to carry cargoes of fish to different markets—last year only one steamer was employed. The employment of steamers to take the product to different markets was a very great advantage to everyone connected with the Labrador fishery, because the fish reached the markets so much earlier, and a great portion was consumed and some markets were bare before sailing vessels could arrive with cargoes. This means of getting the produce to market and its consumption early had to be abandoned owing to the fishermen holding back their fish and refusing to deliver it. Every strike at Labrador has resulted in loss to the fishermen indirectly, it has led to the curtailment of supplies, the withdrawal of steamers to carry the product to different markets of the world and, finally, it has tended to influence merchants to withhold supplies for the Labrador fishery. Formerly one of the largest markets for our fish was Genoa, which would take about thirty cargoes, but we gradually lost it, and 1912-13 the shipments there had fallen to three cargoes only. No more fish is being consumed in Europe than of old, it is difficult to sell our fish, owing to the competition to which I have already referred, and to bad cure. Icelandic fish and other fish is better cured than ours, and they can

consequently reap profits though they sell for less than we do. I wish to be excused while giving one instance from my own experience. In 1913 I had a cargo of fish on demurrage at Gibraltar a long time, and eventually was compelled to consign it to one of the largest fish merchants at Genoa. That merchant was getting fish from Iceland and Norway and selling it, but could not sell mine, the price being too high. He did not complain of the cure but the price was too high for him to dispose of the fish, and the last of it was not sold for thirteen months after being shipped. I lost \$1,500 on that cargo and might have lost \$10,000 but that the cure was really good and this shows the value of having good properly-cured fish. I reiterate the assertion and cannot impress as forcefully as I would like on hon. members here the necessity for an improved cure if we are to hold the markets we now possess and expect to get fair prices. A number of firms have abandoned the Labrador fishery, not that they have made enough money, but because they have lost money by it. In my opinion within a very few years the fishery will be prosecuted only by planters owning schooners who, with their crews, will catch the fish and bring it to the shores of Newfoundland and cure it and sell it in the open market. Merchants cannot go on supplying men and motor boats and traps to go fishing, with hooks and lines to catch fish when they are losing money by it. I think the Government should appoint cullers to supervise every shipment from the Labrador coast, with power to issue certificates with each cargo to prove it is No. 1 quality. This would be a very great advantage. Very often now a sale is made and finalized, so to speak, but is not confirmed until an expert is sent to Gibraltar to examine the cargo.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—It is not

my intention to oppose this Bill on its general principles, although I have not any hope that benefit will accrue from it. It is experimental, and some times great things do arise from experiments, but I fear very little of any value will arise from this. There is one section in it to which I have no alternative but to take very strong exception, and that is the one now under consideration. The Labrador Fish Prices Board if it is to be formed, should be representative not of a section, but of those who are mainly interested. There are two classes of people who are interested in this matter—principally interested; the fish exporters, who may be said to include the fish buyers, and the fishermen. I fail to see, as I have already said, that the Board of Trade represents the fish exporters. I fail also to see that a political party represents the fishermen. I shall therefore content myself with proposing an amendment and leaving it there. The amendment I propose is as follows:

That section 2 be elided and the following substituted therefor: "On or before the first Monday in July in each year the Labrador Fish Exporters shall appoint one person, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries another two so chosen a third, and the three so appointed shall constitute the Board. A meeting of the Labrador Fish Exporters, of which a full month's notice shall be given, shall be convened by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in St. John's not later than the 30th day of June in each year, and the appointment of the aforesaid representative shall be made by a majority vote of those present."

Fish exporters will then have their representative, and there can only be one representative of the fishermen of the country, and that is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries appointed by the Government, duly elect-

ed by the country.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Having charge of the Bill before the House I cannot consent to the acceptance of this amendment because that which the hon. member wants to eliminate, by his amendment he perpetuates.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—How?

HON. MR. GIBBS—Because the Minister is a member of a political party and is returned by a majority vote of the district he represents, and the same idea of politics and the same fear that politics will intervene in the appointment of the Board is just as apparent, and no doubt it will be said so, just as much as if we were to allow the section to go through in its present form. There is no body in this country known as the Fish Exporters' Association; they are not an organized body. The Fishermen's Protective Union is an organized body and represents possibly the majority of the fishermen. To refuse it the right of appointment would not be fair. In England the present Government is made up of different elements and some of the supporters of that party are what is known as Labor members. These members represent Trade Unionists and were first elected to the British Parliament through the agency of the funds of trade organizations there. And you will find that the Government in England recognize the Labor party and Trade Unionists by nominating them as boards of settlement of industrial disputes and other things, and surely when in England that right is recognized and conceded there is nothing wrong in conceding the same right here on behalf of the F.P.U. In New Zealand trade and labour organizations are given the right of representation on boards of different kinds relating to the scale of wages and similar matters, and they claim the right and the right is conceded,

and that is all the F. P. U. claim here. The fish exporters have no status as an organized body, so to speak, and I think hon. members will agree that the section in the bill as it stands will meet the wishes of all concerned very much better than the amendment proposed by my hon. friend.

HON. MR. McGRATH—In view of the tone the discussion has taken and with the idea of a compromise, may I suggest that if the Fish Exporters are to name one member of the Board, the other might be named, as the Legislative Commission on Fisheries has suggested, in reference to the cull of fish, by the outport members of the Assembly. These Assemblymen, it could be claimed with much justice, are the best ones to choose the nominee of the fishermen. As I understand this Bill, it is not so much to fix prices as to create a Board of Arbitration yearly to decide what figure is meant by the term "current price" I may be wrong, but as I understand the situation it is that thousands of people go to the Labrador to fish and are supplied by merchants or planters, to carry on that industry, and because it is more convenient for both parties to wait until well on in the season before deciding on the price, nothing is done to fix this at the start or when the fish is bought from those who catch it and put it on board vessels for shipment to market. I have tried to learn what part of annual catch is sold under the term "current price," but have been unable to get any clear idea thereon, though apparently a large proportion of it is so sold. Then, we must conclude that the practice is of benefit to both parties, or it would not be continued; so, if it suits the fisherman because he hopes to get better prices later in the

season, and if it suits the merchant because he is unwilling to fix a price until he knows what the market is likely to bring, I think, then it is only fair that both parties to the transaction should have some say in settling the price when the time arrives to do so. Accordingly, I agree that the man who catches the fish, as well as the man who buys it to export, should have a voice in fixing the price that is to be paid under the arbitration which this really represents. With reference to what is said about the President of the F.P.U., the fact should not be overlooked that while he speaks for a large number of fishermen, so far as one can judge from the results of the last election, there may be other fishermen's organizations later, and therefore, it is questionable whether we should recognize in an Act of Parliament any personality if we can devise a scheme that will meet the requirements of the case as well and prevent possibilities of trouble in the future. Accordingly, I suggest that we leave the appointment of the fishermen's representative to the outport members of the Assembly. At present the effect will be the same, because Mr. Coaker would probably be appointed, but this step may obviate friction in the future. Another difficulty which arises is that under the Bill, it may not be possible to get anybody to act either for the exporters or the fishermen, and even if men can be got to act for them, it may be difficult to secure an umpire, and then the Supreme Court will have to name one. This I think will not prove easy because it is fairly certain that the first two men chosen for the Tribunal will exhaust the possibilities of the community as to getting a desirable man for an umpire, before they go to the Supreme Court, and if they are unable to get him before they go there,

the chances are against the judges getting one afterwards. Still, I do not think we should reject the Bill. We ought to give it a fair trial, recognizing that the fishermen have a grievance, that they believe they are not getting a square deal as regards prices; and that the broad principle is a good one, that if two people agree to buy and sell an article on a price to be fixed, both ought to have a say in fixing it. At present the fishermen have no say in fixing the price. This is done in some vague fashion; and, when one is dissatisfied, he has to go into Court and sue for what he thinks is the current price and that, too, against alleged combinations to keep the price down. There is, however, another way of dealing with the problem, and that is to abolish the "current price" and provide that no agreement regarding the sale of fish on the Labrador coast shall be legal unless a specific price is fixed at the time the article passes from one party to the other. Then the exporter would know what he was paying and the fishermen what he was getting, and there would be no further trouble, but while things continue as they are, endless disputes are bound to occur. From what I have heard, my preference would be for a Bill that would oblige every quintal of fish shipped from Labrador to be bought under a specific price, but if merchant and fisherman prefer the other policy, then we ought to legislate so that both shall have a say in fixing the current price on that for which they are bargaining.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE.—On the second reading of this Bill I asked that it be deferred in the hope that when the report of the Legislative Commission appointed last session to report on the fisheries was received, some legislation would follow, in which

to some extent, the views of the introducer of this Bill might be met. I am totally opposed to the principle of the Legislature fixing the price of any commodity by law, as its value must be determined by supply and demand, and I know of no precedent for any such enactment as this. Of late years the competition for codfish on the coast of Labrador has been most keen, and it occurs sometimes, owing to vessels chartered for a certain quantity, requiring only two or three hundred quintals to fill up, and also the super-cargo being anxious to get away and catch the market he offers some great inducements. Some hon. members say the Bill only establishes a court of arbitration. It is, in my opinion, no such thing; it is a court to fix the price that buyers shall pay to sellers and without reference to any fluctuations in markets abroad, and that price must be fixed on or before 1st October, at which time there will be insufficient evidence available to fix a fair and reasonable price for the season. Some sales of early arrivals by steamers will probably have reached here by cable and no doubt have an effect on the opinions of the gentlemen fixing the price for the whole season, and I contend that a hard and fast price is going to injure the fishermen as much as exporters, who will be very indifferent about chartering vessels to load on Labrador, and probably many fishermen unable to bring their catches home will have to let it remain on the Labrador the winter. If this was a bill to settle what was the fixed current price for codfish shipped off the coast of Labrador for the season, it would not be objectionable, but surely our courts are fully competent to take evidence and decide that question without our creating any tribunal to do it. When the price is fixed at what may be considered a fair and reasonable price, no

fisherman will care to sell at less, and should markets decline or show a declining tendency our exporters will cease to charter vessels to proceed to Labrador to load, and thus an insufficiency of tonnage will cause a quantity to remain there. I consider if the Bill passes it will be quite unworkable. It provides for commissioners to be appointed to fix the price of Labrador fish shipped off the coast, and these Commissioners are not to be paid. What competent or eligible person will accept such a position with the certainty that he cannot please both parties, and in all probability will displease both? I don't think that this Bill will settle any difficulty that has been felt with regard to the current price. Fishermen will not sell their fish at the price fixed by the Commissioners with an advance paid thereon by others, and the same difficulty will be experienced, and super-cargoes anxious to get their vessels away will give receipts to that effect. I am opposed to this legislation and shall vote against this Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—With regard to the arguments urged in favor of the amendments and against the Bill, I would point out to the House that the outport member is not a representative solely of the fishermen. He represents supplier and supplied, all classes, and consequently, while his interests may be identical with the fishermen, still he has other interests to demand his consideration as well. There are people in the district he represents who are exporters of codfish, and because of their trade and business they have considerable political influence which the outport representative would hesitate in antagonizing, and it would be unfair to cast upon his shoulders the duty of appointing him a member of the board to represent the fishermen. The object of the Bill is giving the Board of

Trade the right to appoint a member so that the merchants may be represented by one of their number who is able and competent to deal with the question, and the object of the Bill in giving the right to the President of the F.P.U. to nominate another person, is that the fishermen shall be represented by somebody appointed by that body representing as it does 20,000 fishermen. This is not a bill to fix the price of fish, but a bill to fix a fair and reasonable price in cases where there is no agreement upon a price. If the fishermen on the Labrador sell their fish at \$3.00 to A. B. or C., this bill does not apply. It only applies when fishermen sell to a buyer their fish at a price to be agreed upon later, namely, at the "current price." Now, that is a very different form of contract. And should not a fisherman have the right to be heard in the matter of what is the current price as well as the man who buys from him? This is what this Bill does. In a court of arbitration each party could represent their side of the case and the facts as they bear upon the current price; then after the subject matter is investigated these men could meet and fix the price according to the facts and evidence. Now, it has been said, and I don't know but it may be true, that Labrador fishing operations have been carried on at a loss. Is it not time that the fishermen should know that? What better means of demonstrating that, once and for all beyond doubt. If this industry is going down, and if the men engage in carrying it on are operating at a loss, is it not time that the fishermen should know it in order that they may govern themselves accordingly? You cannot have a better means of doing that than this Bill. I have not the least doubt that we can get men in this community only too glad to act upon that board and discharge the obligations

which this bill imposes. If each goes there to do his duty honestly and fearlessly there will be no trouble or difficulty in arriving at a fair and reasonable price. If the findings of the board are going to be unsatisfactory to the fishermen as some hon. members argue they will, that which business interests now pretend to take alarm at will be of no value to the fishermen. But I do not agree with this contention. A great deal of good will be accomplished, because it will have the effect of removing distrust and suspicion from the minds of the Labrador fish catcher. Give this bill a fair trial. There is a great deal of discontent in the minds of the fishermen, who think they are not getting a square deal. It is as I have said, only when the fisherman and the buyer fail to agree upon a price, that this Bill applies. It does not interfere with the conditions described by the hon. member. It has reference solely to the fish purchased when no price has been agreed upon at the time of sale, but is dependent upon the extent of the catch and prices in the foreign markets. Surely it cannot be seriously contended that the fisherman has no right to be heard in relation to the amount he is to receive for his fish, when no price was agreed upon at the time of sale. It would be a manifest injustice and wrong to hold that if I sell to an exporter 200 qts. of codfish at the current price, that I should not have any say whatever in the fixing of the price. Why should I be content to accept a price fixed by three or four men who export fish. This bill is possibly of a character we are not called upon to deal with often, but it is the peculiar conditions surrounding that trade that call for it and it ought not be a difficult matter in September or October to determine what is going to be the current price. The fishermen in this country differ from

any other producers of food in the world. If a farmer in the Western States is raising grain he can tell what the price of wheat is in any part of the world. There are information bureaus where the Government supply him with the prices. Nobody can come and impose upon him and get the advantage of him, because the information is supplied him. But the fisherman on the Labrador knows no more than the man in the moon what price is being paid, and in the absence of information of that kind he should be heard as to what is the current price when he sells upon such conditions. It is really a Board of Arbitration, not a board appointed to assess damages, but one that deals with the subject matter in the form of arbitration. It is unfair to assume that the men composing the Board are going to be unreasonable.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—I don't want to delay the House, but I have been very much tempted to rise to a point of order. If we are going to have conversation of this kind we shall be here till September. We have already adopted the principle of the bill, already adopted the first section, and the subject now is the appointment of the Board.

HON. MR. JOB.—I think we will all admit that the principle of this bill is agreed on, but I would like to say a few words at the present stage. When I referred to this clause before I said I thought it was a good one, and that the composition of the board was as good as we could get. In the absence of any discussion to the contrary I thought so, but since I have heard the remarks of the other hon. members, I am inclined to believe that what Mr. McGrath suggests would be very acceptable to the Board of Trade. It would certainly be a relief to the Board of Trade to be relieved of the responsibility of having to appoint a

representative on that Board. I think the suggestion that a representative be selected by the Labrador Fish Exporters is a very reasonable one. With regard to representation of fishermen personally I don't see much difference in having them represented by the President of the F.P.U. or the out-harbor members. Either is satisfactory to me. There is one remark which Mr. McGrath made that I would like to refer to, and that is that there should be no current price on the Labrador. Now as a shipper and one who has some interest in the matter, I am convinced that a current price is necessary.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I am very anxious indeed to try and help this through and get a workable Bill for various reasons. One is that, no doubt there is among the fishermen a strong feeling in favour of some such bill. Another is that it is very unpleasant, and a course that nobody in this Chamber likes to turn down or to amend beyond minor details, bills that come up unanimously passed by the other House. Personally, I would like to see this bill go through in some form and I am prepared to help it through, although personally, I do not think it will prove in practice any real benefit. I see a great many difficulties about this Bill. I had not intended to speak at this stage, but for the sake of charity, I would like to call attention to some points that have struck me while listening to the debate, as instances of misapprehension of the facts. Hon. Mr. Gibbs said he thought there ought to be no difficulty in getting the members of this board, who would be glad to set and to do their duty well. Well, I differ with him, for this reason, that the Bill as it stands makes it impossible for any appointee to do his duty, that is to carry out what is required of him by this Bill. I defy anybody on

the date named in this bill, if, indeed at any date, to name a fair and reasonable price, applicable throughout the season for Labrador fish. It is a question if the price of Labrador fish can be fixed fairly and reasonably under any circumstances. There cannot be named, as a rule, and between individuals, a price which can be described as fair and reasonable for fish shipped throughout the season. The buying price has been pure and unadulterated speculation, and it can hardly be anything else. It has not been what I can fairly pay on the Labrador, much as I may wish to pay a fair price that I am prepared to give, because I don't know what that is.

When I buy fish on the Labrador I do it perforce in the dark. Results depend upon the quality of the fish, and the speed the vessel makes which carries the fish, the question of sea damage and the date when the fish gets away, all varying factors, and I doubt whether anybody can ever say what is a fair and reasonable price for an article, whose value varies so constantly. I want further to say that the present current price system, unsatisfactory as it is, has been mutually adopted perhaps as much as for the purpose of protecting the fishermen as the merchants. A man fishing off the Northern Labrador hitherto has been entirely out of touch of the markets and similarly with the man to whom he is shipping fish. It was impossible for him to say what was a fair speculative price even, and the result has been that in order that neither side should get ahead of the other, a receipt has been taken at the 'current price,' which has been adjusted afterwards, both sides pulling their own way. All this would be impossible if the man on the Labrador had to name a price, hence the birth of the 'current price.'

Let me make clear another point. It is argued outside and in this House that this Bill will only touch a small quantity of the fish shipped from the Labrador because it will only touch the fish for which no price has been fixed. I believe after this Bill goes through especially in its present form that no fishermen will want to settle a fixed price and that men will refuse to ship except at the 'current price'. This may not occur the first year, but it will eventually be the case. The trouble then lies in this — can we expect the exporters to buy fish at a price to be fixed by a tribunal later on, who may, or may not be unfriendly and upon whose judgment they may not have confidence and whose personnel they do not know before supplies are given out. Men who thoroughly understand the Labrador markets may of course be found willing to go on this board, but I know many desirable men who would not undertake to name a fair and reasonable price. To fix a fair and reasonable price is in my opinion so difficult that I would not like to be a member of the board charged with fixing such a thing. To decide upon the present so-called current price is a very different thing. That is based upon competition among buyers on the Labrador itself.

What I fear is that this Bill is going to curtail the number and reduce activity and competition of exporters, because they will not feel like going down to invest large sums of money in an article whose cost they have no control over. This is not business and no prudent business man, who is not tied to the Labrador so that he cannot help himself, would speculate on such terms. In all human probability hereafter the fishermen will not want to ship except at the "current price" to be fixed by this tribunal of whom much will be

expected. We are well aware that the fishermen are not satisfied with existing conditions, and that is the true reason for this Bill, viz: that they think erroneously that they have not been getting value and they want to get more for Labrador fish, and they cannot be blamed. Now in regard to the formation of a board which is the question before the Chair, I should like to be able to suggest some solution. I cannot, however, see the solution. But in regard to the formation of this board I feel thus—suppose we appointed two members one representing each side of the controversy; those two members are not going to fix a price. Those two men are not really fair judges or unbiased arbitrators at all, but pleaders for their own clients in the case and the chances are against their agreeing mutually to a price and the price will have, in reality, to be fixed by the third member. This situation holds with nearly all arbitrations and tends to make them so frequently unsatisfactory. My personal preference would be to have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries fix the price and do away with the board altogether. A satisfactory board may be difficult to get and they eventually fix the price and can act as advocates just as well without being appointed officially. I am quite sure that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not welcome the cause of fixing that price, but I think, the official representative of fishermen (the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) is the man to do it, if some one must do it. I am sorry I have nothing really satisfactory to propose. I have risen at this time not to oppose the bill, but to clear up what appeared to me to be a misunderstanding on the part of some hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. McGRATH—If hon. members will read the bill carefully

they will see that in the last resort the cause of appointment rests with the judges of the Supreme Court. The bill provides that if it should prove to be impossible for the President of the Board of Trade or the President of the F. P. U. to make selections; or, if the two named men fail to choose a third, or if no price is fixed by the Board after appointment, the matter has then to go to the Supreme Court or a judge thereof, and under these circumstances I suggest the query, why not leave it to the Court to fix the price and eliminate the Board altogether? The judges of the Supreme Court are about the only three men not likely to be swayed by the various influences that will operate with regard to everybody else in undertaking the duty of fixing the price of fish. It is no argument against leaving the matter to them, that they have no practical knowledge of the fishery, because a case arising out of a transaction in fish between any two hon. members in this chamber will go to these judges in the ordinary course of events and will be considered by them after being argued out by lawyers who know no more about the matter than themselves. In saying this I do not reflect on either judges or the lawyers, but merely point out that none of them has any practical knowledge of the fisheries, and if we are prepared to leave it to them to settle other issues, not alone with regard to fish, but with regard to everything that occurs in the country, I fail to see that any more harm will come from leaving them to fix the price of fish than follows from the cases they now try. As to hon. Mr. Job's remarks about the impossibility of doing away with the 'current price' all I have to say is that it seems to me that one of two things must follow, either it

should be done away with or the fishermen should have a say in the fixing of the rate when fish is bought and sold at the 'current price'. As for the appointment of the fishermen's nominee, I would ask the House to note that, as I have said before, the choice of the outport members at the present time will probably fall upon Mr. Coaker or somebody favoured by him, but it may happen, at some future date, that the F. P. U. would split into fragments and then it would be a difficult matter to know what to do. I, personally, do not think it would be wise to put this matter in the hands of any Minister of the Crown, because, while he may have a right to recognition in the administration of fishery matters, still to invest him with the authority suggested in regard to this problem would be to impose duties upon him, which I think, ought not be imposed in view of the necessarily partisan character which he must possess, seeing that he is a member of a political party and is always liable to be open to the charge that any action he takes may be in the interest of his political associates rather than in that of the fishermen of the country. Reference is made in the bill to the Board fixing prices. I should like to ask if there is to be more than one price, and if so for what contingency?

HON. MR. GIBBS—The contingencies are provided for in section 10.

HON. MR. McGRATH—But you will not fix a different price for each of these conditions. It appears to me it is intended to have only one price—the 'current price.' I do not know what is intended and what is meant as it stands. I have been under the impression that the purport of the Bill was to fix a price which would stand as the 'current price', according to which everybody would be

paid who had not made a binding contract for a satisfactory figure.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—The introducer of the measure in the Lower House informed me that the Bill only contemplates one sitting of the Board of Arbitrators, and that in future or at any other time it may be necessary to grade fish on Labrador, if it does occur, it would be necessary to fix the price according to grade, not that there will be a different price fixed during the season, but it may come about as suggested by the debate. What is necessary down there is better cured fish, and some make better cured fish, but do not get paid more. In the event of fish being graded, different prices would be paid according to the grade. There will be only one sitting of the Board, because if hon. members will read sections 5 and 6 they will see that if the Board fails to act, the Supreme Court shall act. It only contemplates one price for the season, but if it fails to agree then different prices will be necessary.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—As we go on with the Bill, it seems to me to become more and more fraught with difficulties of all sorts, and I see more difficulties as to the details, but this is not necessarily a reason for throwing it out. With regard to this section, as every speaker has pointed out, it is almost impossible to fix what, under all circumstances, is a fair and reasonable price, and yet form any point of view as to the way this Bill will work out in practice. I would like to see the date for a fixed price made the 1st September, and I will explain why. I feel this way with regard to this Section. If the date is to be fixed on the 1st November or December, it simply means that people will send vessels to Labrador, and if unable to come to terms with the fishermen, they will have to load their vessels at the current price, and they will not know what that is. Will any one

business man send a steamer to Labrador to invest say \$50,000 in fish at a price to be fixed by a Board, whose very constitution he has no knowledge of, but who are to invest his money without his control? I say no business man who is not already so tied to Labrador that he cannot help himself, can reasonably be expected to do so, and I express my own opinion, knowing that there are other opinions. I say I do not understand how any sane business man can look forward to chartering a steamer or even a sailing vessel, sending her down there and investing a large sum of money without the vaguest notion of what the fish will cost, and having the price on what he must pay put in the hands of a Board whose personnel he may or may not have confidence in. My feeling about it is that if the current price is fixed on the 1st September, it cannot be a fair and reasonable price, except by good fortune, but if the price is fixed at some figure then anybody who loads vessels on the Labrador will at least know where he is. He will pay the current price, or if the current price is higher than he cares to ship at, he will be able to bring the ship back or see if the people on Labrador will accept say 20 cents below the price, or maybe he may give more than the current price. My point is that unless he has some knowledge of what he is to pay or control of what he is going to pay for a cargo of fish you deter him from sending to the Labrador at all for the fish. That is the difficulty about this section, and I would move that the latter part of the section be stricken out, and instead of the 1st October, September 1st be named. I know that you cannot fix a proper price at that time, but at least you can fix one that will enable the business to be carried out upon something approximating business principles. This is my private opinion, and I do not wish to influence anyone. It

will deter people sending down steamers and vessels, from loading them, unless they have at least a rough idea of what they will pay for fish.

HON. MR. JOB—I entirely disagree with Hon. Mr. Harvey in this matter. This Board would simply be taking the place of the merchants who fixed the price before, and if he will be afraid to send down vessels to load after the Board is appointed, he ought to be afraid to send them down when the merchants fix the price in the fall, or try to fix it. I cannot see any possibility of talking about the fixing of these prices, at any rate when we do not know the catch. A lot of Labrador fish is caught up to the end of September, and the fact is the 1st November is a more suitable date; at the same time they might be fixed on the 1st October with the knowledge of the fishermen. The question of this Bill having any encouragement upon people fitting out for the Labrador is an important one, and you may be sorry after if you passed the Bill that it would have this effect. But I would like to say now that there is very little inclination, at the present moment none are inclined to supply for Labrador, either in Conception Bay or other parts of the Island, because it does not pay. It would pay under the old circumstances, but not now.

HON. MR. McGRATH—With reference to October 1st, section 6 provides for that. If a majority of the Board do not fix the price by the 1st October then a judge of the court has 30 days to fix it. It is a question for the gentleman in charge of the bill. Is he prepared to consider another day?

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I judge by the debate on the Bill that the business carried on in the Labrador has been in a state of chaos. This Bill proposes to bring order out of chaos, because if the arguments of hon. gentlemen and the reasons advanced against the Bill are correct, the sooner some

such legislation is introduced to bring about the cessation of the prosecution of the Labrador fishery, the better for all concerned. The argument of hon. members is that if the bill goes through it will bring about the cessation of the fishery. Is not this the best thing for them? I can hardly believe that statement to be correct in every particular. In all classes of industry money is lost. Some make money, some have made money in Labrador and others have lost it, and it is the same with every other industry carried on. Men have started industries and amassed fortunes, and side by side are others who fail. It is because of the greater executive ability and business ability of the other. The argument advanced against the fixing of the price is that it is impossible. How is it that buyers go down there and fix the price of 3,000 or 30,000 qtls. as the case may be. Surely he fixes the price with the knowledge of the market where he sells and exports the fish. Others may say it is a gamble. Why should it be made a gamble by any body of men? There is no getting away from the fact that though we may defeat the Bill we see the necessity for some such Board as the Bill makes provision for.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I beg to move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. The Committee accordingly rose and reported as recommended.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill relating to the management of Outport Local Affairs.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD (Minister of Agriculture and Mines).—Before section 2 of this Bill goes through I may say that I should like to express an opinion in connection with its working, although it is a difficult

task to know exactly what to say, as I feel fully convinced that the tenor of the Bill from beginning to end is impracticable and can never become workable, and I am rather surprised that a Bill of this nature should be passed in the Lower House and then brought to this Chamber for ratification. It must not be understood, however, that I do not believe in a Bill for the election of Road Boards; on the other hand, I think something should be done whereby the people in the various settlements in our outports should have the power of choosing their own Boards; the best would thus be appointed, who would get the best of work out of the men engaged in reconstructing the roads, which would result in the advancement of the interests of each particular settlement.

I am thoroughly convinced, however from my own personal experience whilst representing one of the largest districts in the Island, that an Act with one or two sections could easily overcome the difficulties which are presented in the many sections of the Bill now before us.

I shall only dilate upon one of these sections now under consideration and which, in my opinion, is perhaps one of the worst features, viz:—Section 11. "That the cost of the election shall be paid out of the moneys granted to each Board."

Now, Sir, my experience teaches me that to deduct any amount for such expenses out of the infinitesimal sum which is allocated to each Road Board would be disastrous and I cannot believe that the Act should permit this tax upon the Board's allocation.

As an example allow me again to refer to the district of Bonavista which I had the honor of representing for eight years. Bonavista, if my memory serves me correctly has

a grant of \$1,200.00, which the Board had during that period, by an election, to manipulate in any way they desired and that amount covered the section from Cape Freels to Canaille—in other words, it included the Cape Shore, Bayly's Cove Mockbeggar, Red Cliffs, Bonavista Proper, and Canaille so one can readily appreciate the very small amount each would receive when the whole had been divided, amongst them, and which would be considerably reduced if the expenses in connection with the election of the Board had to be deducted, and I think it would be a great injustice to make a Road Board responsible for such expenses. The cry throughout the Colony is that the Road Boards are not receiving sufficient money to keep the roads in even ordinary repair, to say nothing of providing for the construction of new roads, much less to bear the expenses of an election. Of course new roads have been constructed by special grant and all the monies that are available should be given to the Road Boards to keep them in decent repair instead of asking the Board to pay the expenses of an election out of their funds, and if the people belonging to the various localities are so interested in their particular section the election should be voluntary and no sum for such should be taken from the pittance which is at present provided for the Road Boards.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The hon. gentleman surely knows that this Bill will not apply to the little settlements he refers to.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—In reply to my hon. friend, I desire to say that his argument seems to be rather weak and if he will permit me I would point out that in one or two of the largest settlements that he can think of, for instance, as I have said a few moments ago, such a place as Bon-

avista. I think that would be a fair representation of any of the other settlements. I believe that the road Board would not receive any greater amount than \$1,200.00 for the places that I mentioned in my opening remarks, in other words, that the Road Board for Bonavista would not receive any greater amount than \$1,200.00; I do not, of course mean the special grant and I believe that the elections which have been taking place during the last eight years free of expense is an improvement upon the Act which is now before us. There has not been a corner of Bonavista Bay where an elective Road Board has not been in effect and from my experience the people were well satisfied with the working of such boards, but this section creates an immediate charge upon the Board, and should not, in my opinion, be placed upon the Statute book. At all events, time will tell, but, as I have said before I do not believe that the Bill is workable and do not think that the Road Boards themselves will be satisfied to pay the expenses of their election out of the pittance which they receive.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

STAMP DUTIES BILL.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received messages from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 5 Geo. V., Cap. 19, entitled An Act respecting Stamp Duties" in which they request the concurrence of the Council.

HON. MR. BISHOP—Mr. President: I move that the Bill, An Act to amend 5 George V. Cap 19, entitled "An Act Respecting Stamp Duties" be read a first time. The Bill was then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

HON. MR. BISHOP—Mr. President: In appointing yesterday the Select Committee to consider the Logging Bill, you were good enough to mention my name. I wish to say that I desire that you relieve me of that duty. It is known to hon. members here that I have considerable interest in logging and lumbering in the country, and for that reason I feel that whatever I may say should be said in open session of the House. For that reason I ask you to be good enough to allow me to retire and nominate another in my place.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I would ask Hon. J. D. Ryan to act in the place of Hon. Mr. Bishop.

HON. MIN. AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg leave to lay on the table of the House the report of the Board of Agriculture.

MARINE DISASTERS FUND BILL.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill in which they asked the concurrence of the Council. “

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg leave to lay upon the table of the House the Report of the Public Schools in Newfoundland under Methodist Boards for the year ending December 31, 1914.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till four of the clock to-morrow.

WEDNESDAY, May 12th.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

LABRADOR FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs House went into Committee of the whole on the Labrador Fish Prices Bill, Hon. J. D. Ryan resuming the Chair of the Committee.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES

—Before that amendment is put I wish to express my opinion regarding casting my vote for or against the amendment. As far as I can see the amendment is very little improvement on the Bill. With regard to the Bill generally I think that something should be done so that matters on the Labrador both from the standpoint of the fishermen and the exporters should be put on such a basis that justice will be done to all. At the same time I can readily appreciate the difficulties in the way, and what I am afraid will occur at a future date is that if arrangements are not effected between the fishermen and the exporters somebody is going to be driven out of the business which will inflict a great hardship. Generally speaking I am in accord with this Bill as far as it goes for the advancement of the country, and regard it as a step in the right direction as between the two parties concerned. Whether this Bill will be of value to either is very doubtful, and I am only speaking at this moment so that I might be in a position to justify myself in voting against the amendment put forward by Hon. Mr. Robinson, as I think at the moment one is as good as the other.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I desire to point out to hon. members that the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman is defective in many respects. This bill, as hon. members will see on perusal of it makes provision in the event of certain things not happening, what shall be done. Now the amendment proposed by my hon. friend asks that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall convene a meeting of the Labrador fish exporters and that they shall at that meeting nominate one member to represent them. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sends out notice. The

fish exporter says: "I am not going to attend this meeting." What becomes of your amendment then? The object of the Bill is to create machinery by which its provisions can be carried out. If the amendment goes further and says that in the event of the fish exporters refusing to attend the meeting they will be liable to a sentence in the Penitentiary of not less than thirty days, it would be alright. But it is useless for us to discuss the amendment. In the event of the President of the Board of Trade not appointing or fixing a price, then by application to the Supreme Court it may be done. We should have to go to work and amend this Bill right through in order to make that amendment effective. Then again the bulk of the Labrador fish exporters are not living in the city and are not going to come here merely at the bidding of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at a season of the year when it is possibly of more benefit to them to remain at home at their business. Now these are some of the objections to this amendment, with all due deference to the mover of the same. The active members of the Board of Trade are those who are interested largely in the trade and business of the country and the members of that board are going to see that some person will be nominated, who will be competent to deal with this matter and who will look after the interests of the people he is supposed to represent there. Why should not a similar right be given the fishermen? What objection can there be for the President of the F. P. U. to represent them. Suggestion has been made here that outport members be given the right to nominate. They are also a political body. It is not fair to throw upon the shoulders of them the duty of nominating a member of the Board because they do not

represent the fishermen only, but all interests, I think that in view of the fact there is so much aggravation as to the current price on the Labrador that something ought to be done and this Bill aims to bring about a settlement. If it fails, then we can remedy it later.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Before the amendment is put I would like to say a word. Apparently we have reached what, without exaggeration, may be called a deadlock with regard to this Bill. I suggested yesterday the idea of having the out harbor members select one member of the Board and the fish exporters the other. The hon. gentleman who moved the amendment is agreeable that the amendment should be withdrawn in favour of one which will embody the principle of having the fish exporters and outport members make the selection. But it would now seem that perhaps the simpler method would be to place the duty of appointing three members of the board upon the Judges of the Supreme Court. It may and possibly will come to that in any case. We can easily understand that the President of the Board of Trade or the fish exporters may be unable to make a selection. We must take it on the other hand that the members of the House of Assembly can secure a member but it will come to the Judges of the Supreme Court to appoint one or possibly two, so I think to remove this whole problem from the arena of politics it would be better for us to leave it to the three Judges of the Supreme Court to name three members of this board, a selection that would be, I think, in the best interest of all parties concerned. I think we ought to affirm the principle that this is to be an arbitration tribunal, and we ought to get proper men who will be impartial. I don't think we are going to get im-

partially from the representatives of the exporters or fishermen under the bill as at present. If we leave it to the Judges we probably will be able to get men who will command the confidence of the country.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The suggestion of the honourable member is certainly a unique one because it goes beyond the principle he advocates, namely, arbitration in the event of their failing to appoint arbitrators. He proposes that the judges of the Supreme Court should be asked to act. But in the first place to ask the judges is a proceeding for which I don't think we can find any precedent. It is only in the event of parties not being able to make an appointment that the judges are ever asked to do so.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would point out that it was only yesterday in the Lower Chamber that the Premier abandoned that principle in connection with the Fertilizer Bill now before the House, in order to substitute a provision whereby the Supreme Court would appoint an arbitrator with the necessary expert knowledge to act as an umpire between the nominee of a wealthy corporation, and the man chosen by some poor settler who could not afford to secure an appointee with the experience to warrant his holding the balance evenly between the two.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The reason for that is such as will commend itself because it would be unfair to ask a man having property in Bay of Islands to appoint an arbitrator with the necessary expert knowledge to act in conjunction with the arbitrator appointed by a rich corporation. An arbitrator called upon to deal with questions which must necessarily arise in the expropriation of land and property must possess ability and fitness for the work, and unless the one appointed by the owner of the

property be sufficiently expert he whose land is taken will suffer material loss. But in matters arising under this Bill hundreds of people possess the requisite knowledge to act as members of the board for the reason that all, no matter what our station in life may be, have an intimate knowledge of fishery matters.

HON. MR. McGRATH—To my hon. friend I merely reply that if only yesterday it was admitted that the Supreme Court was a more proper authority to appoint a third arbitrator under the Fertilizer Bill than any other authority, the Supreme Court would be equally and more likely to choose a suitable man as umpire in this matter, because this Bill is going to have its own complications too, arising out of the varying prices paid for fish in the European markets, not alone in different years but at different times in the same year, the result of markets being empty or glutted owing to the number of vessels arriving at the principal ports together. We have heard enough the past day or two in regard to this to indicate that therein will be a problem that will call for arbitrators of exceptional judgment.

HON. MR. BISHOP—There is no doubt that the suggestion thrown out by Hon. Mr. McGrath arises from the feeling that we appear to be at a stage which resembles a deadlock in relation to the Bill and that that might be regarded as a reasonable way out of the difficulty. None of us could begin to question the reliability of any selections made by the judges of the Supreme Court, but it seems to me that we may be placing upon the Supreme Court duties which they are not at all in accord with their well known duties, and we may be dragging the Supreme Court into a controversial matter, which is not excusable. It has occurred to me that

I might suggest another course, as it is apparent we shall be here a very long time before we can arrive at unanimity and I would suggest that to begin with, we should, for a year, at any rate, empower the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to select two men, one representing the interest of the sellers as far as possible and the other of the buyers and that these two be empowered to select the umpire, or that the Minister himself would act in that capacity. It seems to me that that might be worth considering, if not preferable.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD— Pardon me for giving my opinion the second time with reference to section two. As I said before I believe there is a grievance on the Labrador with regard to shippers of fish, and I think it is agreed by every member of this Chamber that there is a principle at stake somewhere and the principle of this bill, in a measure has touched the kernel so to speak of getting over the difficulty with regard to the 'current price.' But how are you going to adjust matters between the two parties?

I am in accord with the principle of the Bill and verily believe that the fishermen on the one hand should be protected, and the merchant on the other hand, but I have to admit that we have a large sectional body—the fishermen of Newfoundland, being represented by the F.P.U., and I can't see any person who would be better able to look after their interests than the President of the F.P.U. I have no brief for stating this, but I am speaking as far as the fishermen are concerned, and whatever might transpire, I believe that he is the proper person to look after their interests. On general principles, I believe the bill inoperative, but I think we should give it a trial, and then we shall find that at the next session there will

be grievances for rectification. I think the Bill will work out its own salvation and that is the only way to test it. If we start in and make amendments to section 2 then from time to time amendments to other sections and send these down to the Lower House, I don't know what will befall the bill and we shall probably be here till August or September.

HON. PRESIDENT—I did not intend to speak on this Bill for the reason that I am not familiar with the Labrador fishery, but I may say that I am in favor of the principle of the Bill. What I mean by that is that it has often occurred to me that the method of arriving at the current price of Labrador fish appeared to be unfair. The producer of the fish on the Labrador appears to me to have no voice in assessing the current value of Labrador fish. Of course the obvious answer the merchants will give to this position is that whilst fishermen have had no voice in the naming of the price, yet somehow they appear to have got more than the fish was worth. If the fishery were a profitable one we would not see it abandoned by merchants in Conception Bay. I heard also to-day that 200 fishermen from this bay are looking for supplies and cannot get them. Well, if the price given for Labrador fish by the merchants were below the value surely this condition of things would not exist, because their profits would naturally be large. The question is a rather complex one, but an effort should be made to convince the fishermen that they are not unfairly dealt with. I prefer to vote for the bill at present before us, objectionable though it may be, rather than run the risk of having no bill passed this session. There are certain objections to the President of the F.P.U. acting as arbitrator, as pointed out by Hon. Mr. Robinson, but I think it would be

better to have the President one of the arbitrators, as he appears to have the confidence of the fishermen at the present time, and as Hon. Mr. Blandford says, if this Bill were passed and found unworkable, then we can amend it. It is for the purpose of removing from the minds of the fishermen the impression that I should entertain, if I were a fisherman, if the price of a commodity that I had for sale was to be made by a purchaser. As a rule the purchaser does not give a higher price than is necessary when buying. The rule of trade is to buy in the lowest market and sell in the highest. In reading over the bill I was trying to see how it would work out in practice, and I failed to follow the thing logically and the possible course things will take during the coming season, but I should not be one bit surprised if the very same thing that is going on to-day will be going on even if we pass this bill. But my principal reason for rising, Mr. Chairman, is to say that I am in favor of a bill—it may not be this bill—it may be Hon. Mr. Robinson's or Hon. Mr. McGrath's amendment, which ever it be, I am in favour of a bill to regulate the current price of Labrador fish. I cannot help saying that I rather think there has been a good deal of mismanagement with regard to the fishery, and this management very likely led to present conditions with regard to the Labrador fishery. Last year I was told that there were 10 cargoes of fish at Gibraltar on one day. This should not be. It may be said it was unavoidable. I say it was not. It must have had a most disastrous effect upon the price of fish. There are many ways of avoiding that. One or two occur to me. These may be impracticable, but I don't think so. The cargoes should be in the hands of a committee, who should dole them out as the markets need them. It may be that it would remove the chances of individual ship-

pers making a big profit, but it would also have the effect of preventing big losses. It would stabilize the industry and the price, and encourage the merchants to supply for the fishery. It often occurred to me that it would have been a good thing for this country if Canada owned the Labrador coast 50 years ago. I said I did not have much experience with this fishery. I had some experience of it three or four years ago and I don't wish to have it again. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a bill having for its object the intention conveyed by the section just read, and preferring it to no bill at all, I intend to vote for the one before us.

HON. MR. KNOWLING.—There is no doubt but a Bill of this sort will be useful, but it will be difficult to so shape it as to make it workable. It is well known to all connected with the trade that every fall there is great difficulty to ascertain what is the current price. You have men coming in who want to know the current price. You telephone to one merchant. He does not know. You telephone another, he gives you a price; still another, and he gives you another figure, and you get no definite information from one end of Water St. to the other, and, by and bye, you find receipts coming in; one with so much and freight, another with so much and 10 cents bonus, and another with 15 to 20 cents bonus. This is most unsatisfactory. I know of a number of cases where the bonus and current price were in dispute, and some never got what they expected they would get, and it was not worth their while to go to law, as it would be a most difficult task to decide. In the explanations given us by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, he says there is only to be one sitting of the Board. This surely is a mistake. The Board should sit whenever required, and should be a board of reference

both for the fisherman and merchant. It may fix one price right through the season. That is not fair. There is a certain time of the season when the fish is worth more than later on. The fish caught and shipped from the latter part of August to the middle of September gets to market first. It goes to a bare market, and reaching there, everybody is on the lookout for buying and is prepared to pay much higher prices than later on. Seeing this is the case, one price should be paid for early fish and another for the fish to be shipped from the 20th to the last of September, and another price for the October shipment, while after that the greater bulk of the fish left over would be brought back to the outports and reach St. John's or be shipped from the outports. It is scarcely fair that fish bought on Labrador, where it would be shipped earlier and marketed earlier should not get a higher price than late caught fish, which is marketed later. The probability is that a number of vessels reach the market about the same time and prices come down rapidly, so that if you had only one uniform price through the season it would not be fair. I make these suggestions, though I do not put them forward as an amendment, but solely that the House may consider them. The Bill, no doubt, has some weak points, but we must have a Bill of some sort, so that the fishermen might know what they are going to get. There should be no question of coming to some fair and satisfactory solution of this matter. At present it is difficult to know how to act. I have often occasion to try and find the price of Labrador fish, but cannot get satisfaction, and after asking half a dozen firms, am as far off as ever.

HON. MR. WINTER.—I think it is quite impossible to carry out the provisions of the section now being considered. It says here that you must

fix a fair and reasonable price for fish shipped off Labrador and must decide that price by the 1st of October. This is utterly impossible. You can fix a price certainly, but not a fair and reasonable one before you know what you are going to get for the fish, or can have any idea. The bulk of the cargoes of fish will not leave until after the first of October, and you cannot sell your fish even when it leaves Labrador, and must wait for cargoes to arrive before the price is mentioned. Judging from past experience we will not know what we get for fish until the end of October. We might get a vessel off about the 20th of September and that vessel may take three or four weeks to get across. Then a price will be named for one cargo which will be a very high price, probably. But the other vessels arriving later place a different aspect on the situation. The Hon. President referred to so many vessels leaving Labrador and arriving at Gibraltar at the one time, thus increasing the difficulty of realizing the fish. It will be difficult to avoid this. When the cargoes arrive in large numbers a general slump in prices occurs, and it is only after we know what the first cargo realizes that we can form an idea as to what will be the current price. How can anyone put a price on fish the 1st October when he does not know what it will bring in the markets? It is absurd. You do not know when a vessel leaves Labrador whether you will get 25 or 30 shillings. You may have an idea of getting a good price, but may not get 25 shillings when the vessel arrives over there. It all depends upon conditions, and it is impossible for any company or anyone to put a price on Labrador fish, until you have some idea of what the great bulk of the fish can realize. In past years after we knew what the first cargoes would sell for, we could then form an idea as to what the balance of the voyage

would realize, and then average the price up; this is the only way in which you can arrive at a reasonable price. If one price must be fixed we must have a fair idea as to what all the fish will sell for. If you fix the price on the first shipments or on the basis of what they sell for, it will be too high; and if on the late cargoes, it will be too low. You must average the prices up. In place of determining on the price on the 1st October it would be far more reasonable to take the 1st November; then you can get an idea of what will be a fair and reasonable price for the whole voyage on October 1st.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—We are going to arbitrarily fix a price which a man has to pay in the absence of any contract to the contrary. If that price is going to bring about loss to all, then I think this is the best possible bill the Labrador exporters could have. Now, what would any three men sitting at a board of arbitration do? They would first ask what is the catch of fish on the Labrador; what are the conditions of the market to which the fish is to be exported; what the price which should be obtained, and what price can the fish exporter pay to the fisherman and at the same time give him a legitimate and fair profit on the investment? Can anything be fairer than that? No board will ask a man to pay a price which will be a loss to him. It is not common sense to assume that any three men will do anything of that kind. Except when conditions such as have existed the past eight or nine months arise, the fish exporter will always get a fair profit. We want to see him do so, and if he does not it is his fault. He has been either paying too much for fish or has been too anxious to get the fish over to market to get ahead of his neighbour. The Hon. President of the Council made, I think, a very good suggestion as regards a

combination of the merchants to market their catch of fish. If there was some sort of exporters' combine so that tens of thousands of quintals of fish would not be sent to the market at the same time, but only in such quantities as the market can take, it would be much better. The debate upon this bill, as I have pointed out, shows that chaos exists on the Labrador in connection with this matter, and I think the Bill will only create order where chaos now exists.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I want to point out to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Job) as to fixing the price, and as to the situation being the same on this Board as when the price was fixed by a combination of merchants. If the price was fixed by a combination of merchants, at least I knew the constitution of the combination and I myself would have a voice in it, but to allow another combination of this sort to invest my money for me is a different thing. To draw a parallel between this Board and a combine of shippers is unreasonable. I do not agree that as long as I had anything to do with the Labrador fishery the price was fixed by a combine. What practically happened was that active competition among buyers on the Labrador, and there were a good many spot cash buyers, fixed the eventual dealing, or current prices. It was practically fixed at the highest price that these cash buyers paid. Several of these buyers were foreigners, or buying for foreigners' account—like Captain Jensen—who had nothing to do and no communication with Newfoundland shippers of any kind. They competed with Newfoundland shippers, and Newfoundland shippers competed among themselves actively and the current price was not fixed by any

combine. I protest against the suggestion that any member of this House should allow his judgment to be warped by any fear that his attitude may be misunderstood and misrepresented outside this House, quite as emphatically as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bishop) has protested against the House permitting itself to be influenced by any outside threats regarding a campaign to abolish it. The position of members of the House may sometimes be unfortunate and liable to unjust insinuation and attack, but members must act and do act without regard to such criticism, and simply according to the best of their judgment. Unfair outside criticism has to be faced and should not influence this House. Criticism generally has to be reckoned with, and so long as it is fair it is to be welcomed.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN—The thought has occurred to me that it might be wise to make an amendment distinguishing as between Straits fish and fish taken on the Labrador. Straits fish, which is earlier fish, is the best, and early cargoes fetch better prices than the later ones. I made some remarks yesterday that I considered the bill a useless one; perhaps the best thing to do is to pass it, but as a whole I do not think it will do any good any way. In my opinion this discussion is "much ado about nothing," but I do think that if we pass it as it is we should make two prices; one for the Straits and one for Labrador fish. Hon. Mr. Gibbs spoke about the injustice of the business, but would he expect any one man to do business on the Labrador and be subject to three men to fix a price who have never engaged in the fishery and probably do not know the difference between a haddock and a codfish? That, to my mind, is just as unjust, for I do not think any buyer will go to the Labrador and buy fish in August subject to

three men who will settle what the price of fish is to be in September, October or November. If it is so important or necessary to bring in a Bill to fix the price of Labrador fish, why not bring in a bill to fix the price of fish sold in St. John's? It is just as reasonable. We very often hear a lot of talk about no price being offered for Labrador fish on the coast. In my experience we have always named a price, and last September 17th I telegraphed my agent on the Labrador to pay \$3.60 for fish and to put the price on receipts. All my dealers who paid cash for fish have been settled, and we have not had any dispute whatever as to anything over the price offered, viz: \$3.60, which price they were aware of when they shipped it.

The marketing of Labrador fish from the coast has not been very profitable during the last few years, and I can assure you that the business of 1913 meant a loss to all merchants that shipped Labrador fish in bulk from the Labrador coast. Some of these cargoes had not been disposed of up till the time that the new season's fish caught in 1914 was in the market. These are facts which can be proven.

Last year cargoes were shipped later than other years on account of the late catch and could not be sold before arrival at Gibraltar, and even when they arrived there they could not find a buyer, consequently a great many cargoes were held at Gibraltar as long as twenty days and were costing four pound sterling a day for demurrage. I had two cargoes there myself and after spending a great deal of money in cables was finally advised to send the vessels on to market on consignment as other people were doing so. After all this delay and cost of cable there was still no sale made and the vessels were ordered on, and we have not yet re-

ceived the account sales of these cargoes.

There seems to be a great deal of talk about this Labrador fishery. How many people have got rich at the business? In fact I do not know of any. If so I would like the Hon. Mr. Gibbs to point them out to me. I do not think the men who drafted this Bill ever caught any fish or ever set eyes on the Labrador. The much abused merchant has a lot to put up with while trying to do his business which is sometimes done at a very great loss to the merchants and the Legislature should try not to hinder them in the prosecution of such a precarious business, and he should not be interfered with by legislation such as we have now in the Bill before us.

In my opinion the fishermen got the best of the bargain during the past few years for when they shipped their fish they knew what they were going to get for it and no more bother than to collect their money for what they sold and deposit it in the Savings Banks where we are told there are six million dollars deposited by the fishermen of this country. Very few merchants engaged in the Labrador fishery can boast of having any money put away in the Banks made out of the Labrador fishery, but on the contrary they have their money made in other lines of business, locked up in cod traps, schooners and had debts which are always depreciating in value, and apparently will never be recovered from this line of business.

I think Hon. Mr. Knowling's amendment is a good one. Cargoes sent early last season brought from five to six shillings per quintal more than those shipped later, consequently the man who bought those cargoes and sold them can afford to pay a better price for the fish than those who sold later. Years ago cargoes were ship-

ped as early as the 14th and 15th of August when the weather was dryer and much better fish was made, now the fishery begins late and last year as late as October; and the weather is not so dry then or good for drying so that the fish is shipped in a wet or soft condition thereby turning out as much as from four to five per cent short in weight when reaching our market.

Hon. Mr. Harris says that an effort might be made to remedy the marketing. There was an effort made in 1912 but it resulted in failure and a great deal of expense to the shippers. If the hon. gentleman can show how this can be done we will be very glad to learn the lesson.

HON. MR. BISHOP—Suppose the Board meets and fixes a price before the first of October, and the great bulk of the fish is shipped before there is any dissent to that or any difficulty arising therefrom, but before the men come along here they find that prices in St. John's are forty to fifty cents more than fixed on the Labrador. Would the introducer of the Bill say that the men are entitled to no more than the price fixed by the Board, and have no redress from that?

HON. MR. McGRATH—In the case of *Nowworthy vs. Munn* evidence was given that in the autumn of 1912 a price, presumably the current price, was offering on the Labrador of \$4.20 a quintal, but that some parties offered forty cents more to certain people for fish in order to get. I presume complete cargoes, and subsequently many of these people who had arranged for \$4.20 got \$4.70. How will conditions like that operate in such a case as named by Hon. Mr. Bishop. That will be very unpalatable to the fishermen.

HON. MR. GIBBS—If the Bill passes that the price is to be fixed by the Board, then they will have to be sat-

satisfied with that price, and I think with all due deference to the hon. member that his amendment will probably cause greater confusion than this bill will do. If that section be allowed to go as it is in the Bill it will work much better in the interests of all concerned. If the fishermen are satisfied that the price be fixed not later than first of October, and it is presumed there will be sufficient evidence before the Board to fix a price then I think that to make two different dates and two different prices may make less in September and more in December, or vice versa, and I think would only cause dissatisfaction and complaint. This bill has been considered in all its aspects by the fishermen and they think that if the Board be given the power to fix a price for the calendar year on or before the first of October that will be the best. Now if the fishermen are going to lose by the price being fixed by that date, and are satisfied to meet a loss of that character I do not think we should intervene, and the section should be allowed to go through in order that we may have a trial, so to speak, to see how far this operation will be beneficial to all parties concerned. I regret that I am unable to accept the amendment.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The Hon. Mr. Knowling is entirely right in principle but it is impossible to carry out in practice, and I really think this would not be of any benefit. A man might buy fish but the vessel might be delayed for weeks before sailing for market. Then the seller might claim to be paid accordingly. We see this kind of thing arising again and again in the Newfoundland shore, let alone the Labrador. I would be glad to support any amendment which would help the bill, and make it more easy to put into practice, but do not think this would.

HON. MR. MILLEY—I was very much struck with the remarks of the speakers in the House of Assembly, and I would very much like to see the Bill passed as it is. If we are going to amend this Bill we are going to get further into the mess, and therefore I think it well to accept the Bill as it stands. I give it my hearty support.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I don't know whether I am right, but from a small experience of the Labrador coast and also of the Straits I verily believe the introducer of the Bill meant to exclude the Straits of Belle Isle. I can readily appreciate when speaking of the Labrador Coast what was in his mind was from Battle Harbor down. The price in the Straits for fish is different to that on the Labrador, and I am certainly inclined to believe that the introducer of the Bill meant to exclude the Straits. It would be ridiculous for the price of Straits fish to regulate the price of Labrador. Before that section is adopted I beg to move after the words "Labrador coast" that the words "excluding the Straits of Belle Isle" be added.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

SAW MILLS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Blandford the Saw Mills Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Committee on Customs amendment bill deferred.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

House went into Committee of the Whole on Local Affairs Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. J. D. RYAN—Before we go any further there is a section here which says: "Notice shall be given in the Royal Gazette." According to this Bill, it is for the administration

of Local Affairs I am not aware that any of those people know anything about the Royal Gazette. I don't know the most popular papers, but the Royal Gazette does not come to the notice of the people generally, and I think that a little change should be made. Don't think the proprietors of the papers will object to that being changed to "and at least one other newspaper." The people could then see that the notice will be read. I think it would not be money thrown away if besides the Royal Gazette we were to include some other newspaper.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I can assure the hon. gentleman that such an amendment is unnecessary. It is going to be so popular that I am sure if the papers will only be too glad to give a free ad. It would be difficult to make an arbitrary selection of one paper, and I am quite sure that full publication will be given to the provision for election in any part of the outports for carrying out this Bill.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment and it was ordered that the bill be read a third time to-morrow.

PERMANENT DISASTERS BILL.

Mr. President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed the Bill entitled: 'An Act respecting the establishment of a Permanent Disasters Fund,' in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled the report of the Public Schools under Methodist Boards for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1914.

On motion the House adjourned until to-morrow at 4 o'clock.

THURSDAY, May 13, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 4 p.m.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the Local Affairs Bill was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing them that this House had passed the Bill without amendments.

LABRADOR FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Labrador Fisheries Bill.

Hon. Mr. Ryan took the Chair.

HON. MR. WINTER.—I beg to offer an amendment to the amendment suggested by Hon. Mr. Robinson, that the Board be constituted as follows:—

"One member to be appointed by the Labrador Fish Exporters, another by the outport members in the House of Assembly, and the third by the two as chosen."

HON. MR. GIBBS.—By permission of the House I would like to point out that that which some hon. members pointed out should be eliminated from the two sections is simply perpetuated by the amendments proposed, that is the introduction of politics. The outport members, it is said, are all interested in the Labrador codfishery. The members for the west and south coasts are not interested, so that if we ask that the outport members shall elect some person of that number there will be at least ten or twelve who have no interest whatever in the prosecution of the Labrador fishery. An amendment of this kind should go far enough, so as to deal with those directly interested in the industry. Now I want to point out that outport representatives are a changing body, and

men elected this year may never see the Legislature again for two or three years. In order to have recognized bodies and known to law like the Board of Trade and organizations like the Fishermen's Union, there must be representatives from such bodies. But how can a mandamus go to outport representatives or to local fish exporters? No one knows who or where they are. The bulk of these may be in some other part of the world engaged in business, at the time when it may be necessary that some process of law should issue. To carry out the provisions of the act it will be necessary to get representations from bodies that have a legal existence. Labrador exporters do not exist legally. A man may be a dealer, butcher, or baker, but is he an exporter of Labrador fish if he exports 16 quintals? Then you simply perpetuate that idea of politics which hon. members want eliminated from this Bill, and I regret very much to say that I cannot accept either of the amendments given.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—Mr. Chairman: I am as wedded as ever I was to the amendment which I introduced with reference to this section, and the only thing that causes me to modify my action is the authority for the proposed amendment, given by Messrs. Piccott, Harris, Harvey, Job, Winter, Goodridge, Ryan, Templeman, Sir E. F. Morris, Cashin, Moulton and McGrath, representative men in various departments of business and public life, who have given the measure much thought and have agreed this session to make recommendations that there should be created a Board similar to the Canadian Grain Inspection Board. Their idea is to appoint a fishery inspection board of three members, one to be appointed by the Governor-in-Council, another by the Board of Trade, and a third by the members who sit for the outports. Though I do not like the idea, yet when I consider

that these gentlemen have been meeting for a whole year that they consider this principle to be a sound principle, I am not prepared to be a stumbling block in the way, and will defer to their opinions. As the evil of giving legislative recognition to a political party and also the evil of throwing upon the Board of Trade duties which are not properly theirs, have been obviated, I am prepared to withdraw my amendment and to accept that of Hon. Mr. Winter.

On motion, the amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. Winter was put and carried by a vote of 13 to 2.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I would suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill, before the section under consideration goes through, that we substitute for the Judges of the Supreme Court, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I look with a great deal of concern on the dragging in of the Supreme Court into commercial matters of this kind, which are completely outside of their proper functions in this Colony. It has been stated that Judges of the Supreme Court are to act as arbitrators in connection with the expropriation of lands in the Wilson bill. If it is correct, I am afraid it is a bad precedent and is no reason for putting that forward as a precedent in a case of this sort. I do not think that they should be saddled with work of such a kind at all. They are the highest embodiment of justice and require the greatest amount of respect of any institution in a civilized country, and to saddle them with this, I consider, is derogatory to the Court and the Colony. I am not going to move this as an amendment at this time, perhaps other members will express their views, but it is due to the dignity of the Court that they should not be saddled with duties of this sort. I am going to take another step and propose a motion which is much more drastic. I have

expressed from the beginning my agreement with the general proposition that the present system is far from perfect. I know that it needs revision and improvement, and I wish in some way that I could see how it can be revised and improved, and I will give my hearty support to anything that appeals to me as an improvement; but I cannot, honestly, in my position of responsibility and trust, vote for a Bill which in my opinion is going to do a great deal more harm than the wretched system we now have. Hon. Mr. Job, the value of whose opinion on this matter is at least second to that of nobody else in this House, has pointed out the great reduction in the export of fish off the Labrador. That is a thing which we all want to see changed, and it is essential to see a change if the Colony is to retain its independence. But I cannot believe this Bill will have any other effect than that of further reducing the outfitting and exportations from Labrador. Personally, notwithstanding what has been said by others who know as much about it as I do, I cannot see how any reasonable man who is not forced to do so, owing to his being already involved on Labrador, can go down to Labrador and invest money in fish, as to the value of which, and what he is paying for it, he has absolutely no control, and as to which the parties who have to fix the value may not know as much about the general business as he does. I think the effect must be to curtail energies in that direction, and to discourage business people from going down there. I cannot conceive of a good business man standing up for such a principle as this. It will reduce the output, the outfit and the shipments. And admitting as I do the evils of the present state of things, and very much averse as I am to taking this position in regard to the Bill, I do not feel that I can, honestly, believing as I do, and

with my judgment as it is, I do not feel I can vote for it. It will do more harm than good, and it is with the utmost regret I now move that the Committee rise.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE.—I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion of Hon. Mr. Harvey. From the first I have been opposed to the principle of this Bill, but did not move the rejection of the second reading out of deference to the views of the Lower House, but from what I could gather, although it passed in that Chamber unanimously, it is generally believed that the Bill will be unworkable. I am unable to understand how members of this Chamber can uphold the Bill, for if we pass it, it will be with the express knowledge that it is unworkable. I think it will reflect upon us as a legislative body.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I would like to add to what I have already said, that objectionable as I think the Bill to be, I would infinitely prefer to see the Government itself take hold of the fishery and export the fish and give them everything for it, to letting the Bill go through, because this would stimulate the exportation. I think the Bill as it stands must tend to kill the Labrador fishery.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—The arguments which have been advanced here that this Committee rise, which means that this Bill be thrown out by the House; I submit are not sufficiently grave to warrant any such action by the House. It is admitted by the hon. members who have just spoken that the present condition of affairs on Labrador are, to use their own words, wretched, and that they cannot conceive of any business man standing up for the Bill. I would like to ask where the consistency of hon. members comes in? They admit that such conditions exist, and further say that the industry is being carried on at a loss.

Why then the opposition to this Bill? If the industry is being carried on at a loss, where is the necessity for the opposition to this measure? Surely no one will engage in an industry which is carried on at a loss. And then there is the question of control over prices. Why should not the men who sell as well as the men who buy have a say in the matter? Are we going to give the man who catches the fish no say in what that price shall be, in the absence of a price being fixed at the time a sale is made? Should he not have as much right to be heard in the absence of a price being fixed, as to what he will sell the produce of his toil and sweat for, as well as the man who gives him his outfit or goes there to buy fish? It is not obligatory on exporters of codfish to go and invest their money in it. It is a voluntary act upon their part, and if they can buy fish at prices which will give them a reasonable and fair profit upon their investment, this is their own business. Why should other people suffer? None can compel them to invest money in an industry which would not give them a profit. But here is the act that causes ruin with regard to the industry. Is it not about time to do something to bring order out of the chaos existing there? This Bill does not prevent a man from going to Labrador and saying to a fisherman: "I will give you \$3.50," and the other saying "yes I agree." This Bill does not affect a case of this kind; it only affects the question where the price is not fixed if two persons get together and agree upon the sale of an article on which no price is fixed at the time, but the price is to be determined by conditions not apparent or existing at the time, but depending upon conditions remote when this sale takes place; the man who sells has a right to be

heard before the man who buys fixes the price for the article. What better position to assume than that. If I sell an article and no price is fixed at the time, would it be fair for that person to whom I sell to say: "I am giving you so much and you must be satisfied." This is a most unfair and most unreasonable attitude for any man to set up in connection with such a matter. There are two parties to every bargain, and both should be heard. Why should a merchant have the right to say to a fisherman in November: "I am going to give so much for that fish that I bought in the month of September." Is not this very unfair? The Board steps in and gives the right to both parties of being heard and then decides what is a fair and reasonable price. We may defeat this measure; if we do it will be history repeating itself but just so sure as it will record defeat it will record victory. The world over legislation emanating from the masses has had to meet the opposition of the powerful business interests that are ever apprehensive of the capital invested in them; clash upon clash has resounded of industrial warfare because he who has will not give him who has not that which he is entitled to. Opposition to this measure is only adding fuel to the fire of strife already existing in this country. I ask this House to rise superior to any business or commercial interests and look at the question from the viewpoint that he who sells should be heard in the fixing of a price as well as he who buys. This is the position I take and have always followed in matters of this kind the broad standpoint of what is best for all concerned. Every attempt by the people in the lower walks of life to rise a little higher and have their ideas made a little

easier of attainment is always opposed. What does the history of the present Government of British teach us. The strongly entrenched business and ranked interests opposed legislation emanating from the people's representatives but quickly and effectively democracy curtailed their powers. If we continue in the course we have pursued with in regard to this Bill the same will happen here.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It seems to me that the hon. gentleman in charge of this bill finds himself in a position he has unquestionably found himself in often before; he has a bad case and must do the best he can. The hon. gentleman is hardly logical in all his arguments. He says he objects to the principle that men have to sell and the price is fixed months afterwards, but he avers and strongly that this principle shall be applied to the buyer. That is given as a reason why we are considering the bill at all today, that the merchant does not have to fix the price until later in the season. We have agreed to the principle of the bill recognizing that there are difficulties in connection with the Labrador fishery and the shipping of fish from that coast. We consented to the second reading of the Bill with the idea of proposing something better than this form in which the bill comes to us but all are agreed that the bill cannot be amended in any way that is likely to prove beneficial either to the fisherman or to the buyer. The Hon. gentleman said that the seller should have representation and that it was unfair that he should have no word in the settlement of the price of fish. Now Mr. Chairman it must not be said that we here arguing against this bill are looking only to the interests of the buyer. I protest against any

such remarks that have been made here, and think there are those here who are inclined to do more to help the fishermen than the introducer or anyone else who has fathered this Bill. I say further, Sir, that the real knowledge of the circumstances is to be found in this Chamber and not elsewhere, and if any who have considered the measure here are interested (I myself am not, I do not ship fish from the Labrador), if they are interested they are just as keen for the benefit of the fishermen as for their own pockets. Their efforts are to help the fishermen and those who supply the practical part of the fishery. I would infinitely prefer to see a bill to the effect either that there should be no export of codfish from the Labrador, or, if there be, that none shall be shipped without the price being fixed between the buyer and the seller. No one denies the right of the seller to have a say if that is practicable, and he has his right if we say that no fish shall be shipped without the price being fixed, and I am sure that nine out of ten of the shippers of fish from Labrador would rather that they should not be permitted to export until the price is agreed on, than that they should be bound by the conditions of the bill we are now considering. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill spoke carelessly when he referred to an agitation against this Chamber, and the possible results if we should act differently than some people wish. Is any hon. gentleman going to be influenced by a threat, no matter where it comes from? If we are to consider our positions here, and value those positions highly, and consider it an honor to be here, we are going to do our best in the interests of the whole people in all legislation that comes before us, and I submit that any effort to influence us, or threat to wipe this

Chamber out of existence, is not worthy, should not influence any member of this House. I repeat, Sir, that the interest of the buyer is to do full justice to the seller. I am confident that the Board as it is intended to be composed will not be able to work out anything that will be practicable or satisfactory, and if the measure is tried this year I venture the prediction now that all will be aware before the end of the year that there is more objection, more heart burning, more dissatisfaction through the operations of this year than that of last or any previous year. However, having agreed to the bill going through its second reading in the hope of making it workable, I am not disposed to vote that the bill should lie on the table. I think that it is better to even give it further consideration and to take it up again. We are not yet near the end of the session, unfortunately, and it may yet be possible to arrive at something beneficial.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I would like to say that I do not think the House would be acting wisely in rejecting this Bill. We agreed that there is a situation connected with the Labrador fishery calling for action. If there is anything in the principle of fairness, it is that where men make an agreement for the future such as an agreement to trade by the current price of fish, both parties ought to have a say, and if some Bill is put through now and an attempt is made to carry it into effect and this proves unworkable, then perhaps some better scheme may be worked out next year. I do not take any stock in the argument that this House ought to be influenced by any threats made as to its existence, for speaking for myself, I am not prepared to be a rubber stamp for any man. I supported the principle of the Bill because I believe there was a case made out for it. I opposed last

year's Logging Bill because I considered it was a most preposterous one. It was thrown out, and has now come before us again, and this House could with much better grace reject that Bill than this Bill, because hon. gentlemen were not directly interested in the Logging industry, but a large proportion of the members of this Chamber are interested directly in the fishery, and I do not think hon. gentlemen ought to be put in the position of being regarded by the fishing classes as a whole that their motives have not been square and above board for their rejection of it. Now, I have taken precisely the same view in this House as regards the Sealing Bill, features of which have been of such a character as would warrant suspicion in the minds of the people as a whole that the Bill was rejected for improper reasons, and I think the good sense of the House will assert itself if it puts this Bill on record and also the Sealing Bill, because if we reject this Bill as suggested, what is the alternative? Now, I would ask pardon if I allude to hon. gentlemen in a personal way, but there are three or four hon. gentlemen in the House who have stated publicly that they were interested in the Labrador fishery and have gone out of it because it did not pay, and they thought it wise to get out. If they have gone out of it and therefore it may be taken not to interest them at all why do they oppose this Bill so vigorously? The bill will not do them any personal injury. Any bill that provides for a system of fixing a price on the Labrador will not do these gentlemen any injury in their individual concerns. Hon. Mr. Winter says it will drive others out. Well, that may be, but why should it drive them out, unless, of course, it is understood—I do not put this argument offensively or that I think it is a sound argument—it may prove to be that the

reason each party oppose this Bill is that they expect to gain an unfair advantage out of the conditions that exist at present. Now, I do not say that that is the case, but I do say that when faced with such a situation as we are now, and people make an agreement for a current price and when one side fixes that price itself, the obvious argument is that the man fixing the price is doing it for his own advantage. I am free to admit, on the contrary, that from all we have been able to hear from hon. gentlemen in this House the very opposite has resulted, and that the fishermen have received on the whole, probably much better returns for the catch for a period covering some years than they would have if such a Bill as we now propose, had been in force. But the fact remains that the fishermen believe they have not had a fair show; they clamor for some method of settlement which they think will give them a better price. They are not asking for this Bill to get worse prices, but better, and until the Bill, or some Bill, puts the industry on a proper basis, we are going to have complaints and a continuance of the trouble that exists. One hon. gentleman says the fishermen do not want this Bill, and next that you will never get a board to fix the price. As regards their not wanting it, I do not know, but I understand there were a large number of petitions brought in asking for it. Every hon. member admits that conditions are such that some Bill or board of arbitration is needed. That I think is sufficient argument as to the fishermen not wanting the Bill. As to its going to have the effect the fishermen hope, far be it from me to say anything about that in view of the arguments put forward here. Certainly the fishermen are not asking for this Bill that they may get lower prices, and

if that is its effect I am sorry for those who bring it in. There is only one other thing, I submit, to do, either to take this Bill and put it in whatever shape we are prepared to stand for, or adopt the suggestion I advanced a few days ago, and provide that there shall be no current price at all, and make every trade a binding and specific one.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I listened with much sympathy to my hon. friend on my right (Hon. Mr. Bishop), in reference to his protest against this House being influenced by any threats of its undoing, and I must protest similarly against the position assumed, as I understand it, by my hon. friend opposite, who has just spoken. I understood him to say that one reason why we should not reject this Bill is because people would say outside we were objecting to it, because it was against our own interests.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN.—Mr. Chairman, while listening with much interest to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Gibbs I could not help wondering why we waste so much valuable time on the question of the Current Price of Labrador fish. Why not bring in a measure compelling the merchants to name a price no matter what the circumstances or consequences are, such a step would be as reasonable as that called for in the Bill before us now, or why not let the fishermen state the price they want for the article, the same as anybody else does that has anything to sell, and then it is up to the buyer to refuse their offer or accept it. One would imagine from what we see and hear that the merchants doing business at Labrador have been very unfair in their dealings with their dealers or customers, but in my experience I do not agree with it, for in my opinion there is a great deal of unfairness practised by the fishermen at Labrador against the supplier, who when the voyage is over

finds that the dealer did not have as much fish shipped to the supplier as he was given to understand his dealer had secured. So you can see where the unfairness comes in, and on which side it is.

Regarding current price, it is very hard to define what the words mean, "Current Price." In fact, to my mind there is no such thing as Current Price to govern the price of this article, and there should not be any mention of such a thing, and in my short experience the price is generally known or named at the time of shipment, and the words "Current Price" is brought about by the fishermen themselves by asking the buyers' agents to put it on their receipts, and in most cases the agents giving receipts for Labrador fish when taking it from the fishermen, although having been instructed and advised by their employer not to do so, but the fishermen demand it thinking it will be to their advantage when they come to settle up their shipments of fish, more especially if they think there is any chance of the market advancing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to devise some scheme or plan whereby the price for fish shipped off the Coast of Labrador could be fixed so that all parties would be satisfied and have any misunderstandings between merchants and fishermen removed. I fail to see any way unless it is to name a price at the time the purchase or offer is made which may or may not be accepted, as is the case with everything bought or sold all the world over.

I consider the Labrador merchants always paid as good a price at Labrador as compared with prices paid at St. John's at the same date. Most of the Labrador fish bought at St. John's last year was purchased at \$3.50 per qtl., while the merchants at Labrador shipping off the coast paid \$3.60 per

qtl. This compared with the extra high insurance and the cost of collecting, etc., brings the cost of the product very much higher than the cost at St. John's, where there was no expense to the buyer until he took it at his wharf, which goes to show that the fishermen did better at Labrador with his fish than at St. John's at the same date.

The Labrador fishery is a very inconvenient and expensive business to conduct besides being very precarious, much more so than the Shore fishery, therefore I think if we are going to foster the Labrador business and fishery we ought to be careful how we legislate regarding same.

Regarding the price for Labrador fish and as to fixing a price on it we must remember that the Law of Supply and Demand governs the price of the article as well as all other food stuffs. It is impossible to think of fixing it otherwise than by the supply and demand of this article and I cannot see that this Bill will help in any way to fix the price, and if placed on the Statute Book will not be workable, and will not bring forth any fruit, and it is not much difference whether it is passed or not, as it is useless.

I would suggest that a Bill be brought in compelling both buyer and seller to make or settle a price at the time of buying which would avoid all disputes and misunderstandings.

I consider that the people who want fish and are buying fish on the Labrador coast in the future will make it their business to name a price at the time of purchase which the seller may accept or refuse as he wishes.

I endorse all the Hon. Mr. Harvey has said and I say that I am not opposed to this Bill because I see anything in it in favor of the fisher-

men but because I see nothing in it. I agree with a price being named on the Labrador as I have said, and that price be put on the receipts, and I think that is the only way we can fix a price because when you come to think of it the current price is pretty well known and acknowledged when the fish is bought, and there is not much change afterwards. When fishermen were offered \$3.60 the past year some of them refused, and brought their fish to St. John's with no insurance, at great risk, a distance of five or six hundred miles, and afterwards accepted \$3.50. That shows they need their own minds. I understand the bulk of the fish sold in St. John's last fall fetched only \$3.50.

I consider that the men who refused the price and came to St. John's did not do as well as those who accepted \$3.60. I see nothing in this Bill to benefit the fishermen, but I would be pleased to see a Bill to make matters agreeable with the merchant and the fishermen. The merchant and fishermen in this case should be as one, as a house divided against itself cannot stand.

HON. MR. GIBBS—There is a firm doing business on the Labrador who don't settle up with their dealers until the following spring, and it is to prevent conditions of this kind in connection with the fisheries which the fishermen consider an imposition that this legislation is proposed. With regard to some hon. members' criticism of my statements about the threats of putting an end to this House, I merely stated that as one who is anxious to see the institutions which have grown up with this country and are part of its life, which are the very foundations of law and authority, perpetuated and continued. That is why I am anxious, and it is because I am anxious to see its valu-

able services continued, that I advocated the passing of this Bill.

The amendment being put it was lost, those in favor being Hons. Harvey, Goodridge, Winter, Templeman, Ryan, Power; those against, Hons. Harris, Bishop, Robinson, Job, Gibbs, Knowling, Anderson, Skelton, McGrath.

SAWMILLS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into a Committee on the Saw Mills Bill. Hon. Dr. Skelton took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD (Minister of Agriculture and Mines)—I understand that this is an amendment which was brought into the Lower House by Mr. Jennings. It is explanatory of the words "milling purposes," used in section 8 of the Act respecting the operation of Saw Mills passed on March 11th, 1914. It is a definition of what these words mean.

Since then I have had a conversation with Mr. Jennings and pointed out to him that I did not altogether agree with the amendment as it limited the section considerably, and I informed him that I was bringing in a further amendment.

Under that section as it originally stood the term "milling purposes" permitted to a degree at least, persons who had taken timber off a reserved area to carry it to a mill and have it sawn, which means in other words, that on reserved areas a person building a vessel, punt, or small boat for fishing purposes would be in a position to have the timber sawn at a mill, but under Mr. Jennings' Amendment, and his definition of the term "milling purposes" he would be unable to have the timber so sawn; and in my opinion that

would be arbitrary and fishermen who had to cut their timber on reserved property would have to use the old fashioned method in sawing it, viz: the pitsaw, and this would necessarily entail a waste of time, while on the other hand if the fishermen were permitted to take their timber to a saw mill it would assist them very much in their work and save considerable time.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would allow the amendment to stand over. I would like to understand it. While on this subject I would like to ask if there is any information with regard to the amounts that have been collected under this act since it became law. I would like to know whether any list of these mills exist.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—Yes, and of all lumber cut.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Under this Act they were obliged to apply for license.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—Under section 1, no; under section 2, yea.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Did all the mills which ought to have taken out licenses take them out? This list does not show the \$5 license. Under this Act there are two rates of payment, \$5 for a license to saw and \$1 on a thousand on the board measurement. Now I would like to know if all those mills took out the \$5 license. I would be glad if the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines would provide a list of those who ought to and have not. As I read the Act a certain section of those mills ought to have taken out licenses by April 1914, and every day operating without a license made the mill owner liable to a fine of \$29. In addition to that it is reckoned that 40,000,000 feet of lumber are sawn annually in the country which should pay a royalty of \$40,000, but instead of

that amount less than \$1,000 have been collected. I am not complaining, but I do want to point out to the House how utterly unjust it is to those who have licensed mills and are paying their royalty and Crown rentals, that such an enormous amount as 40,000,000 feet should be cut without paying any royalty or, in most cases, without apparently taking out a license I have no interest in any mills, but I do think it is pretty hard lines for such a concern as the Horwood Lumber Company, operating on a very large scale, and investing a large amount of capital, and paying not only royalty on their cut, but rentals on their land, to have to compete with those who do none of these things. I would like to ask the hon. member these one or two questions, and would be very glad if he would give me the answers at his convenience.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—I shall gladly hold over the amendment and I may say that my hon. friend partially anticipated me in the amendments I intended to bring in. Under section 1, as it stands at present, any fisherman may apply to the Minister and receive a free license provided his "cut" does not exceed 10,000 feet broad measurement, but at the same time he is permitted to cut shingles, staves, etc., to any quantity and the act does not interfere with him, but his friend may have a mill only a short distance away, on which he has to pay a tax of \$5.00 for the license, in other words, where a mill owner cuts more than 10,000 feet, B. M. a fee of \$5.00 is imposed for the license and a royalty of \$1.00 per thousand B. M.

HON. MR. GIBBS—If the hon. gentleman will move his amendments we can have them printed and distributed to the House.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—I pro-

pose to amend Section 2 by striking out the words "one year" and substituting the words 'eighteen months.' The object of this is to give two seasons in which to saw and cut. It was thought it would be unfair to restrict hauling out the "cut" to one season as persons may not be in a position to get it out during the year through no fault of their own for instance the want of snow.

Under the terms of the original amendment, if a logger failed to secure his cut, or in other words, get it out, under one year, it could be claimed by other parties. This section does not apply to any person operating a mill under any license but to the public generally. It would not of course apply to the servants of such licensees.

Now the next is a very important section and I do not believe that those interested in the Lower House in the passing of this Act in the last session really intended what the wording of the Act implies. It has reference to section 1. "It shall be lawful for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to issue licenses to persons or companies who are at present operating mills on what is known as the Three Mile Limit, and are not the holders of timber or pulp licenses under the Crown Lands' Act." The amendment is to this effect, by striking out the words "on what is known as the Three Mile Limit." The amendment is necessary because the wording of the original act is almost nonsensical. As the section stands at present persons operating on the Three Mile limit, that is, within three miles of the seashore shall before the 30th. of November be able to get a license to cut on Crown lands, but persons operating at a greater distance than three miles inland cannot get a license to con-

tinue operations. Persons may obtain supplies of timber at any distance inland and his license permits him to continue operations but if he moves his mill to a greater distance than three miles to manufacture timber and to cut it from the same place for which he obtained his license, he is penalized.

The next section that I propose amending is section 2, which reads "The quantity of timber which a licensee under this section shall be permitted to manufacture in staves or heading for making barrels for fishery requirements, or for the making of shingles, lobster laths or lobster boxes shall not exceed a total of 50,000 feet, board measurement in any one year." That is in addition to section 1 and is my third amendment.

Under section 1 at present, the free license man is permitted to cut 10,000 feet B. M., but as to laths and other commodities he can cut as much as he desires, millions of feet, and I deem it wise that this amendment be made, and it further creates an equality between section 1 and 2. This then necessarily interferes with section 3 and I ask that the following be added viz.: "2,000 herring or other barrel staves shall equal 1,000 ft. B. M."

HON. MR. BISHOP—If you dropped the word "herring" and say "2,000 barrels" you will accomplish the same thing.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—I certainly agree with your suggestion and there will be no need of the amendment which I have proposed, consequently I shall withdraw it, viz: striking out the word "herring" you will have the same result.

The suggested amendments and the addition of the other sections yesterday I explained. The sections are in categorical order and

I take it now that it is simplicity itself, with the exception that the hon. gentleman should put some of these amendments in another portion of the Bill, then they can be moved, but you will notice that these amendments are really a Bill from the Lower House brought in by Mr. Jennings and I have amended them and made other amendments and added a new section, also renumbered the sections.

The Bill before us passed in the Lower House, but I do not know why they were not incorporated in the first Bill. Mr. Jennings' amendment is practically a definition of what "milling purposes" shall be held to mean, sawing or otherwise manufacturing at a mill. I propose in amendment to go further, as regards "sawing or otherwise manufacturing at a mill" so that any individual or person who desires to build a vessel, punt or boat, and who shall take the timber off the reserve shall be permitted to carry the timber to a mill and have it sawn for that specific reason. If the Bill which passed the Lower House went through as it is, a fisherman who desired to build a schooner, punt or boat, would be unable to bring his timber which he had cut off the reserve to a mill to be sawn and consequently would have to return to the old system of sawing timber, viz., by means of a pit-saw. This would be more expensive and would necessitate a longer period for the construction of the vessel, punt or boat, hence my reason for making the amendment.

A further amendment I wish to make is in section 1 of this Bill, which reads: "But any person actually engaged in the construction of any boat or vessel may be permitted to have such quantity of lumber as may be bona fide required for such actual construction, sawn or manufactured, in a

saw mill, and such sawing or manufacturing shall not be in violation of the provision of this section." Whether this should form a new section after my section in the Bill or become a sub-section of it, remains to be determined.

At all events I would ask that the Committee rise and have the amendments printed in proper form to give the honorable gentlemen time to criticize and express their views upon the sections. I beg leave to ask that the Committee rise, report progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD— Before the Committee rises I beg to state, in reply to Hon. Mr. Harvey's question that under section 2 there are 103 mills working at present; under section 1, 116, not licensed 72, and not working 15.

With reference to the royalties paid I may say that some of these people have left their 'cuts' remaining on the banks; this I understand has been brought about owing to the war, and they have been unable to dispose of their timber or mill products, these are some of the excuses which I have received from time to time, but we have reason to believe that the present information is reliable and that such is the case.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Second reading Hospital Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill is one of the most important that will come before the House during the present session. The General Hospital is properly called our most important institution, the one that costs the country the greatest amount of money, and we may fairly assume the one also of the greatest benefit. Here some time ago, from causes which we need not attempt to enlarge upon, the conduct of the institution

was unsatisfactory, and after evidence of considerable friction in its internal management, the Government decided to appoint a Commission of Enquiry. That Commission went into the investigation of all the matters concerning the institution very fully, must have devoted a great deal of time to it and after very considerable lapse of time prepared a report which was submitted a short while ago, and of which all hon. members have received a copy. That report provides most instructive reading, and as the result of the report a Bill has been prepared to provide for a better and fuller management of the Hospital. It seems unnecessary to deal at length with the subject matter of the Bill. It provides, as every hon. member knows, for the management of the Institution to be under a Government Board in future, which shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, who shall take control of the Institution, to whom all the officials of the Institution shall be subject, who shall hear any complaints which may arise, and who will straighten out any little differences, and we may hope that in a short while the Institution will be got into such shape that it will be run smoothly and satisfactorily and prove that the Institution will become a credit to the country, and of much greater benefit even than it has proved to be. We admit that there has been a great improvement there, that under the present administration it has grown, and from being a place that the majority of the people of the Island sought to avoid, the difficulty now is to find sufficient space to accommodate those clamoring at its doors for admission. It affords me much pleasure to move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion the Bill was then read a second time, and will be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

STAMP DUTIES BILL.

Second reading of Stamp Duties Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill is simply an enlargement of the Bill passed in the last session of the Legislature. A new departure was made when that Bill passed, and it has been found to occasion a great deal of trouble, in that under it all Government cheques must be stamped. This is taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another, moreover, with a great deal of labour and time in the operation. This Bill provides that no cheque passed by a Government department, postal or money order shall be stamped, and shall be held to be valid and good in law. That is that unstamped cheques issued by the Government departments will be perfectly valid. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion the Bill was read a second time and will be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Second reading of Marine Disasters Bill.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—As we are only asked at the second reading to commit ourselves to the general principles of the Bill, and as I am absolutely confident that there is no member of this Chamber who will not approve of the establishment of a permanent fund of this kind I will content myself with moving the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and will be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly acquainting the House that they had passed the Bill entitled: An Act to amend 5 Geo. V., Cap. 10, Sec. 1, en-

titled an Act Respecting Municipal Affairs, in which they asked the concurrence of the Assembly.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Anderson, the Bill was read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time tomorrow.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow at 4 o'clock.

FRIDAY, May 14, 1915.

The House met at 4 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

LABRADOR FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Labrador Codfish Bill. Hon. J. D. Ryan in the chair.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would move that the "Minister of Marine and Fisheries" be substituted in the Bill for the "Judges of the Supreme Court."

HON. MR. GIBBS—I regret that I cannot accept this amendment. A great deal has been said in the course of discussion on the Bill as to the political complexion of it by giving the right to the President of the F.P.U. to appoint a person on the Board. If the argument holds good with regard to the objection to the President of the Union appointing a person on the Board, surely the argument lacks consistency when it is now proposed to place a man who must be a political partizan of the Government to give him the power of appointing a third arbitrator. If we want, in the event of a dispute arising between two persons, who are named as arbitrators as to who the third arbitrator shall be, surely we should go to a tribunal free to act in the matter of the choice of the third arbitrator. Whoever the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may be he could not be held to be strictly free from the charge of partizanship by one side or the other, in selecting the third person whom he

may name; and it is simply casting ridicule upon the bill to have a man empowered to nominate a third arbitrator. Whoever heard of such a thing? Search the records of courts and you will find no authority for any such proceeding as this to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to appoint a third arbitrator. I have known cases, disputes arising between two arbitrators, as to who should be the third arbitrator. It is always referred to a judicial tribunal of some kind, some court or person in a judicial capacity. Why? Because it becomes absolutely necessary to select some person against whom no suggestion of partizanship is imputed either by one side or the other, who will hold the scales evenly balanced so as to act impartially between the parties; because it is the third party nominated who is to decide the matter, and his position is of a judicial and not of a partizan character. But it may be said that the second arbitrator appointed under the Bill, will endeavor to maintain the position set up by the respective parties who are represented at the Board. But coming to the third person, he stands in a different position being the judge between the parties. His appointment should therefore be left to the discretion of some judicial tribunal. This is the policy pursued in England. If a man's property be taken for public purposes under Land Clauses Consolidation Act, two arbitrators are to be appointed, one by the person whose property is taken and the other by the person who claims to expropriate it. If they disagree as to amount of compensation and the appointment of a third arbitrator, then the court or judge nominates the third person. The least we can do with regard to the Bill is to follow a precedent prevailing elsewhere, that is in case the persons acting as arbitrators fail to

agree on a third he should be elected by a judge of the court.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I am not objecting to the appointment of a third arbitrator by the court, but the dragging in of the court if they fail to agree upon an arbitrator. I have already explained that I think it is most derogatory to ask a court of justice to come in and settle the price of fish.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would like to point out to the gentleman who moved the amendment that if it becomes operative it will also nullify section 3, because provision is made there for the appointing of one or possibly two arbitrators, as original members of the Board by the Supreme Court. Yesterday I suggested that this matter be left entirely to the judges, because, as I showed, the judges had to act to fill up vacancies that could not be filled up otherwise, and had also to act in case the Board, when constituted, failed to fix a price, and therefore it seemed to me that the logical thing was to eliminate the Board altogether and leave the whole matter to the determination of our highest Tribunal. Curiously enough my hon. friend, Mr. Gibbs, then took the very opposite position to that which he advances now and argued against the matter being left to the judges, while today he contends for the umpire being named by them. At the same time I would point out to him that he is mistaken in asserting that all third arbitrators are appointed by the Court because in the Crown Lands Act it is provided that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, or a person to be appointed by him, is fixed by law as the third arbitrator. Personally, I favour leaving it to the judges to fix the "current price" for Labrador fish, because, as this is a

matter having a direct interest for thousands of fishermen there will be much more confidence felt by all parties if it goes to the judges of the Supreme Court to decide than if it is left to any board that may be chosen otherwise.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I have listened with a great deal of pleasure since this debate on the Labrador fish prices has commenced, and I entirely agree with my hon. friend Mr. Harvey. I do not know whether the decision of the Supreme Court have been consulted on such a bill as this, but it seems to me to be unreasonable to place by act of Parliament the final decision as to the market value of a commodity on the decision of the Supreme Court. The price of a commercial commodity is based upon the rise and fall of the market, and I do not know whether the judges are prepared for the responsibility after we pass this Bill, and I question very much if they would not ask the Governor not to give his consent to the Bill.

If we could arrive at some other tribunal to be the arbitrator it would be much better. What of the market value? It has been stated here that some shipments go over in August and others go in September, October and November, and if the price is fixed at four dollars, and some cargoes get 20/- and others 30/-, others may get less, but how are you going to arrive at a happy medium as to the value of that commodity? As my hon. friends Hon. Mr. Harvey and Hon. Mr. Job stated the other day, are you going to produce your invoices; and what is to be the profit on the one side and the price to be paid on the other to allow a profit of say twenty-five per cent on the investment. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, while I have not the slightest desire to object to the bill that it has either to go through or

be rejected. Is it a good bill or a bad one? We have arguments brought forward here from time to time that it is unworkable. Why is it so? From the complications that must necessarily arise when shipments are made on the Labrador until the close of the season. I think the amendment suggested by Hon. Mr. Harvey is a good one. There may be questions arising in connection with shipments from the Labrador that will come before the Supreme Court to be adjudicated upon, but I do not think it right to embody in this bill by act of Parliament that the judges shall be the arbitrators as to the price to be paid and I beg to support the amendment suggested by Hon. Mr. Harvey.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—It seems to me another strong reason why the Judges of the Supreme Court should not be asked to fix the price of Labrador fish shipped off the coast is that this bill will not prevent litigation with respect to the Labrador fishery in any event. There are other matters which may come up, and I presume that the Supreme Court would not be asked to act judicially in such cases. I think it a very strong reason why they should not be asked to try cases which may come up from other causes to be adjudicated on, and there might be prejudices which would not appear if they had had nothing to do with fixing the price. I feel I shall have to vote for the amendment unless anyone is inclined to name somebody else more competent. It seems to me to be rather absurd to argue that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries represents the Government. Where the Government comes into this question at all I cannot see. In his capacity as Minister of Marine and Fisheries I think there has been ample evidence, as far as the present Minister is concerned, that he is not a partisan. The

Minister of Marine and Fisheries has never stopped to look into partisanship during the various times he has hurried away with divers looking for the bodies of fishermen who lost their lives, and in similar matters wherein the welfare of the fishermen was concerned. I am not wedded to having the Minister of Marine and Fisheries excepting that I do not think that any one has a better knowledge of the particulars of the Labrador fishery and its customs than has the gentleman who now occupies the position, and as to his feelings for the fishermen, that has been demonstrated time and again.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—My hon. friend presupposes that the present Minister will remain there. We will have many Ministers during the time this Bill is in force, and may have some who, as in the past, know nothing about the fisheries. We have had lawyers filling that position, and they say lawyers know nothing about the fisheries. Then again this very question was discussed by the promoters of the bill as to the appointment of the Minister, and there is one gentleman slated for the position (I do not know whether he is going to fill it or not) and according to the arguments of hon. gentlemen, it would be most unfortunate for everyone if he occupied it. The hon. member who spoke just now referred to the objections to the production of invoices. Well, is that not done every day at the Customs House, and to a board of this kind if it is found necessary, because no Court would permit any board to pry into a man's business, and if parties on that Board were taking advantage to do so, then the court could by mandamus, restrain them from showing invoices. In order to give confidence to the fisherman and exporter, it is necessary in the event of the board failing to fix the price of fish that it

be fixed by a tribunal, and you cannot get a better one than this.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—So far as the reference to the Customs House goes, there is only one way to arrive at a standard price of the Labrador fish. It has been stated that the catch was 436,000 qtls., and last year 31,000 qtls. The only way is to put in the whole catch and embody it in the value, and then see what profits the merchants are entitled to. How are you going to arrive at what is the proper value? If you buy in a market and want to fix a certain standard here for a commodity it must be based upon the realization of that commodity abroad. I do not think any proper way can be arrived at; it must be to a certain degree done by rule of thumb. Do not misunderstand me, because I hope when the Bill goes through the fishermen will receive the highest price that has ever been paid. But it is so complicated that I fail to see how it is to be worked out in a reasonable way. But keep the Supreme Court clear of it.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—Has the hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment considered the bearing of section seven? You will see under the provisions of that section that very serious and onerous duties will be placed upon the Minister. He will have to be given power to appoint counsel to compel the attendance of witnesses, production of books, commitment for perjury, etc. It seems to me under these circumstances it will be impossible to have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries filling the position of sole arbitrator in the possible and very probable event that any two gentlemen who may be appointed, are unable to settle the price.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—As I understand it, if this section goes through as amended, these sections will be

(some totally unnecessary. It is incumbent, then, on the Minister to fix the price, and these matters will not be necessary.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I am afraid the hon. gentleman misunderstands the objects of these three sections. They are to provide for the obtaining of the information on which the price shall be fixed. Otherwise what is the object of them? You can have the Minister do it by rule of thumb as my hon. friend on my left has said, but otherwise he has to be invested with powers to get at the data necessary for fixing a fair and reasonable price as the Act provides.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE.—I have to agree with Hon. Mr. Harvey as to leaving matters with the Supreme Court, that it would be derogatory to their dignity. At the same time I cannot agree with appointing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now the Minister is a first class man for the position he holds, and I shall be sorry to see him lose that position, but any Minister who attempts to make the price would have absolutely no chance of re-election as a member of the House of Assembly. I think any one conversant with politics will say that the Minister could not be unbiased although he may be a fair and reasonable man in every way. As to the difficulty in arriving at a proper tribunal to settle the price, I would suggest that instead of the Supreme Court we have the matter left to the Hon. President of the Legislative Council, a gentleman in whom we all have confidence, and one better able to give an opinion than any one of the Supreme Court. His successor, and I should be sorry if we had one for many years, would be equally unbiased. I should like to ask if there is any precedent for this put in, and if there is not, then the

whole thing is a farce and we are losing valuable time here in discussing it.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The curious thing about Hon. Mr. Harvey's amendment is that this House considered that the Minister was not competent to nominate one of the members of this Board, and threw out my amendment on that ground, and now we are seriously asked to appoint the Minister to be the sole arbitrator. I fully agree with Hon. Mr. Goodridge. As I said before, this bill is inoperative and mischievous, and almost worse than useless. It is here, however, and we have to do something with it. I think the best thing is to let it go through as it is, it will kill itself. I just want to say one thing more and that is that I take very strong objection to the remarks of the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill. I think, Sir, that in this House we ought to be able to rise a little beyond the personal element. When I introduced the amendment I just mentioned, I had no more idea of Piccott or Coaker, than of Smith, Jones, Brown or Robinson. I say that the proper person in charge is the head of the Fisheries Department, who is appointed to that position by the Government that has been elected to control the affairs of this Colony. It matters not to me who occupies that position; he is the proper one to do this work. This House has stated he is not. I bow to its decision. I am not prepared to support this amendment. I am not prepared to support a proposition that a man who was unfit to nominate a representative on the Board is fitted to make the price.

HON. MR. JOE—When this Bill first came in I supported it heartily, and I am today more firmly convinced that this Bill is necessary, and we shall not be doing our duty if we do not give our best consideration to ev-

ery clause. This to my mind is a very important section. Some hon. gentlemen say it will be below the dignity of the judges of the Supreme Court. I don't think a more important decision could be given by them during the whole year. It has also been said that gentlemen will not be called upon to act. There is, Sir, enough public spirit left for some to find the position an honorable one and it will never reach the judges of the Supreme Court. I admit what Mr. Gibbs says is correct when he says the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not be the best man. He represents a constituency and the welfare of that constituency, will depend upon the price. I submit that the judges of the Supreme Court if it comes to that, are the proper people to decide it.

HON. MR. WINTER—I think that the judges of the Supreme Court would be quite competent to place a reasonable and fair price on Labrador fish if they have sufficient evidence brought before them, but under this Bill it is impossible to have people before them who could give evidence that will enable them to arrive at a price, for the simple reason that they fixed the time for making the price not later than the first of October. It is impossible for the judges to do that then. The fish would not have been sold off half the Labrador coast and they don't know whether the cargoes are going to realize 30 shillings or 40 shillings. The only way they can arrive at the price will be by taking evidence of the prices realized for the fish abroad. Who can give evidence as to the price of fish at that time? We may be able to make a guess at it at that time. The prices don't become known until the cargoes reach market, and they don't leave till the middle of October and how can we fix a price for fish until November.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I would like to

point out to the hon. member that if the judges of the Supreme Court have no evidence before them of a character to enable them to fix a price surely he doesn't imagine that they have got to fix a price. They will do nothing of the kind. They will take the stand that they have not sufficient evidence to enable them to decide. If that evidence is not forthcoming, and the judges are called upon to decide the question, they are not going to fix the price. They are unable to do so. Hon. members must not forget that the man most interested is the man who catches the fish, and if he is prepared to put the result of his toll into the hands of these people then surely those who do not ought to be prepared to do the same thing. This Bill is the outcome of petitions which have come from fishermen from all parts of the country particularly interested in this Bill. I am not accusing hon. members that they are actuated by improper motives, but simply pointing out that if the men are prepared to leave the decision with the judges of the Supreme Court, then the shippers should be prepared to do the same.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Why not the hon. member in view of the argument put forward, set the date back to the first of December. We ought not be bound down absolutely to the first of October. Hon. Mr. Winter's argument is a strong one. Surely if this date is too early, and the fixing of the later date is going to assist the settling of the price of fish, the first thing to do is to alter the date. If we are going to have a Bill, we ought to have one that can be made operative. Therefore I suggest that we change the date to the first of November or the first of December, which ever is most likely to be the best to fix.

Hon. Mr. Harvey's motion that the

Committee rise was put and lost.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Perhaps this amendment may meet the objection raised. What reasonable objection is there to making section 7 consistent with section 2? "Notice of said motion shall be published in Royal Gazette and any shipper or any fisherman shall have the right to be represented".

HON. MR. McGRATH—I suggest that the Committee rise and report progress, so that the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment may have the opportunity of discussing the matter with the Law Clerk and have it put into shape.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

SAWMILLS BILL.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Saw Mills Bill. Hon. Dr. Skelton in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

CUSTOMS AMENDMENT BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Customs Amendment Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley took the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move an additional section to the bill now before the chair. Hon. members are no doubt aware that in view of the statement made in the other house and which I have no reason to question is correct, the owners of premises where goods are arriving on board steamers and are discharging have no right to charge wharfage. Now both the trade and the public are interested in the matter, and it is only right that where the system has given satisfaction and current rates are changed, there should be no departure from it. I think hon. members

will agree with me that when firms provide premises at considerable cost for upkeep, it would be unfair to expect them to house goods free of charge, but under the law as it now stands they have no legal right to charge. If we do not give companies the right to charge they will collect it in some other way by adding it to the freight rates perhaps, and they may charge more than they do now. So we propose to add a section whereby it shall be lawful for the owner of a steamer premises to charge wharfage upon goods at current rates when said goods reach their final destination under their contract of carriage re St. John's.

The committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered the Bill be read a third time to-morrow.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into committee on the Hospital Bill, Hon. Mr. Job taking the Chair of Committee.

HON. MR. SQUIRES—We have now reached the section (No. 3) of the Bill which involves the new idea inaugurated by the Hospital Commission referring to the management of the General Hospital. I feel that, as a House, and as a community, we are deeply indebted to the Commissioners, who, at a very considerable labor undertook the inquiry which has resulted in this report and the Bill now before us. This Bill in its entirety is to put into operation the provisions of the report of the Commission. I feel that a debt of gratitude is due the Commission for the work they have done, which I think has met with the approval of the House of Assembly already, and has resulted in a practical measure which we believe will increase the efficiency of the institution which has done so much

good already. The measure as a whole and this section in particular has my hearty endorsement and support.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I should like to say in connection with this Bill after carefully going through it that I do not think any Bill introduced in the Lower House or in this one would give greater satisfaction than this. It will give undoubted confidence to those who from time to time require to enter the Hospital. This will, I hope for all time settle complaints that have been made, complaints some of them not justifiable, but it will, I think, give undoubted confidence to the people of the country at large, and I think that the Government deserve the best appreciation of the people of the country for introducing a Bill of this kind.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill has been carefully prepared and with the object of entirely eliminating any possibility of friction in the institution, which as we all know has occurred in the past. It seems to me, however there is just a slight possibility arising by passing that section as it stands, and I propose to change the construction of it slightly so that it will have no possibility for a different interpretation of the meaning of the section. I wish to move a reconsideration of section 18.

HON. J. D. RYAN—I would like to say a word on this section, sixteen. Is it meant to include such people as public servants, like school teachers, etc., with very small salaries? When they come here for the Hospital is it the intention of the Government to charge those people? Some of them have no salaries at all, but are teaching the children in the schools, and they have to pay fees in the Hospital.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The intention is that the Board of Governors shall

have entire control and shall fix the scale of fees according to the means of the inmates. The intention is really that every one who enters the hospital shall pay or be paid for, and where a certificate is given that they are not able to pay, they shall be paid for by the Commissioner of Public Charities. Those who will be exempt from paying anything themselves will have to be paid for by the Commissioner of Public Charities. However that will be entirely under the control of the Board of Governors.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I should just like to say a word about this Bill. It has the right ring about it from beginning to end, and is non-political. Under the Bill we provide for six Governors who shall have full and supreme control of that institution. I have not the slightest doubt that the best selection will be made. I hope a competitive estimate for all supplies will be asked for. My experience as a member of the Board of Works was that there were always tenders for provisions and other necessaries. There are other things connected with that department that might be added to competition because I believe that in all these institutions if any quantity of goods is required at any time both samples and patterns should be advertised for and submitted. I think the Commission of Enquiry deserve the best thanks of the people, and if this Bill is the outcome of their work it will be a great amount of good. As to little mistakes that may have occurred in the past this Bill will be a protection in the future.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

STAMP DUTIES BILL.

Hon. Mr. Harvey took the Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop was order-

ed to be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Robinson the Committee stage of the Marine Disasters Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop further consideration of the Municipal Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until 4 p.m. Monday next.

MONDAY, May 17th.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

THIRD READING OF CUSTOMS AMENDMENT BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move the recommitment of this Bill to consider a slight amendment which is necessary. Hon. Mr. McGrath took the Chair of Committee.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Assembly that this House had passed the same with some amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Stamp Duties Bill was read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Assembly that this House had passed the same without amendment.

LABRADOR FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Labrador Codfish Bill. Hon. J. D. Ryan taking the Chair.

HON. MR. JOB—I am going to propose an amendment to this clause that the words "and the board" be eliminated. The reason of that is probably apparent to all. The board may be composed of mercantile competitors or shippers, and of course it would be unfair to a degree for these competitors' books to be exposed to the Board and made public, and possibly to people who have nothing to do with cur-

rent price. It doesn't follow that this applies to people who have been trading in current price receipts. For that reason I think the words ought to come out. It might render the Board less efficient in its duties by not having all the information that they would get by having these words in the section, but I think plenty of information could be obtained without turning upside down the private books of business people, and I see no necessity for it.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Mr. Chairman: I would point out to the House if the amendment of the hon. member be adopted, that it will simply mean that this bill is of no value. If the board has not the power to compel the attendance of witnesses in order that it may fix a fair and reasonable price for fish sold on the Labrador coast, then it is utterly useless to appoint a Board. Arbitrators appointed under any Act, no matter how trifling or great the dispute, have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses before them in order that they may, from evidence elicited at the investigation, be able to arrive at a proper judgment. Now, if we eliminate the board entirely from this section and give them no power to compel the attendance of witnesses, then how is the board going to compute what is a fair price? It is utterly useless to constitute a board under this Act, and then deprive them of the power necessary to enable them to fulfil the obligations which this bill imposes upon them. With regard to the contention of the hon. member that the books may be turned upside down in the course of the proceedings before the Board, for the determination of the current price of Labrador codfish, I may say that books of account are everyday produced in court for inspection by counsel and witnesses. If such has long been the practice of the courts, surely we are

introducing no new innovation when we insert this clause in the Bill, giving the Board a power that is absolutely necessary for the success of their efforts. Books of accounts are no more turned upside down in the course of judicial proceedings than they would be at this board, and if anybody wants to take advantage of this Bill for the purposes of turning a man's business upside down, the court would very readily grant an injunction to prevent that. Suppose for instance some exporter of codfish from Labrador residing in some part of the country, had a dispute with the man who sold him his fish as to the current price, how is the Board going to determine what is the current price, if it cannot compel the man to whom his fish was sold to appear and state his reasons for believing that the price he paid was a reasonable one. It is absurd to constitute a board and give them no powers whatever. They cannot carry on their work and will be unable to give effect to legislation of this character. There are exporters in this country whose word would suffice without the productions of their books because the board would be quite satisfied with their word, but there are others in Newfoundland whose oath no board would believe, unless corroborated by some evidence, that the price they proposed paying is a fair one. This bill proposes dealing with the unreliable, as well as the reliable. It is not for the purpose of dealing with the just business man that this bill is primarily intended; but those who are not upright must also be dealt with. It would be unfair to ask the Board to fix and determine what is a fair and reasonable price, and at the same time give them no power to ask A, B or C to come before them and show that it is a reasonable price. Where are they going to get the evidence upon which they base their findings. Why should

not the board have the power to compel the fishermen to come before it and substantiate their claim that \$4.50 is a reasonable price. If we strike out these words then this bill becomes at once inoperative and of no effect.

HON. MR. McGRATH—May I ask the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill one question with reference to this section. I will put it in this way: Assuming that he is a Labrador fish exporter, that he goes to that coast as Capt. Jensen or Mr. Hiscock did, and buys fish for cash and has no transactions whatever under the "current price" and that then, after he comes back here, the matter of fixing a "current price" arises at the close of the season, is it contemplated that this exporter, who is not interested at all in the phase of the matter comprehending the "current price" is to be called before this Tribunal and required to produce his books and accounts, and disclose what profit, if any, he made on a transaction which in no way comes within the purview of this Bill?

HON. MR. GIBBS—No, he is not.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Well, I submitted that question to another legal gentleman to-day who took an entirely different view, and I submit that it is unfair that people who are not interested in this question of the "current price" at all should be liable to be dragged before this tribunal and required to make public all their private business affairs when they may not have purchased a quintal of fish subject to the "current price".

HON. MR. GIBBS—If it becomes necessary for any proceeding in court and the question of price of an article is in dispute between two parties the other party may be subpoenaed and compelled to attend or parties who have no more interest than a man

in South Africa. The general presumption is that it will be only to those interested in the dispute that this will apply. They may be asked to produce their books. That is a power vested in the court always, and courts of law will not permit persons to be haled before boards of arbitration simply for the purpose of finding out what profits they are making.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—It seems to me that we have got to a new phase of this Bill now. I think Mr. McGrath's contention is unassailable also that of the mover of the Bill. We have two distinct positions. My impression was that the intention of the Bill was to settle the current price of fish. Now from what the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill says this is to be a court to settle prices, and if so, of course it must have certain powers; but he goes farther and says that it is to be a court to settle disputes.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Only a court to settle the price if disputes arise.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The idea that I had of this was that it was to fix a price and prevent disputes. If this is to be a quasi-judicial tribunal then the more cautious we are the better.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I only want to say a word. This Bill is not a bill to fix the current price. The current price has been a recognized thing up to this date. It may have been very often that the current price was very much higher than the price this Bill may fix. This Bill is to fix a fair and reasonable price which is totally different from current price.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to say also that it is surely clear that this Bill is intended to obviate disputes not to settle them, and no disputes can arise after this Bill becomes law between the buyer and seller. There will be no room for them be-

cause this board may fix a price which buyer and seller must abide by. Once the Board arrives at a price, that price is a fixed price and there can be no appeal beyond that. And moreover, the Bill will not only affect the fish sold without any settled price but will also effect the sales at the fixed price provided it be less than that which the Board may fix.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I would ask the hon. gentlemen in charge of the Bill how much of that \$3000 qts. shipped last year was bought for cash? It seems to me that if any body can go down there in September and buy the catch right out for cash and that cash was current for the time, that the current price must have been fixed. This is the most important section of the whole Bill, and brings us back to the old story as to whether you can fix a fair and reasonable price for this fish in the months of October or November. It has been stated here that you cannot fix a fair and reasonable price before the fish is shipped but how can you find that price except by an estimate of the figure ruling in the markets abroad. The hon. gentleman stated that in order to arrive at a wise and fair price for the fish it is necessary to await its disposal and the only way to get at it is to show your invoice in court. Now I do not think there is any intention in this House to take such a course and I think a fair and reasonable price can be arrived at without going into the profits and showing up the books of shippers as to what cargoes sent in September and October might realize. The hon. gentleman should be very careful as this section is the most important of the lot.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In reply to Hon. Mr. Anderson I may say that this

Bill does not interfere with the buyer or seller agreeing upon the price. If I go to Labrador and buy 10,000 qts. at \$3.50 per qt. and the fishermen accept this, this Bill does not affect that position. This Bill provides for such a contingency as where I will say "I will give you the current price for your fish," or some such words. Then the Board must say what is a fair and reasonable price with regard to transactions of that character and in order to enable them to buy it, it gives them powers of investigation, because they cannot arrive at a fair and reasonable price if they have no power, if they want to summon witnesses before them.

Hon. Mr. Job's amendment was then put and carried.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Before going on with section 18, I would like to ask about section 3 as read.

If provision is made for the payment of fees to lawyers engaged in these matters, why not some provision be made for witnesses. If you assume, as my hon. friend does in a case which occurred a few days ago, that the parties to an action proceeding under the bill, live in out-ports and must come to St. John's, why should men called on as witnesses be compelled to come at their own expense. This is in my mind, a most unfair position and moreover the man who has to come cannot refuse the subpoena. Now, if legal gentlemen are taking care of Number One by providing for the payment of their own expenses, we should provide that where a witness comes along, he should be compensated in the discretion of the Judges of the Supreme Court.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In reply, I would say this bill emanates from fishermen who are engaged in the Labrador

industry, and if it is their wish that they should travel at their own expense and cost, I cannot see why they should not do so.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I don't question your veracity, but is there evidence of that fact? Surely we are not to be asked to accept this assertion without any proof.

HON. MR. GIBBS—It is nevertheless the fact that fishermen will be prepared to come here and pay their own travelling expenses and appear in matters of this kind. The lawyers have no direct interest in fixing the "current price" of codfish, and if they are called upon by the Judges to give 10 or 15 days of their time before the Court to the neglect of other business, surely they should be remunerated.

HON. PRESIDENT—But if the fishermen do not want to come?

HON. MR. GIBBS—Then, of course the Supreme Court will compel them, but the Bill now with the words "and the Board" stricken out is a joke. I think we are perpetrating a huge joke upon ourselves, whether or not we admit this clause to remain where it is. The fishermen are willing to come at their expense to appear in these cases. It is hard for anyone to believe and I do not think my hon. friend believes it.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I certainly do not, and I am sure all will agree that we should not cast obligation on fishermen all over the country to oblige them to come here at their expense and give evidence, and I beg to move as an amendment that the section be reconsidered, and then ask the House to say that witnesses coming here in these actions should be allowed reasonable compensation at the discretion of the Court.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The gentleman in charge of the bill does not

evidently desire that this should be changed and as it is presumed to affect the fishermen who may ask to appear as witnesses, I do not see why we should alter it.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I move that section 9 be reconsidered.

The question being put to the Committee, Hon. Mr. McGrath's amendment that section 9 be reconsidered was carried.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I beg to move that the word "not" in the second last line be stricken out and inserted after the word "expenses" "witnesses shall be entitled to fees or travelling expenses at the discretion of the Court or Judge."

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I beg to support the amendment, but I am not satisfied that there are not others interested as well as the fishermen, as regards the Labrador fishing business. Many men such as clerks and supercargoes and others cannot afford to come long distances to give evidence, and I do not think the hon. gentlemen in charge of the Bill would feel like asking these people to come here and spend ten or twelve days at their own expense without being compensated. However we seem to have lost sight of the fact that this is a bill to fix the price of Labrador fish and not a bill for fixing the "current price," therefore there can be no dispute once the price is definitely settled. It is not even intended to fix the "current price" that is paid between the buyer and seller. It shows the whole folly of the Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I think that if the people of the country who are least able to pay the expenses of attending as witnesses in a proceeding of this kind are prepared to come free, those better able to do so should be prepared to follow in their footsteps. Why should a fish exporter who

can afford to pay, say from \$100,000 to \$500,000 or \$700,000 be paid anything to come to St. John's for the purpose of fixing a price which concerns every man, woman and child in the Colony. This is not a question of a dispute between two people, but concerns the fixing of the price of a commodity, which may be worth one, two or three millions of dollars to the whole country. The whole Colony is affected by it and when those who have the largest needs and have the least means are prepared to come and give their evidence and pay their charges, then those who can afford it should be prepared to do the same. It will be in the discretion of the Judges of the Court to question as to whether the witnesses were necessary or not, in order to fix a fair and reasonable price. This Bill has emanated from the fishermen. In order to avoid expense they say "we will pay our travelling expenses in proceedings of this kind," and we should not saddle the Colony with unnecessary expenses.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I repeat, Mr. President that it is absurd for the honourable gentlemen to seriously argue that the fishermen have authorized any declaration on their part that they are prepared to come here from all parts of the Island to give evidence in these cases without asking to have their expenses paid. The hon. gentleman may believe this, but he will find it difficult, I think, to persuade others to the same degree of credulity. Then he says that the Judges will construe my proposal as to discretion in a certain way, but this, I submit, is equally absurd. He cannot forecast what the Judges will do any more than I can, and it seems to me that the only thing we have to consider is this, are we prepared to reimburse men who may be called to the city as witnesses in such cases,

leaving it to the Judges to award them whatever compensation these authorities may think the men entitled to.

Hon. Mr. McGrath's amendment having been put to the Committee was carried.

Hon. Mr. Winter's amendment that the date for the fixing of the price be the first of November having been agreed to by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, was carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

SAWMILLS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee of the whole on the Saw Mills Bill, Hon. Dr. Skelton in the chair. The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop moved the House into Committee of the Whole on the Hospital Bill, Hon. Mr. Job taking the Chair.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

MARINE DISASTERS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Robinson the House went into Committee on the Marine Disasters Bill, Hon. Mr. Blandford taking the chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—When this Bill was read a second time the only remark I made in reference to it was that I was sure that no member of this Chamber could possibly oppose the principle of the Bill, which is to establish by such means as may be in the power of the Committee that will be appointed, a Permanent Marine Disaster Fund. We have had in recent years some very terrible disasters. In 1912 five vessels were lost, and it became necessary to establish a relief fund, generally called the Erna Fund.

Last year we had the terrible tragedy of the Southern Cross and the loss of so many men on the Newfoundland. Every member of this House will remember that in previous years there have been case after case of vessels being lost, and appeals being made for these special purposes. All these appeals have been worthy ones, and have all been answered in that spirit happily characteristic of the people of Newfoundland. It has been especially gratifying to know that the assistance so willingly given has not been confined to any one section of the island, but that outport has vied with city, and city with outport, and subscribed handsomely. There have been many instances of generosity, too, on the part of Newfoundlanders abroad, as well as at home; and also of the friends of the Colony in Britain, Canada, and the States. A grave grievance, however, has arisen in connection with these matters; a grievance which at first sight is not apparent, but which becomes very real. May I illustrate? Here is a widow who has lost her husband in the 'Little Jap' living alongside another who has lost her husband in the 'Southern Cross.' They are both getting assistance from the funds. Living between them is another widow. She has little children, and has lost the father of these little ones, but not in any of these disasters. No collection is made; nothing is done for her, but her suffering is just as acute. Her neighbours are getting assistance, she gets nothing. Another objection to the hap-hazard system we have had in the past is that it has been found that the greater the tragedy the greater the benefaction, and the recipients from one fund get more than the equally deserving beneficiaries of another. A further objection and a very serious one is that the lack of method is not the sort of thing to encourage

the exercise in its best form of true charity, the greatest privilege of citizenship. The idea has been for quite a long time, that some fund should be formed which would always be there, the Managers of which would be ready to grasp the opportunity if the sad necessity came for making further appeals. The attempt has been made before, but for various reasons failed. In 1912 when the Erna Fund was established an attempt was made then to form a permanent fund. The answer came that if you make that now the collections may not be as good as if you appeal for the one object. The same argument was raised last year. But when the meeting was held under the Chairmanship of the Chief Justice special powers were granted to the Committee thereafter appointed, one of which was the formation of a Permanent Marine Disasters Fund. I may say that it had been the intention of that Committee to have got to work before seeking legislative powers, but the war intervened, and the more immediate and greater duty had to be met, our duty to the Empire, and to those of our sons who may have fallen or shall fall or be crippled in the war. The same spirit which had been shown by the people of Newfoundland in 1912 and again last year, was emulated or perhaps exceeded by the generosity displayed by the people of Canada, the United States and the Old Country. The amount we thought we should require at that time would have been about \$200,000; but instead, over \$300,000 was subscribed, and it was not thought too much. The whole of that amount has been practically allocated, and I took occasion to place on the desks of every member a few days ago a copy of the report of the Committee, to show how the money had been allocated, how handled, and how it is kept. A great many of the people contributing were of the opin-

ion that some of the money should be given to a permanent fund; it was so urged by several of the donors, many of whom believed that their contributions were towards a Permanent Fund. This view was emphasized by Mayor Ellis and others who had been in close touch with many of the donors and charitable societies abroad. Of course no Committee has any right to allocate one cent of this Fund or any Fund except for the purpose for which subscribed. The Committee, however, felt that it would be justified in appealing to the Supreme Court of the Colony and asking for three things: (1) To allow them to apply for disasters other than the sad one of last year say donations, the donors of which desired them to be applied to a permanent fund. (2) To allow the Committee to place the interest on the money to a permanent fund. (3) To allow the young widows a vote for five years. At the present time I think about fifteen or twenty widows are remarried, and, of course, when they re-marry, the grants lapse.

Another class of lapses is this. All the grants are based on actuarial figures. Old people are not given grants for five years, but for life. The actuarial tables gave, say, to a person of sixty an average life of fifteen years. Suppose that party dies before ten years have elapsed, then it is asked that the balance may go to the permanent fund. On the other hand, if that party lives over the fifteen years and more is required, the monies of the permanent fund will be just as applicable to this case as to any other. In other words, the idea of the permanent fund is to make it supplementary to the other funds, not lessening their scope, but widening its range so as to embrace every call of the kind for aid. The Court very properly replied that it was

beyond its power to accede to the suggestion and that legislation would be necessary. Later it was found that practically all the funds subscribed would be actually required to meet the obligations, whilst the unexpected receipt of about \$15,000 enabled us to raise the rate for children from \$30 to \$35. There are cases where some of the survivors may be beneficiaries of the fund for 30 or 40 years, or the whole of their life time. Some of the poor fellows have been maimed and will be incapacitated for years, again there is many a man who was out on the ice fields and is apparently recovered to-day, who has, we fear, got within him the seeds of a disease which some day or other will come out and make it necessary for him to have something to fall back upon. Such contingencies must be provided for. The 1914 Committee have decided we shall want all of the money subscribed except such lapses as may occur. We therefore ask the Legislature to allow a committee to be formed by the responsible authorities and give power to that committee to carry out the work in connection with the Permanent Disasters Fund and to allow that committee to place the lapses and the interest from the 1914 Fund to the credit of the Permanent Disasters Fund.

This Bill is to a certain extent unique. We ask nothing from the Government of the Colony, absolutely nothing. There it at present in force an act, rather a mixed act, and the only thing asked for here is the authority to act under a section of that Act which came to us in the form of an amendment and was passed in 1912. This Bill has been drawn up by two lawyers, Mr. Blackwood and Mr. Conroy, who very kindly consented to do so. There is just one amend-

ment I will have to propose when we read the section it affects. I am glad to see that the Bill has received the unanimous support of the other chamber. There is no need for me to say anything more. Both the Bill and its object speak for themselves. The honour of its introduction into this chamber has fallen upon me, as the President of the 1914 Committee, who is Treasurer of the 1912 fund, occupies the Presidency of this Chamber. Of his work indeed of the work of every one of the members of the Committee, with whom it has been my honour and privilege to be associated in connection with these matters it is impossible to speak too highly.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I think the introducer of this bill has gone pretty thoroughly into the objects for which it has been brought forward. I don't think I need delay the House at this late hour by attempting any lengthy remarks except to say a few words of appreciation of the work that has been done by my hon. friend in connection with this Marine Disasters Fund of last year, and also the year of 1912. He is secretary of the latter fund and for this reason the work of the members and chairman did not amount to very much. All the thinking was done by my hon. friend. How he got through all the work I don't know. When we come to think that there was 250 cases in one loss and 77 in the other, and that every individual case had to be gone into, and possibly three or four letters to be written to magistrates and clergy in connection with each case, we get some idea of the work. He, however, persistently and perseveringly clung on to the work, for I don't know how many months, and eventually completed it, so that now everything is going swimmingly with regard to the fund. It occurs to me that it is very strange that in a coun-

try like this which depends for its existence on the realization of the products of the sea, such a Bill had not been introduced years ago. Suppose for instance, that any hon. gentleman in this House, when he thought he was approaching his end was desirous to allot some portion of his wealth or savings to the Marine Disasters' Fund or some fund for the benefit of mariners, there is no provision for such a case and I suppose, for that reason we have had very few instances where legacies have been left for any such purpose. I don't know that I am aware of any at present. It is a positive relief to read this bill, when we remember the nature of the Bills that have been before us this season. This bill is quite clear. It is easily understood. I hope the benefit to be derived from this bill may be felt at once, and that in that way my hon. friend will receive some recompense for the trouble he has taken in creating it.

Hon. Mr. Robinson asked that section 7 stand over.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I should like, with the other hon. members, to add my word of recognition of the work which I know from similar experience must have accrued to my hon. friend, and from all I have heard, I think there is no question that the hon. gentleman did more than one man's share in administering the Marine Disasters' funds of 1912 and 1914. In connection with this fund, I should like to ask just one question. Is not the provision in section 19 meant to apply to seamen as well as fishermen?

HON. MR. ROBINSON—As a matter of fact this is the only section that was not in the original Bill. I agree with the hon. member that the word 'seamen' ought to be added. It is an evident omission.

The clause was amended accordingly.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Before the Committee rises may I express my exceeding gratitude to those gentlemen who have spoken so kindly of what little assistance it may have been my privilege and pleasure to render. The work done has been that of no individual but of the entire Committee. If credit is due it is peculiarly so to the Hon. John Harris, Hon. R. Watson, Hon. Geo. Knowling, Messrs. Ellis, J. S. Munn and J. C. Hepburn, who have been present at almost every meeting, sometimes several weekly, each of from two to three hours duration. The absolute harmony and singleness of purpose, displayed by the members has, however, removed the tedium, and enabled much to be accomplished at each meeting. May I also say that the Committee's arrangements have been carried out with a minimum of trouble. This has been largely due to the system which provides a trustee for every beneficiary. Through the hands of each trustee, who in almost every case is a clergyman or a magistrate the half-yearly payments pass, thus safeguarding the best interests of the beneficiaries, and keeping the Committee in touch with the individual history of each case. I thank you gentlemen, and move that the Committee rise.

The Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the second reading of the Municipal Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until 4 o'clock tomorrow.

TUESDAY, May 18th.

The House met at 4 o'clock pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Saw Mills Bill was read a third time, and sent to the House of Assembly

with a message informing them that the Committee had passed the Bill with some amendments.

LABRADOR CODFISH BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Labrador Codfish Bill, Hon. J. D. Ryan taking the Chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—In view of the amendments made to section 2 of this Bill it is obvious that an amendment is necessary to section 7. I now move that section 7 be deleted, and the following substituted therefor: "The application aforesaid to the Court may be made, on motion to a judge in chambers on summons. There shall be published in the Royal Gazette at least one week before the hearing of any such application, a notice giving the time and place at which said application shall be heard, and a copy of the said notice, or, if the application be by summons, a copy of the said summons shall be served upon each member of the Board created under sections 2 and 10 of this Act. Each member of the said board and any other person interested in said application shall be entitled to be represented at the hearing by counsel, but no costs shall in any event, be allowed to any person."

Hon. Mr. Robinson's amendment on being put, was carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments.

MARINE DISASTERS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Robinson the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Marine Disasters' Bill.

Hon. Mr. Blandford in the Chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I would ask that another section be substituted in lieu of section 7—"The Committee may invest its funds in such investment as trustees, are now or here-

after may be authorized by law to invest trust funds." The reasons for which I ask it, are as follows: It is obvious that it is desirable to have the assets of a fund of this description in as liquid a form as possible. When the funds were collected in 1914 the Managers of the Banks doing business here were asked to tender. One Bank offered to take it at 3 per cent. compounded quarterly; the second offered $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent compounded quarterly; the third $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent compounded monthly and the fourth 4 per cent. compounded quarterly. The highest tender of course was accepted. The result is all our funds are with the Bank of Montreal drawing 4 per cent. quarterly, available at a month's notice, and the rate of interest is about as high as can be had. I do not say that we are justified in assuming that a similar bargain may be now secured, but we hope so, and if we can continue this it will be very much more desirable than having the responsibility of looking for such investments as may be liquidated at demand. I therefore ask that this addition be made.

The amendment was put and carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with an amendment.

On motion the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to move the second reading of the Municipal Bill.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Before this Bill gets into Committee, I want to say that I object to what may be said to be its principle. The object of the Bill is to do away with the present Commission before they have reported, to do away with their powers of government, which, I think, is a

great pity, and I think that the Council ought to amend the Bill so as to permit the present Commission to continue its work until it has reported, in order that the next regular election of a council shall take place under revised and approved rules. We all agree that the government of this city has not been what we should have liked to see up to the time the present Commission took charge, nor do I say that it is so since it took charge, but the only chance of getting improved government to my mind is the opportunity that exists of keeping the present commission in power until it has been able to report upon what, in its opinion, should be done. If, as arranged for here, the election takes place under the old law, and the Commission does not report until some time after the new Commission takes office, it is going to be extremely difficult after that to make any practical alteration in the government of St. John's. The Commission, as I understand it, cannot possibly report before at any rate, 6 months, and I think the act of the Legislature ought to be to keep them in power until next June or sufficiently long to enable them to lay before the next session of the Legislature, their report upon civic business, and to allow the Legislature either by arranging for a plebiscite, or by direct vote to deal with the new charter they will recommend. We know that the trouble is not so much with the Municipal laws of the city. My hon. friend on my left, Mr. Gibbs, introduced and carried some most admirable regulations in connection with the government of the city. The trouble has been with the machinery of administration, and I believe that the present Commission is particularly giving attention to the question of administration, and to perpetuate by another election the conditions which have hitherto ex-

listed, without giving these gentlemen an opportunity of putting their views before the Legislature and the city will be a grave error, so that I hope the Bill will be amended so as to prevent any new body taking office until the work of the Commission has been before us.

On motion the Bill was then read a second time and will be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

LOGGING COMMITTEE REPORTS.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I beg leave to present the report of the Select Committee appointed by the House to consider the Bill relating to the employment of men engaged in logging. They have had the matter under deliberation for some time, and have made some amendments to the Bill.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Harvey the report was received.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Mr. President, I would suggest that as this is really a new bill (Logging Bill), the original bill be printed with the amendments now proposed in order that hon. members may see the nature and scope of the amendments now proposed and that it be sent to committee of the whole on tomorrow.

It was ordered accordingly.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned until Thursday next at 4 o'clock.

THURSDAY, May 20th.

The House met at 4 o'clock, pursuant to adjournment.

LABRADOR CODFISH BILL.

Third reading of Labrador Codfish Bill as amended.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—Mr. President I am anxious to have recorded in the Journal of this House the fact that this Bill, or at least that section calling upon the Supreme Court under certain circumstances to fix the price of Labrador fish as an ordinary part

of its business, should not go through without a protest of some sort, and I have to make a motion that the House go into Committee again upon the Bill for the purpose of considering that particular section. I want, at the same time, to say in relation to the Bill generally that I hope it will not be urged hereafter that the Council amended the Bill out of existence or even changed it seriously. I am opposed to the Bill myself on the ground that in its more particular features it traverses the obvious principles on which a commercial community must exist. But the alterations which have been actually made here have been practically of a formal nature. They have altered nominally the method proposed for appointing the Board, but that alteration is more formal than actual. They have changed the method by which that Board gets its information. They have to get it voluntarily instead of under compulsion. But this will make no difference in getting the information required by the Board. They can get it from everyday information and will get it from voluntary evidence, so that those alterations are formal and hardly change the measure at all, and the Council are not open to the accusation of having stamped the Bill or of having improved it out of existence. It is going through practically as it came up. My point, however, is that the Supreme Court is the one institution in this country that ought more than any other to be inviolate and kept within its own strict functions. I consider that the precedent now being established by which the Supreme Court is brought down from its proper function and called upon to deal with matters of this kind is a precedent at once objectionable and dangerous. I cannot see any reason why if the Supreme Court is to be called upon to fix the price of Labrador fish, they may not be called upon to fix the price of any-

thing; for instance the price of partridge berries or of seals. The value of seals brought in is probably fully equal on an average to the value of Labrador fish shipped off the coast, an industry more concentrated, in fewer hands and less open to competition than Labrador fish. And if the Supreme Court can be called upon to fix the price of Labrador fish or the price of seals, where is it going to stop? It may be called upon to fix the price of sausages. There is not an institution which should be so jealously guarded and protected by the Legislature, particularly by this branch of it, than the Supreme Court. I only hope that the downward step we are taking in this matter will not be looked upon as a precedent, and in order that this may be again considered, I beg to move that the House do now go into Committee of the whole upon this bill for the purpose of reconsidering this particular section.

HON. MR. JOB.—As Hon. Mr. Gibbs, who is in charge of the Bill, is ill, I consider that it is hardly the time to move in this matter, and must propose that its further consideration be deferred.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I think it is a mistake for the impression to get abroad that the only duties of the Judges of the Supreme Court are to act in a judicial capacity. This has been departed from in Canada, and I would like to refer to an instance just on record of the latest case wherein Judges of the Supreme Court have been engaged in the capacity of Commissioners. In Manitoba the downfall of the Roblin Government recently was the result of the appointment of the judges as commissioners to investigate charges of dishonesty in connection with the new buildings in Winnipeg. Presiding was Chief Justice Mathews, and with him were Justice McDonald of the Provincial Supreme Court, and Sir Hugh John McDonald,

District Judge of Winnipeg City, the former Premier of Manitoba. In the same province a Judge of the Supreme Court for years past occupied the position in addition to his judicial functions, of President of the Utilities Commission, which dealt with a variety of matters like control of accounts, administration of street railways and various other matters of the same character, and these functions and the powers of that Board are vested in this Judge. The same applies to the Province of British Columbia, where one of the Judges of the Supreme Court acts as Public Commissioner and in the same way settles rates and other matters. In Ontario, I think it will be found that Judges of the Supreme Court, not the entire Supreme Court, acted in a variety of positions somewhat akin to those which are proposed to be placed with the Supreme Court here. It will be noticed, if hon. gentlemen are interested to delve into the history of the Dominion Provinces for years past, the tendency there is to use the Supreme Court Judges in this connection for work of this character, it being felt that it is in no way derogatory to the judicial functions for which they are appointed. But as Hon. Mr. Gibbs, who is in charge of this Bill, is ill, it might not be unwise if we agreed to postpone the third reading until he comes.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—When this Bill was before the Committee I took the position just taken by Hon. Mr. Harvey, and I entirely concur with what he has said on the matter. It is all very well to speak of the precedents formed in Canada by giving the Judges certain powers as to Utilities Commissions, but I have yet to hear of their being asked to fix the price of a commodity, such as wheat, for example. As matters stand, there is nothing to prevent the calling upon the judges of the Supreme Court to fix the price of clove, lines and twines

or bread. These are commodities, the manufacture of which is being assisted to a certain extent by the Government, and judging by the precedent established here you will have a bill bye and bye asking the government to fix the prices to be charged on them. I agree with what Hon. Mr. Harvey says as to the placing of the responsibility of fixing the price of fish on the judges of the Supreme Court. They should not fix the standard price upon the exports of the country. It is absurd. Their functions in a judicial way are to interpret the law and while this chamber is prepared to extend this in every way for the protection of the fisheries of the country, we should not go so far as to place in their hands the power to fix the price of fish, and further, Mr. President, there is no one in this House but wishes to see the fishermen get as big a price, and as fair and reasonable a price as they can get, but it seems to me a better way could have been arrived at, a more simple way of fixing the price of a commodity that depends to a large extent upon supply and demand. I do not think that you can fix a price on this article any more than you can on anything else unless you get at the bottom of it, and as the Hon. Mr. Harvey and Mr. Winter say, you have to get more explanation than this provides for. I support the suggestion that this Bill be reconsidered, as I do not think it fair to ask anybody to fix the price for the Labrador cod.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN.—Just a few remarks in reference to this bill. I may say that I rise to support the remarks of Hons. Harvey and Anderson; and I think this part of the bill should be reconsidered. I think myself it is not right to bring the judges of the Supreme Court down to the position of fixing a price on Labrador fish. I think we should arrive at some other way. The law of supply and de-

mand fixes the price of all commodities, particularly food. I still think this bill will do good to nobody. I would like to see a bill enabling somebody to fix a price on fish, but do not think it can be done under this bill. I think it will be totally unworkable. As Hon. Mr. Anderson has already said, I would like to see the fishermen getting a good price for their fish; the more they get the better for the exporter. Referring again to the current price, no merchant in this country desires the current price as much as the fishermen themselves. That is the last word; they say they want the current price put on the receipts. The merchants do not want to use it; it is almost meaningless. I think the Judges and lawyers of the Supreme Court will have a hard time to find what it means.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Before the amendment is put to bring this section referred to before the Committee again, I think it would be better to bring the whole bill back to committee for reconsideration. It strikes me very forcibly from what I have heard from hon. members here that this bill is either good or bad. Shall we have the same debate over again, or shall we reconsider the whole bill and pass it in its original form, or turn it down altogether? I hardly see what position the House seems to be taking, but in my own opinion we should either take it or reject it.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I would just like to say to my hon. friend opposite, Mr. McGrath, that the Canadian precedents that he quotes are not necessarily good argument. It is true that the cases he quoted were submitted to individuals, but not to the Supreme Court as an institution. I say it is a bad principle and a bad precedent. I am only moving this amendment for the sake of getting a record in the minutes. I do not want to go

over the Bill again as it has already been thrashed out at length, but more by that those who agree with me should go on record as protesting against the Supreme Court being appointed as the final arbiters.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job, the third reading of the Labrador Codfish Bill was deferred.

HON. MR. ROBINSON moved the third reading of the Marine Disasters Fund Bill, as amended, which was carried, passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Assembly that this House had passed the same with some amendment.

Committee on Hospital Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I meant to move the House into Committee on this bill so as to complete its legislation in this Chamber, but in view of Hon. Mr. Gibbs' illness and the probability of his being with us to-morrow, I think it wise to defer it to a later date. I move the further consideration of this Bill be deferred.

It was so ordered.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Committee on Municipal Bill.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on this bill, Hon. Dr. Skelton taking the chair of the Committee.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I beg to move an amendment to section 2 to alter the date for the election of Mayor and Members to a later date.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I think, Mr. President, it is a mistake to alter the date fixed in this Bill. I do not see any substantial advantage from continuing the term of the present Municipal Board beyond December 31st next. Last session, when the Bill creating a Municipal Commission was brought in here, I expressed the opinion that such legislation, while desirable from some points of view, was only justified if a strong case was established for a very radical departure

from existing methods of Municipal Government. Petitions from more than 3,000 citizens were, we were told, the reason why this new policy was adopted. These petitions were based upon the report of a Citizens' Committee which advised that such a Board be installed for twelve months to draft a new scheme of city government and to submit the same to a plebiscite before its adoption by the Legislature. We passed the bill on that understanding and while I would have it clear that I am not criticizing the Commission, since I think they have done good work, yet two of the obligations have not been fulfilled—namely, the Commission is not ready with its report, though twelve months have now elapsed, and the idea of a plebiscite is now openly abandoned. At the last session I pointed out that the Commission would really have only six months in which to prepare its report, because ordinarily the session now in progress would have been started in January or February and been over in March or April. In other words, the report would have had to be ready by the end of last December. Instead, we find ourselves, now near the close of May, and the Commission not ready with its report even yet. The Bill that is before us, recognizing that the circumstances were exceptional, proposes to continue the Commission in office until December 31st, so that it may complete its study of the various branches of the city administration and finalize a report by that time, but the amendment now offered would continue the Commission in power for still another six months or until the end of June, 1916.

If the Commission proposed to radically alter the present system of Municipal Government, such a course might be excusable, but as it does not, so far as we can learn, plan any very

decided changes, I fail to see why we should deprive the town of St. John's of its right to an elected Municipal Board for that period. From what is known of the draft scheme which the Commissioners have been considering for some weeks past, it appears that they intend merely to go back to the old system of an elective Mayor and five or six Councillors though it is undecided whether these are to be chosen by wards or "at large" as at present. The other changes contemplated are not serious and therefore the proposed report could be just as well considered by the Legislature next winter with an elective Municipal Council in power as otherwise, because, moreover, the Legislature will not be bound to accept in its entirety or even in its least detail, the recommendations of the proposed Commission. I think, too, that it is not fair that gentlemen appointed as the present Board is appointed, without any responsibility to the rate payers, should take it upon themselves to expend what may prove to be a sum of \$200,000 in a new water service. They brought down an expert, he made a report, this calls for an outlay of \$170,000 and that outlay is to be gone ahead with though the public have had no opportunity of considering the scheme in any way. It may be that the best possible was done, but if not, the burden will be unloaded on to whatever body they elect after this Commission makes its report, and the men who have brought this expert here will escape all responsibility. This, I submit, is not a proper position. Of course, if we have abandoned all faith in the principle of an elective Municipal administration and favor the abolition of a city franchise and the depriving of the ratepayers of the right to their own representatives the present policy is quite proper, but

so long as we oppose the principle of Crown Colony Government for the island, we should set our faces against the continuance in office of a non-elected Municipal Board for any longer period than is absolutely necessary to carry on the special work with which that Board has been entrusted, and that in my opinion, should be completed by the end of December next.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I take the view that has been advanced by the hon. member who has introduced this amendment. There are few more dangerous actions than swapping horses when crossing a stream. At the present time this city is in a process of evolution and any radical change in its guidance at so critical a juncture may prove extremely serious in its effects.

A number of gentlemen have been appointed to investigate and they are investigating. In the face of many difficulties they have done remarkably good work, and done it quietly. They have not advertised themselves, but much of their work advertises them. There is no-one in this city but must admit—and I am sure that my hon. friend opposite will be the first—that there are great improvements necessary, and that some of them are being accomplished. All have not been effected. There are many yet to be accomplished.

The present Board is operating, but it is doing more. It is not only doing the work, but making the plans for others to work by. We can't build a large edifice without having a good scaffolding. This body of Commissioners are at the present time engaged in putting up that scaffolding. If we pass this section in its original form that scaffolding will not be finished until a new foreman and new workmen take charge. Surely for the

sake of a few months we may give these men—if with their splendid public spirit they are willing to complete the scaffolding, and show us the plans of the edifice such as they propose to build,—surely we might give them the chance of doing so.

I admit all that has been said as to the right of the city to elect its own Government. I agree it is their right. If they demand it, but I am far from convinced that self-government for a city is the best form of Government. Personally I have always advocated Government by commission. I think we have illustration after illustration in the last few weeks and months of what a difference it has made when those in control of our city affairs are not depending upon the votes of the people for the positions they hold. The old Councillors have no doubt done all they could do in a position of much difficulty. The present Board has but one object, the betterment of the city, and it is to be desired that these men, despite the burden of work, may be given the opportunity of completing their task.

This question, put into a nut-shell, might read, "are we going to change horses while crossing the stream?" Can we afford to adopt so dangerous a policy?

HON. MR. ANDERSON—It is not my intention to say very much upon the section before the House, nor have I any special desire to speak for myself and support a bill to keep the Commission in office, of which I am a member. The Commission might as well go out now as in December. Twelve months ago we took office and a great deal of time was spent; we often had meetings three times a week, we have been there at all hours, and the principal reason that we asked for this Bill was that if accepted by the Government the next election should

take place under the new charter. It was our desire to have a charter completed in time to be brought up this session, but it is not an easy matter to prepare a charter for a city and whether accepted or rejected the chairman, Mr. Gosling, deserves the best thanks of this community for the time and labour he has given to this matter. We have no desire to remain in office. But we have been appointed to perform certain duties and we are not on a retainer.

If it's the wish of the Government to give us certain time, we are satisfied to do it. But if it is not acceptable to the Government we might as well go out now, and the new council take office on the first of July.

Reference has been made to getting down an expert in relation to the water works, etc., but I want to assure hon. gentlemen that the greatest care has been exercised in going into these matters, and should a conflagration have taken place we would have had another and bigger fire than the last, and whilst we devoted our care and attention to matters of this kind, when completed it must save in fire insurance alone in a short time the cost of installation. Another matter is what is known as the "small homes." In suitable houses in which there is no water or sewerage, we put it in at 1 per cent to be refunded in so many years. The principal aim is to try and abolish that infernal system of night carts, and if that alone is done, it will be of untold benefit to the city. We have reduced the number of these carts from 15 to 7, and if we can succeed in entirely abolishing them our efforts will not have been in vain. Another provision in the bill is that a lot of houses not already connected shall be, and it can easily be done at a cost of

\$10 to \$50, to be refunded together with a charge of 6 per cent. That is, those paying \$100 will be charged \$106, and so on. There have been so many matters of so various a nature to occupy our time that we have found it utterly impossible to do more than we have done in connection with the charter and, if the election is to take place under a new charter we can't expect that until next session. In connection with what Hon. Mr. Harris said we have found it (in our experience) in preparing estimates for the incoming council. We prepare estimates for one year so that six months have passed when the next council comes in. The first six months the revenue is much smaller than the last, consequently there is always jealousy between the different councils, and if no provision is made in the bill, provision should be made that if the incoming council take office next July, that they should take office for either 3½ or 4½ years. I think 4½ would be fairer, I hope. Mr. Chairman, that I have made myself clear. I have given my reasons why the time of the present commission should be extended, but I wish it to be understood that I am not supporting an amendment to keep myself in power.

HON. MR. JOB—Before the amendment passes I wish to say a few words of encouragement regarding the present Municipal Commissioners.

The opportunity will not likely occur again in this generation in St. John's of lending a helping hand to make a Commission's work a success. It is probably the only chance this Chamber will have of passing legislation of this sort to improve matters in the town we are all so proud of.

It is surely difficult to obtain the services of such suitable men as this commission is composed of, to de-

vote so much time and thought to the interests of Municipal government as these gentlemen are now doing. I say, Sir, that this commission of picked men are likely to render valuable service and it is a pity for the sake of a few months to run the risk of spoiling their labours, and until their final report as to new methods of election, is filed an election should take place.

If the election takes place in December as provided in this Bill it apparently must take place under the old rules which may not be desirable, and it will therefore be better, I think, to postpone this election till the commissioners' report be published and discussed by the Press and members of the two Houses.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Apropos of the discussion, I don't quite see the point which Hon. Mr. McGrath raised as to the danger of large expenditure, if we extend their term of office. I feel we can trust this Board in that matter. They have admittedly incurred large expenditure in connection with the water system, but anybody who knows the condition of that system will agree that it would not have been right for anybody in control not to have done what was required immediately to improve it. The town is not suffering by the management of the present board and none can believe that the extension of their term is in reality, going to do the town any harm. I think we can trust these gentlemen not to go beyond what is necessary, and I do think that as we have adopted the principle last session that we should uphold it now.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I personally see no hope whatever that the electors of this city will ever elect a board that will be as competent and unselfish as the Commission at pre-

sent governing the city. The fact that their work is not completed is, to my mind, a strong reason why they should be urged to continue their services a while longer, until they have completed the charter in course of preparation. The work that was thrust upon them no one could have expected could be accomplished in the short time they had, when it is remembered that, in the meantime, the city had to be governed, and it is apparent to all of us that reforms have been effected and expenditures reduced, that the number of night cars has been reduced sixty per cent, with the possibility of further reduction, and the work has been done at least as efficiently as before.

Supposing that we were to decide that we will not recommend extension of time. What then? An election takes place and a new mayor and councillors will be elected, and instead of having something substantial inaugurated and some better system for the government of the town within 12 months, it seems to me that it will be two or three years before it can be accomplished by the incoming Board.

The work that they are engaged in now, is, to my mind, very much more than that described by Mr. Robinson as a "scaffolding." To my mind it is the plans or specifications of the important structures, and the incoming body of mayor and councillors will surely not take up the work where it has been left off by the present Commission, for, if so, that is sufficient justification for continuing the present commission. Then I submit, it is most unlikely we are going to get a Board of equal confidence and devotion to duty. I favor the amendment.

HON. PRESIDENT—I would just like to say a word or two on the subject before the chair. This section has been damned with faint praise by

the Hon. Mr. McGrath, more perhaps by what he has not said than by what he has. He need have no fear whatever as to the ultimate success of this commission so far as the judgment of ordinary human beings can be applied.

The firm of engineers who have the work in hand is well known in Canada and the United States and has performed important engineering work in both countries, and the Commission before engaging them, satisfied themselves beyond question as to their reliability. The present is the first time that there has been anything approaching a scientific investigation of the water system since it was laid.

It has been done now by a thorough expert, who found many defects in it, some of which have been remedied by him. At present he is endeavouring to ascertain the whereabouts of a leak in the main by which a quarter of a million gallons per day are lost in the town. This leak is situated on Water St. near Harvey and Co.'s and is giving quite a good deal of trouble in locating it.

Quite a serious leak has been discovered by him further west on Water St. which has been remedied, and the pressure of water resulting from the improvement has increased very considerably. Some improvements have been suggested by this expert in the extreme west of the city, the result of which caused the pressure of water to jump from forty to fifty per cent, to one hundred and one hundred and ten, at which pressure the water has remained. For all these reasons my hon. friend can rest peacefully and satisfied that only good can result to the town from the employment by the Commissioners of Mr. Longley, the water engineer. When the system suggested by him is completed I think

a rate of at least \$50,000 should be looked for from the insurance companies. Their risks in St. John's will certainly be lessened, and as a consequence I see no reason why there should not be a considerable reduction made in the rate of premium. Since Mr. Longley's visit the Commissioners have been able to dispense to a great extent with the turnkeys, so that now when an alarm of fire is sent in there is no turning off the water with the result of injury to the pipes. The pressure is practically sufficient all over the town. This improvement will eventually result in a considerable saving in money as well as preventing the danger of breakage in the pipes because of the sudden turning on or off of water.

Another matter upon which I should like to make a few remarks is that of the removal of night soil. As Councillor Anderson has said, the reduction in the number of the objectionable night carts is from 17 to 6, the latter being the number now in use, and I understand that by the end of the present year, there may be also dispensed with, and pedestrians will then be able to use the streets at night time without any fear of meeting those objectionable carts. I would also wish to say that this objectionable material is no longer thrown around the country to the injury of vegetation and its generally disagreeable and dangerous effects. All this matter is now deposited in the main sewer at the sanitary stables and causes no annoyance whatever to the people living near the locality of the said stable.

The apparatus used for the disposal of night soil has been pronounced perfect by the Health Officer, and it is working well. Great credit is due to the chairman of the Sanitary Dept. Mr. Bradshaw, for the expenditure of

time and patience made by him on this department of the Commissioners' work.

The improvement which will be seen in this department when the Commissioners' service ends will be ample apology to the Government for depriving the city folk of the franchise for the short space of a few years. I did not intend to make any remarks on this Bill, being one of the Commission concerned in its several sections. I thought, however, that in justice to ourselves I could not allow the present opportunity to pass without making a few remarks on the few important services referred to.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I would just like to say a few words in connection with this Bill. I think the Commissioners have done excellent work since they took office, and took upon themselves the working of the Municipal Council. They have taken deep interest in the work for the welfare of St. John's. There is no doubt but the town has been greatly benefited by the Commissioners' work, and it will be in the interest of the city to have them retain office. I agree with Mr. McGrath that the election has got to be held, but the amendment is to hold the election in January or February. I think the original idea of the Bill was that the election was to take place during the first week of June. I think it better to allow the section to go as it was.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I should like the Board to give some idea of what they prefer themselves. My own feeling is that these gentlemen are doing fine work and I think they should be kept in office until they have finished. If they could be forced to stay it would be the better for the city.

HON. MR. McGRATH—If they are

going to be continued longer and are willing to stay on the job, they might as well remain till the 30th of June, 1914, because it ends a definite period in the municipal year.

HON. MR. HARVEY—They must wait till the end of June according to the section. The new Mayor and Council will take office July 1st, 1914 according to the section as amended, and the old council must remain whether they like it or not. I prefer to leave the amendment as it is, and keep the Commissioners there till 1st July, 1914.

On motion the Committee rose reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Hon. the President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly intimating that they have passed the amendments sent down by the Council upon the bills entitled respectively An Act to amend the Customs Act of 1908, and the Saw Mills Act, without amendment. Also that they had passed a Bill entitled an Act to incorporate the Nfld. Patriotic Association.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill relating to the Patriotic Association was read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to lay upon the table of the House the Report of the Newfoundland Savings Bank for the year 1914.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till to-morrow at 4 of the clock.

FRIDAY, May 31st, 1914

The House met at 4 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

Third reading of Labrador Codfish Bill as amended.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, this

order was deferred until later.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Hon. Mr. Bishop moved the House into Committee of the whole on this Bill.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I want to make one suggestion, before this goes through, to the authorities, that on the appointment of this Board it would be well, I think, if they appointed some ladies, because they have taken a great interest in the hospital and have done much good, and I think it would be most valuable to have at least one or two commissioners. This enquiry has been very thorough, and an enormous amount of detail has been gone into, not only as regards our own hospital, but also the organization in other hospitals, and the Report and the Bill are, in my opinion, both admirable documents.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I should just like to say in regard to that suggestion that there is nothing whatever in the Bill to prevent the appointment of ladies. The matter was considered by the Commission. One member urged the appointment of two ladies, the others offered no objection, but it was considered that the matter was better left open. As there are so many females, both officials and patients, the presence of one or more ladies on the Board might prove very helpful.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion, the House went into Committee on the Municipal Bill, Hon. Dr. Shelton in the chair.

On motion the Committee (Municipal) rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

PATRIOTIC FUND BILL.

Second reading of Patriotic Fund Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—As hon. gentlemen are conversant with the aims and objects of the Bill, I will not delay the House with any remarks, but will move its second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

LABRADOR CODFISHERY BILL.

Third reading of the Labrador Codfishery Bill as amended.

HON. MR. JOB—I hope this matter of reconsidering the Bill will not be passed, as it will render it inoperative. The hon. gentleman who has brought in the bill thinks that it is probable they will not get men to act on the Board. If this is so it will either become inoperative entirely or the Supreme Court must take it up. The hon. gentleman's contention is that the Judges of the Supreme Court are not the proper persons to deal with the Bill. I submit that such legal giants as Sir Edward Morris, Mr. Morine and others in the Lower House considered the matter, thoroughly discussed it and passed the measure, and if they think that this is work that the Judges of the Supreme Court can do, I do not see why lay members of this House should view it otherwise. We know too well remember that we have legal members of this House. I notice at the present moment three legal gentlemen here, and possibly any of these three legal gentlemen may become Chief Justice or a Judge at some future time—I hope they will—but they have voted before this in favour of this clause, the three of them, and all the other legal members of the other House; therefore I cannot see how we can question the matter as to whether this is the sort of work Judges should do. The Bill has caused much discussion and has already had the ap-

proval of a majority. I would liken it to a ship coming into a dock for repairs after a hard voyage. The Bill needed repairing and got it. It was then taken out of dock and was sailing gaily on its way to the Lower House when it has been unexpectedly been torpedoed, and the torpedo will sink it as far as I can see if we are not careful. Therefore, I beg leave to ask that the third reading be passed.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I think the hon. gentleman himself as the lay gentleman who has charge of the Bill, made it unworkable by the erasing of the words "and the Board" from section 9. As regards the observations referring to the legal gentlemen of the Lower House embodying in the Bill that the Judges of the Supreme Court shall fix the price, I believe they are competent and qualified in every way, but it does not seem our duty to place them in that position. May be questions will arise out of the fixing of the price, that they must deal with. They will probably have to deal with prices and other questions arising from these prices; and if somebody else could be decided upon to be the final arbitrator, I am of the opinion of Hon. Mr. Harvey this would be better than the appointing of the Judges though I am sure that there is no hon. gentleman but has the highest confidence in the qualifications of the Judges, but it is the unfairness to compel them by Act of Parliament to fix the price of any products, that I object to.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—If I understand it rightly, the motion before the House is that the Bill be now read a third time. There is an amendment that it be recommitted, so that section 6 may be reconsidered. It would, I think, be fairer to the House if the hon. member who intro-

duced that amendment would reconsider his motion. I may be out of order in discussing the purpose of his amendment, rather than the amendment itself, but the hon. member has clearly expressed it as his desire to have recorded the names of those who approve the principle of his proposed amendment to section 6, and of those who disapprove. I maintain, Mr. President that no division can give a correct record. There are I believe many others in this Chamber who think as I do on this question, but I speak only for myself. My position is that whilst I regard the placing of the burden of fixing the prices of fish on the Judges of the Supreme Court, as a blunder and an injustice, the appointment of the Minister of Fisheries as umpire, in view of the decision already recorded by this Chamber, would be a greater blunder. The House in its wisdom has denied the propriety of that official to represent the fishermen, and with that facing us, how it is possible to appoint him as umpire. We are confronted with objectionable alternatives, and all that is left for me is to choose the least objectionable, and vote against the amendment. If the third reading is not proceeded with, when the question comes up in Committee, I shall be compelled to record myself as, inferentially, approving of the appointment of the Supreme Court, as the arbiter of fish prices. But, sir, I do not so approve. It seems, however, impossible to discover a satisfactory substitute and of two evils, the least must be selected. It seems, as I have said, unfair to many in this House to press the amendment, and I trust the hon. member, with whose opinions as to the appointment of the Judges I am in accord, will not press an amendment which can result in no advantage, and which, in view

of the decision of the House already recorded, would place many hon. members in a false position. I do not think it fair to press the amendment. I do not think any advantage will be gained by its consideration.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I find myself in rather a difficult position, because though I sympathize with Hon. Mr. Robinson's position, I differ with him in the general proposition laid down that this is the lesser of two evils, I say it is the greater, and I feel very strongly on the subject of dragging in the Supreme Court. I feel it is infinitely more objectionable than to ask the Governor in Council, or as I have suggested, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to fix the price. It is a principle that goes far beyond the exigencies of the case. I do not consider it right that the Supreme Court should be asked to undertake this sort of work at all. However, what I want at this time is to get something on record to show that the principle did not pass in this House without very strong objections being taken to it. However, in view of the request now made, and recognizing that a number of members who have already voted in favour of the section as it now stands for other reasons, are in reality convinced that the principle is bad, and recognizing that they might be placed in an awkward predicament and as the protest has been strongly voiced and supported, and is not likely to be forgotten, I suppose I had better not press the matter further, and under these circumstances I beg leave with the assent of those who have supported me to withdraw the motion.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I fully concur with the views expressed by Hon. Mr. Harvey in this matter, and therefore beg to withdraw the support which I gave to the amendment.

The Bill was read a third time and passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until Tuesday next at 4 p.m.

TUESDAY, May 25th.

The House met at 4 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Hospital Bill was read a third time, passed, and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with an amendment.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP moved the House into Committee of the Whole on the Municipal Bill, Dr. Skelton in the chair.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I beg to move an amendment to section 11: "It shall be lawful for the Municipal Council in addition to their other powers to impose a tax upon every Contractor or Builder not domiciled in this Colony for one year prior to the acceptance of any contract, in the sum of \$500.00 (five hundred dollars) per annum. The first payment of such tax whenever imposed or paid shall be a payment, only for the then current calendar year, and the second and subsequent payments shall be due and payable on the second day of January following such payment. Provided that they shall not apply to any contract entered into before the passing of this Act."

Hon. Mr. Harvey's amendment was carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

LOGGING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on this Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to point out to the House that to my mind there is a defect in the 1st section of the Bill reported by the Select Committee. The 1st section reads that in the Bill—"the employer shall be held to mean the individual or company who engages or pays the workmen of a concern." Now it is possible and is of frequent occurrence that the man who hires the workmen may have nothing whatever to do with paying him. He may be employed for the purpose of hiring a certain number of workmen under an agreement, and when he performs the work for which he was engaged his employment ceases. There is evidently some mistake, and I think that the Select Committee should reconsider this section, because hundreds of cases may arise where a man may hire, but not have anything to do with the paying of the men. We are not legislating for to-day, but for the future, and many cases may arise where the man who engages the workman has nothing to do with the compensation as is to receive. Consequently this Bill would be inoperative so far as the employment of loggers are concerned where such contingencies as that would happen. I take it that it is not the intention of the Select Committee that difficulties of that kind should arise in future with regard to any action of theirs in the drafting of the Bill. In the next section, I do not think the definition of the word "logger" is correct. The Bill referred by the Select Committee defines logger as a man engaged in the "physical work of cutting, hauling, driving, etc., of logs." There is no such thing as physical

work, there is physical force, as for instance the army or navy of a country represents its physical force. Man does not work, he labors. When speaking of rights, you would not say the right of work; a horse may work, but it cannot labor. If an elaborate definition be necessary, and it is desirable to have the word "physical" retained in it, then the Committee should insert "men engaged in the physical exercise for the sake of gain or reward of cutting, hauling, driving etc., of logs." I cannot accept the amendments made by the Select Committee to the Bill.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I cannot quite follow the hon. gentleman as to his argument upon the 1st section. Can he suggest any other word, for to have a clear definition is most essential.

HON. MR. McGRATH—It might be as well if Hon. Mr. Harvey, the convener of the Select Committee, would give us an explanation as to why they have changed the Bill, so that we may have a clear understanding as to where we are.

HON. MR. HARVEY—The reason why the first clause was inserted, was because there was no definition of the word "employer" and the definition of the word "logger" was altogether too vague in the opinion of the Select Committee. The reason why the word "physical" was introduced was to differentiate the actual work of cutting logs from work incidental to the working of pulp and paper, for instance the clerical staff. Personally I will not make much point of this but as the original Act defined loggers, it appears to us that it might conceivably be held to apply to clerks, people in lumber companies offices and others not engaged in the actual work of cutting logs, so that the Committee thought that this amendment should be clearly confin-

ed to the physical work necessitated by the handling of logs. In going through the Act I shall suggest another slight alteration to the Committee because it is doubtful whether the section as it stands covers the work of cutting pit props. The Select Committee interviewed Messrs. Harris and Horwood and also considered the protest put in by the two companies, the Anglo Nfld. Development Co. and the Albert Reed Co., and the principal alterations—except minor ones which do not affect the Bill but do away with ambiguities and unnecessarily harsh obligations which are now put in a less harsh way—the main alterations are the intended elimination of the so called logger's agent. The Government has got to appoint an Inspector whose duty it is to visit the camps etc., and see that the Act is carried out. Every man in the camp has free access to him, and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and, why we should put on an outside representative of the loggers, who is only "the fifth wheel to a coach," and a personage who may make a great deal of unfair trouble to these companies, we could not see, or any good from his presence or the least necessity for it, and the main alteration of the bill is as regards to the so-called agent of the loggers. In any case there would be great difficulty in getting an agent of the loggers. The Bill does not provide for his selection. It would be impossible to get an agent properly selected by the men to begin with and these companies nearly all replace their men three times in a season. Mr. Harris has shown us that. Now how can you get a representative of the loggers themselves under those circumstances? The Government appointee himself is really the representative of the loggers, so af-

ter discussion the Committee were of opinion that a second inspector was superfluous and in fact no reason for appointing him has appeared. There are some minor alterations, I may say, and particularly to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, that there has been no intention to change the principle of the Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS—With regard to the explanation of the Hon. gentleman I think with all due deference to the Committee they should not have confined their investigations to one side only. They have heard the owner of the mill, or the employer of the men, but have not heard the representative of the loggers in order that he might lay before them certain grievances which they think should be remedied. While I have no doubt that there was no desire on their part to do anything unfair, still I contend that in order to give their proceedings that show of fairness so essential in matters of this kind, they should have heard the representative of the loggers in order that they might learn from him why a representative of the men should be appointed; and I have no doubt that if they had heard the reasons given for independent representation their demands would have been conceded on that point. The reason alleged for the omission of the logger's representative is that the men have access to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. My experience is that workmen will put up with wrongs and injustice for fear of losing their employment. I have known this to happen from actual knowledge of the men who give of their toil and sweat in the work of cutting logs, and have no person of their choice that they can make a confidant of. Rather than complain to the employer they will endure it, and it is for this reason that the loggers ask that they be given the right

to nominate a representative. Independent representation of that character has been productive of good results in other parts of the world. In the United States and in England where persons have taken it upon themselves to go into shops, mines and factories to see the actual conditions that exist, the result of that inspection has been to have laws placed on the Statute Book remedying abuses and causing necessary reforms in connection with factory and other industrial life. There should be no reason why loggers should not have a representative of their own going about amongst them for a similar purpose. The hon. member refers to the fact that there is no organization or union of the loggers and advances that as an argument against the power being given of appointing a delegate or representative. It is strange how inconsistent a person can be at times. When we were discussing the Labrador Fishery Bill I argued strongly against the Labrador Fish Exporters being given the right to nominate a member of the Board upon the ground that they were not an organized body and were unknown to the law, but my contention proved of no avail. At the present juncture it suits the exigencies of the occasion to perform mental gymnastics. But in this case there is a society. They are represented by the Fishermen's Protective Union, and a large number of them are members of that organization. For this reason I would urge that the loggers be given the right to nominate one of their number.

HON. MR. HARVEY—The hon. gentleman rather scores the committee because they only examined the representatives of the Companies. These gentlemen requested to be examined. Now we could get at the loggers I do not know. But I would point out that the censure administered in this

House is equally applicable to the Committee that sat in the other House. That Committee examined the same witnesses we examined and practically no others. As regards the F.P.U. I do not know why we should assume that they represent these particular loggers because they say so. I do not know where they will be bye and bye. There may be several Unions. I do not know to-day whether twenty or fifty or seventy-five per cent. of the loggers are members of the Fishermen's Protective Union. But whether they are or are not I do not think the appointment of an Inspector over the head of the Government Inspector or side by side with him is necessary, and it is certain to make trouble.

HON. MR. GIBBS—With regard to the remark of the hon. gentleman that the Committee pursued the same course as the Lower House, I quite agree it did, but the hon. member forgets the fact that the select committee of the Lower House was composed of men who represented the loggers because he must know the action of the Lower House from which this bill emanated. Consequently as the representatives of the loggers they knew what was wanted. This bill, I take it, is a bill to protect the logger and if you give the employer the right under the bill to put himself outside the provisions of it by taking advantage of the lack of knowledge on the part of an outport man the good intentions of the framers will be frustrated. I do not think we should be a party to anything like that. The members of the Committee, I feel assured, never had any such intention in view; and I say this with all sincerity, but with all due deference to them, the effect of the amendment is to place an employer of labor with hundreds, possibly thousands under him, in a position to take advantage of the workingman by con-

tracting himself out of the provisions of the bill. Now I think that would be a most unjustifiable amendment to make to that section and I want here to record my sincere protest against such being done.

HON. MR. HARVEY—The reason this clause is put in is, that where a company makes a special agreement for a special man and possibly trains him on the strength of his agreement for special work, that he should not be able to break his agreement because of this Act. But as far as I am concerned I do not press it. It is not perhaps very vital.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to point out to the Committee that it would be most unfair to give the employer of labor the right to issue their own paper in payment of their employees' wages. Let us work this out to its logical conclusion. Suppose that one hundred loggers make application for payment of wages that they are owed by their employers, and are given orders upon John Smith, or some other person payable to bearer or order; the orders may possibly represent thousands of dollars. The men who receive them, upon arrival at their homes must of necessity make use of them. They go to the store of Mr. A. or Mr. B. to make purchases of food or clothing and there present their orders for payment. The owner of the store will not, unless he be paid a commission, in addition to the profit on the goods sold, take the orders in payment and give cash for whatever balance there may be remaining. Thus we see, that the transaction in this case means a loss to the holder of the order. The persons taking the orders must use them in the purchase of stock to replace that which was sold. The orders, therefore, become a sort of circulating medium in the way of trade,

as if they were cash. There is no absolute guarantee behind them that they will be honoured upon presentation like a bank note. The person issuing the orders may be unable to pay one hundred cents in the dollar upon the demand, but nevertheless, without provision being made for security against the issue of the orders, we are asked by the Select Committee to give a right under the law to any person or company employing loggers, to pay the wages that may be due them by orders which may be worthless and which in any event will mean loss to the logger. A more vicious principle to insert in a Bill I can not conceive. Why should the man engaged in the manufacture of pulp or lumber be given a right, while others engaged in another form of industrial work are denied it. The history of issuing orders in payment of wages has resulted in loss to the workman. An instance of this kind occurred in the Pilley's Island Company. That company paid a number of their workmen wages with orders and what happened? Before the paper could be redeemed the Company went into liquidation and the men were not paid. We do not want a repetition of that; if we do, pass this Bill in its present form. Then the right to pay by cheque on a Bank is also provided for. This I object to. It may appear alright to hon. members who are not conversant with outport trade and business with regard to the issue of cheques. But if they would place themselves in the position of the logger who has a cheque for one hundred dollars, and who upon arrival home goes to the store of John Jones to buy goods, of to cash the cheque, what happens? Mr. Jones very often will charge a premium for giving cash for the cheque, or if the logger purchase goods, he wants to receive one

half the amount in cash and he will, in many instances pay more for his goods than if he had the cash in his possession at the time he went to the store of Mr. Jones. There has been a law upon the Statute Book for the past sixteen or seventeen years, I think it was passed in 1898, under which persons issuing paper of the kind which this bill purposes giving, a right to issue, were liable to a fine of four hundred dollars. There must have been some necessity for legislation of this kind otherwise the Government at that time would not have passed this law. This House should not thus impliedly repeal this law and give power to individuals or companies to pay the wages of workmen in orders drawn upon a third person. There is no justification for the passing of this section. To do so would mean serious dislocation of trade and business, because we may have tens of thousands of dollars of worthless paper in the hands of workmen and business men.

HON. MR. BISHOP—There seems to be a disposition to regard this bill as operating only against three large companies. This bill is general and applies to all companies engaged in the lumbering industry. It would be easy for the big companies to provide the means, but by no means so easy for the majority. How those are going to pay cash I don't know. On the contrary I know the cash will not be to their aid. The workmen will have neither the negotiable order nor the cash. If we are legislating for the benefit of the loggers it must be borne in mind that all these men are not engaged by the three large companies.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Would that be met by issuing cheques on bankers? On principle I dislike the idea. While nobody wants to hamper the

men engaged in the logging industry, yet I certainly don't think we ought to open the door to anything that will make it difficult for a logger to get the worth of his labor.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The majority of them will have taken up supplies and will not have a large amount coming to them when the spring arrives. I think it would be well to cut out "negotiable paper."

HON. MR. HARVEY—May I explain the meaning of this section? First of all I recognize the weight of Mr. Gibbs' criticism. The reason why this was done was that employers are liable at a moment's notice to pay enormous claims. A man comes in and demands cash. Now these companies don't keep the cash there. Not that they would want to pay anything but cash, but the idea is to give the companies reasonable chances to get cash. In winter it is possible that the railway may get blocked up and there would be no means of getting cash in. I don't know of any case where one order in the logging industry was ever dishonored. That of course is no argument for justifying them and I perfectly agree that the words "negotiable orders" ought to come out of that section. It is a question whether it is better to omit the word cheque or give more time to the employer to get cash. But to make it binding that they shall get cash at a moment's notice would be a great hardship. I think I may say that the Committee will be glad to do anything in regard to that matter the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill may wish, it is going to be very awkward. The representatives of the companies say it will be next to impossible.

HON. MR. GIBBS—If the companies are prevented from obtaining cash because of storms there could be no successful prosecution against

the company, that is the act of God. No action could lie for a failure to pay cash due to the act of God.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Supposing 100 men conspired to come to the company and demand their money?

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that the statement that the court should allow time is erroneous. It is surely taken for granted in the original bill that the money shall be on hand.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I think that we should hesitate before we demand that employers shall be bound to have cash at their places of business. We have never heard of any dishonoured cheques. I do remember that some companies' cheques were held up, but not so far as the workmen were concerned. The logger received his remuneration promptly. I have no knowledge of any person suffering by taking a cheque from any employer during the past 30 years. In fact they take them in preference to cash. Cheques are accepted all through the trade all through the country.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Except for this fact, if a fisherman has a cheque for £70 in an outport he can't get it cashed unless he pays a premium, and if he pays for goods with a cheque he will pay more than if he had the cash. That is the position. Circumstances and conditions so operate that the men with cash can make a better bargain and get more value than if he had the cheque to present.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN—If we cut out cheques from that section it will have a poor effect upon the business of the whole country.

HON. MR. JOB—I think we all recognize that there is a good difference between a cheque and an order. I think if the words "or cheque" were inserted it would meet the difficulty.

A man is liable to a heavy fine if he signs a cheque without funds. But he can issue orders without having the money behind him. I think as a compromise if we insert the words "or cheque" it would meet the difficulty.

The amendment was carried.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to point out that this amendment to section 4 will mean that if the logger gives a week's notice of his intention to terminate his work and his employment ceases, say Saturday, he must wait till the Wednesday following to get his wages. We should not ask him to do this, and I think before adopting this section, the Committee should give some consideration to it because we have already adopted a section by which 24 hours is given, and then we make the delivery of his time to be on Tuesday instead of Saturday, as in the original bill, and that means that a man terminating his employment on Saturday must wait till the following Wednesday to get paid. No employer here in St. John's will ask a man to wait three hours, much less three days, before making payment. This will be the effect of the amendment.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It does not seem to me that that is a correct interpretation. Section 4 of the original bill only calls upon the employer to provide a statement every second Saturday, and in the event of a man leaving, he would not be affected by this at all. It has no effect as far as interfering with a man when he is getting paid off.

HON. MR. McGRATH—A man may leave any day he likes if he gives a week's notice.

On motion the amendment was put to the Committee and carried.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I cannot agree with the substance of the amendment to the camp construction section.

The amendment says: "Provided that this shall not be obligatory in extreme sections or in connection with temporary camps." If a company engaged in logging business can get supplies, be they great or small, into the extreme sections of the country, surely they can get lumber to provide suitable and proper camps for the men as well. The logging industry is not temporary, it is a permanent enterprise that is here to stay. No person should be allowed by law to have camps in which men live that are not of a comfortable character, and such as the bill contemplates. Is it because a man works at Red Indian Lake or mills on the Gander, away from the base of supplies, that he must labour under conditions which his more fortunate fellow in the city would not tolerate. What right have we to say to them "because you work 25 or 30 miles from the base of supplies of the Company you must put up with conditions which you would not tolerate under ordinary circumstances. You must sleep in camps which are not as they should be." Surely it is not the intention of hon. members that workmen should be obliged, because they go a long distance from the base of supplies, to live under conditions dangerous to their health. Why permit any man to employ labor, and not give the person employed the opportunity of living in decency and comfort? I propose to oppose strongly any such attitude being given to employers of loggers, in this respect.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I am sorry that this is a section upon which my hon. friend (Mr. Gibbs) and I can not agree. Even he must admit that there will often be cases when a company is preparing to open up a new and distinct section, for instance, when logging roads have to be put in

or when exploration of prospective ground is going on, or when camps are shifted daily with the movement of a drive, when it is impossible and unnecessary to put up an elaborate camp such as this bill calls for, and some latitude should be allowed. Temporary camps are no hardships necessarily. Living under canvas, even in the depth of winter, can be made both healthful and delightful, as many of those in this House know from personal experience. Under the Act it becomes illegal to put a man in a tent for one night. I ask anyone whether in these larger lumbering operations such regulation can be carried out literally, or whether it is common sense. This sort of hard and fast undeviating regulation involves nothing more or less than manufacturing new crimes which do not exist in actual fact. We know that the Logging Companies are anxious to make the men as comfortable as they can because if for no other reason it pays them to do so, and without any law on the statute book they have been doing it, and it is reasonable to give them some credit for good intentions, and necessary to give them some small latitude. It is morally and physically impossible to carry out the letter of this section invariably in extreme sections.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I must again point out that this bill does not relate only to big companies, which are well able to take care of themselves, although in such cases referred to by Hon. Mr. Harvey it will be very inconvenient and unnecessarily severe, though I fancy that they will be able to meet it. But what about the poor unfortunate man who cannot afford to provide such camps, that is what I am thinking about. Moreover, these people are not always employers of loggers, maybe a man and his sons

are working in the woods, and you compel him to provide for himself camps that he may consider unnecessary. He is being ruined. This is the serious part of the Bill. It is unnecessarily hard upon companies employing large numbers of men but far harder on smaller men.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I do not agree with the hon. member. I have not had the experience that some hon. members have had in the logging industry, but I think I may be safe in saying that the class of men the hon. gentleman refers to are never engaged in logging at the distance, that this section contemplates from their base of supplies. When they engage in an industry of the kind they do so near settlements and not in the interior of the country, for the reason that nearly all the timber not in the vicinity of settlements is owned by private individuals. This proviso is one by which operators on an extensive scale, will be enabled to evade the obligation imposed upon them by this bill to find suitable accommodation for loggers.

On motion the amendment was put to the vote of the Committee and carried.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to point out to the Committee that the amendment, as proposed by the Select Committee, makes serious alterations in the original bill. In this bill the camps are to be covered with board and then sheathed with felt or other winter proof material. It is not obligatory on the part of the employer to cover the camp or roof with board, but he may substitute other things for it. He may substitute logs instead of board for the floors of the camps. As this industry is a permanent one, and will be in existence here for a great number of years to come, why should not employers roof their

camps with boards and afterwards cover them with some other material for the purpose of making them water tight. Why permit the employer to put up a camp and cover with birch rind or paper to keep out the weather and moisture? Why not let the men living in camps have the benefit of a board roof or at least a board floor. I think it will commend itself to the Committee that a board floor in camps where men live for months, is absolutely necessary to the cleanliness of the place, because if you give a right to substitute logs for board floors, all the dirt of the camp will fill up the interstices between the logs. It is absolutely necessary that a person in charge of camps should be able to clean them thoroughly daily. They can't do it if rough hewn logs are used for the floor instead, and I submit that the section in the original bill will much better suit the requirements of the loggers than the amendment.

HON. MR. BISHOP—In respect of the amendment, I can assure the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill that beyond all question experience proves that the best camp that can be constructed for the convenience and comfort of employees is the camp that is now described in the amended bill. Board covered camps have not been found to be the most suitable or comfortable. The substitution of flattened logs is better than one inch board flooring. I state that positively and experience will prove it if this is adopted, and the consensus of opinion of loggers will be that they have the best and most comfortable camp to reside in for the winter. The alteration is made not for the purpose of cheapening the building of camps but to improve them.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In view of the assurance of the hon. gentleman on

this point I accept this, then.

HON. MR. HARVEY—With regard to this section eleven I may say that at present with the Horwood Lumber Company men have for years been paying 40 cents per month for a doctor. The men have been satisfied to pay that. This arbitrary demand for an hospital would never have been put in this bill if they were not voluntarily supplied by the two companies now operating here. I protest against this being made obligatory on all companies.

The amendment on being put was carried.

The Committee on the Logging Bill rose and reported the bill with some amendment, which report was received and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs it was ordered the bill be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the house went into committee of the whole on the Patriotic Fund Incorporation Bill.

Hon. Mr. Winter in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported the bill without amendment, which report was received and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon. President announced that he had received messages from the House of Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bills, entitled respectively, An Act confirming an agreement between the Government of the Colony and the Nfld. American Packing Company; An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances; and an Act respecting the Bank Fishery, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council. Also a message that the House of Assembly had passed the amendment sent down in and upon the bill respecting the Establishment of a Marine Disasters Fund without

amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the above bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, at four o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 26th

The House met at 4 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Municipal Bill and Logging Bill were read a third time, passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with amendments.

Third reading of the Patriotic Fund Incorporation Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg leave to ask that this House be recommitted as two names had been omitted from it and we want to have them inserted. On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was recommitted to a committee of the whole House.

Hon. Mr. Winter in the Chair.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to move that section 2 be amended by the names of Capt. A. Timewell and Capt. A. Montgomerie, being inserted after the name of Eric Bowring, Esq.

The motion on being put to the Committee was carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the bill with an amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message intimating that this House had passed the bill with an amendment.

BANK FISHERY BILL.

Second reading of the Bank Fishery Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill has not yet been printed to put into the hands of Hon. members. It is how-

ever a very simple measure. It provides that no vessel can get a clearance unless the Customs Officer shall be satisfied by the master of the vessel or otherwise that she has on board (a) three life buoys, (b) sufficient life belts for every person employed on board; (c) a compass for every dory carried, and (d) an approved patent fog alarm. The bill further provides that owners of vessels engaged in the Bank Fishery who permit vessels to go on the voyage without such appliances shall be liable to a penalty of \$100 or in default a month's imprisonment. I beg leave to move the second reading of the bill.

The bill was accordingly read a second time and will be submitted to a committee of the whole House on tomorrow.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Second reading of the Retiring Allowances Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This bill refers to retiring allowances for the following persons:

To Kate Roman, late attendant, Departmental Building, \$83.

To John Barnes, late Warden Lunatic Asylum, \$350.

To James Denief, late Warden, Lunatic Asylum, \$400.

To Patrick Houlihan, late Light Keeper, \$400.

To Thomas Ryan, late farmer, \$500.

To Timothy O'Brien, late farmer, \$400.

To George A. Moulton, late P. O. Keeper, \$500.

To George R. Lilly, late Magistrate, \$700.

To Elliot, late Light Keeper, \$200.

To P. Christopher, late S.S. Fiona \$520.

To J. H. Preston, late Light Keeper, Change Islands, \$232.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

PACKING COMPANY BILL

Second reading of the Newfoundland-American Packing Co. Confirmation Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill relates to an agreement entered into between the government and the Newfoundland-American Packing Co. incorporated and the purport of it is that the company proposes to erect Cold Storage plants, factories and other buildings in different parts of the country. We have had before us on different occasions similar bills and agreements, which unfortunately for the Colony have never become effective. From one cause and another the companies securing franchises of various kinds failed to procure the necessary capital to establish the intended industries. I most sincerely hope that we are now dealing with a corporation that will be able to secure the necessary capital and establish what we all desire to see, that is particularly, some means of Cold Storage which will enable a considerable part of the product of the fisheries to be exported in a fresh condition, as well as providing bait for the fishermen of the country. It is an important measure and I hope hon. members will read it carefully before the Bill is submitted to the committee stage. I beg, therefore to move its second reading.

HON. MR. HARVEY—As regards the verbiage in the Bill I would like to draw the attention of the hon. introducer to section 3 which does not appear to be clear. This section of the schedule calls for the payment of a guarantee. There is no doubt that the intention is to pay a guarantee only on the amount of the investment

in case of such plants only as are being regularly operated and this should be clearly put and if as I think the section is not clear on this point it should be amended to make it so. If the company put up four or five plants the Government should not be obliged to pay interest on any except on such of them as are operated. I am not clear that the wording of the contract defines with sufficient clearness, whether if one plant should be operated and the rest be locked up the company are not allowed to claim for 5 per cent on the whole and I think it will be of assistance that they should be in good condition and will make the Bill more workable.

I do not say that it is so, but it is not clear that it is not so. How this concern will continue operating continuously, i.e. for 12 months in the year when the season is limited here to say six months—how the plants are to maintain continuous operations when the fishing season is over I fail to see, and the chances therefore of a demand being made under the strict letter of this contract are small. But the main point is that the Government should not be called upon to pay its guarantee except on the plants regularly operated; otherwise I am prepared to support the bill.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was read a second time and will be sent to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. the President informed the House that he had received from the House of Assembly a message that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively, "A Bill to Incorporate the Grand Bank Water Co., and a Bill for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited in which they ask the concurrence of the Council; also that they have passed the amendments sent

down by the Legislative Council to the General Hospital Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Messrs. Robinson and Squires respectively the Grand Bank Water Co.'s and N.S. Products Corporation Bill were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—I give notice that on to-morrow I will ask leave to present a petition from the American-Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Company, who claim to own property and rights in this Colony which will be injuriously affected by the passage of the Bill to confirm an agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited, praying that this Honourable Council bear said American-Newfoundland Pulp and Lumber Co. at the Bar before proceeding to the consideration of said Bill.

Also I beg leave to table a petition signed by the various merchants and other interested in the Newfoundland Seal Fishery, praying that the Act relating to the seal fishery now before the House be amended, as in the opinion of petitioners it is calculated to injure the industry.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I beg leave to lay upon the table the Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending June 30th, 1914; also to lay on the table the Report of the Reid-N.S. Co. for the year 1913-14.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till to-morrow at 4 of the clock.

THURSDAY, May 27.

The House met at 4 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

BANK FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bank Fishery Bill, Hon.

Mr. Anderson taking the Chair of the Committee.

HON. MR. SQUIRES.—This bill is the result of correspondence received from residents of Grand Bank and neighbouring places by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself. Mr. Thénault, who is himself a practical fisherman, took up the matter of the safety of those engaged in the Bank fishery with the same energy as he does all matters appertaining to the fishing industries, and not only has this Bill resulted, but I understand he is looking into certain matters in connection with the desirability or otherwise of putting into effect in Newfoundland certain rules and regulations under the Merchant Shipping Act.

This measure has my support. It will also be a pleasure to assist the Minister in the carrying out of his ideas as to the application of English Board of Trade Regulations to local fishing vessels undertaking foreign voyages.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I want to move an amendment to the first section to make it read on and after Jan. 1st, 1915. As the Bill comes to us, there is no date when it comes into effect. I want to make it the 1st Jan., 1915.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—Why?

HON. MR. BISHOP.—Because the fishery is in progress now, and the vessels will not be home before the end of the fishery, and it would not be fair to make them come into port, and as it stands the customs officers will have no option but to enforce the Act.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—Might I suggest that in Section 1 we might insert after the word 'sains,' referring to life-belts, compasses, foghorns, etc., the words "in good condition." They may have all these things on board ship, but if they are not in good condition, of what value are they?

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I think that amendment is scarcely necessary.

When the law demands that these articles shall be on board, it implies that they shall be in good condition. This Bill is really to compel owners to carry fog alarms. Compasses are usually carried now, and are the property of the Bank fishermen themselves. No crew will go to sea without the patent fog alarm being in good condition.

HON. PRESIDENT.—Will it be necessary to amend the second Section in view of the amendment to the first Section?

HON. MR. BISHOP.—That can relate to the time when the Bill is to come into effect. In view of the question raised by the Hon. President, it seems to me that the better course would be to pass the Bill as it comes to us, and add a third section, that this bill will not come into effect till after Jan. 1st, 1916.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD.—I rather favor the addition of the few words that Mr. McGrath has mentioned. I take it that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when bringing this Bill into the Lower House did it with the best intentions and considered that by Sections A, B, C and D he was covering everything. From past experiences he has found that these articles have not been kept on board, and I think it would be well to stipulate that they shall be kept in good condition.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I think we might insert the words "in good condition" if it is the wish of the House.

The amendment was put and carried, and the Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendments, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that it be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Retiring Allowances Bill, Hon. Mr. Templeman taking the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and on

motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Nfld. American Packing Co. Incorporation Bill.

PACKING COMPANY BILL.

HON. MR. KNOWLING.—With regard to Section 4 there are companies manufacturing jams at present in this Colony. Do they get the same privileges as this Company gets?

HON. MR. BISHOP.—As far as I am aware they do not.

HON. MR. KNOWLING.—Then I don't think we ought to grant these people concessions which would mitigate against the factories already working.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—The Hon. gentleman rather meant to say that he thinks other persons should also be accorded similar privileges? It does not seem to me that this privilege should be refused because others have not received it. It is an agreement made with this particular Company.

HON. MR. HARRIS.—I have an idea that there is some such concession in the revenue bill with regard to local jams exported.

HON. MR. (J.D.) RYAN.—I may say that I am interested in such a manufacturing industry here, and I have never heard from the manager that they have any such concessions.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—This only applies to export.

HON. MR. RYAN.—I think it is a peculiar thing. If the exporter gets that concession why can't the consumer get it as well? It looks to me to be rather odd if we give concessions to this Company and don't apply the same to ourselves. We ought to look after ourselves first, and outsiders next.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I am rather surprised that the hon. gentleman advances that argument. He is old enough a parliamentarian to know better. The concession is given to enable

these men to employ our people and to use our fruits that have hitherto gone to waste, and as a concession we say that we will return the duties they pay on sugar and other preservatives used in the goods which they may export. That policy is not new. It has been given by other governments in order to create new articles of export.

HON. J. D. RYAN.—This section 5 is very important and requires serious consideration, and we may get a Company who will perform what they propose carrying out. I have heard it said that it is a very rich Company formed only about a year ago, and this being so I think that if a section like this were in the Bill, in the event of its not being a paying concern, that is if the Company were fairly started under good management and went on prosperously for a few years—the original promoters may sell out, you may get a manager for this company who will be entirely unable to carry out the business, and still the Government must pay 5 per cent. for whatever shortage may occur in their earnings. This is a serious matter and unfair to the ratepayers of the country to bind them, if the Company was not successfully operated to pay 5 per cent. or a portion of it to the investors or proprietors of that company. I ask consideration of the matter before adopting Section 5.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—In answer to Hon. Mr. Ryan and for the satisfaction of the House, I would call attention to the fact that this guarantee applies only to the cold storage of such fresh fish as may be handled by the Company, but not to its operations as applied to glue factories, fruit factories and such other branches of the industry. We are all aware that it has been the desire in this Colony for a long time to have the exportation of fresh fish enterprised, but from one cause or another nothing has been ac-

complished, and it is with a desire to give the exportation of our fresh fish a fair trial that the Government decided to encourage this enterprise to the extent of giving 5 per cent. guarantee for 15 years. It does not promise, as will be seen later, that they will be guaranteed £25,000 per year until they have done what they undertook to do in operation. They say they will erect cold storage plants one each year for three years, and not until the first plant is in operation for 12 months continuously will the Government be liable for the payment of any sum to supplement their earnings if they do not earn 5 per cent. and then consequently the second year they must establish another plant, and after that is in operation twelve months the same guarantee applies. They have also the option instead of erecting three land plants to substitute one boating factory. This agreement has been under consideration for a long time and has been carefully deliberated upon, and I think the Colony's interests have been fully safeguarded. I hope that we shall see at least the first of these plants erected before the end of the present year, and an attempt made for the handling and exportation of our fresh fish in cold storage.

HON. MR. SQUIRES—May I be permitted in a few brief words to explain Section 5 of the Bill? If, for example, the Company invests £100,000 in the "fresh fish and cold storage business" and makes no dividend at all thereon, the Colony is liable for 5 per cent., namely £5,000. If it makes two per cent., the Colony is liable for 3 per cent., namely, £3,000. If it makes 5 per cent., the Colony is under no liability.

This Section is in accord with the policy of the several general cold storage acts and the many cold storage contracts confirmed by this Legislature. Section 1 of the 1910 Cold Stor-

age Act provides as follows:—

"It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to guarantee on behalf of the Colony for one or more years, not exceeding fifteen years, the annual payment to any person, firm or company engaged in the business of cold storage and other business connected with the fisheries and bait supply of the Colony of a sum by which the net annual profits of such person, firm or company may be less than 5 per cent. on the capital invested by any such person or paid up in any such company"

In this case the guarantee applies to capital invested "in the fresh fish and cold storage business." These words are of a more limited scope than the words of the Act. Thus the House is not being asked to sanction a contract in connection with which a guarantee is being given for purposes wider than the purposes named in the cold storage act, but as a matter of fact for purposes more limited than the wording of the Act allows.

It is true that the Company proposes to engage in the canning of lobsters, the making and packing of fish, the dehydration of fish by the special process in which they are interested, but of all their enterprises it is only on the actual cash capital invested in the "fresh fish and cold storage business" that the guarantee applies.

I earnestly hope that this enterprise will find the capital necessary for their proposed undertakings. I am satisfied that if they can be induced to bring large capital into Newfoundland to invest in this enterprise, it will be profitable both to the Colony and the Company.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I would like to know if the effect of the section is the same as the section in previous acts? If the language is the same I fail to see why we should apprehend any greater danger than in the past.

Every time that a cold storage act was brought up in the Lower House this point was inevitably brought up and debated at length—the effect of the guarantee. What I wanted to be clear about was whether the general tenor of the guarantee was increased in this Bill. Does section 6 mean that it is not lawful for the Company to export any bait fishes? Are herring prohibited from this Company, and all bait fishes? Herring may be construed as a bait fish. I want to be clear as to whether this will not prohibit this Company from exporting herring, caplin or squid. We exported squid to Japan for food purposes a few years ago. It may be a mistake in my reading of the Section, but it appears to me to prohibit the exportation of any bait fishes.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—It will be noticed that Section 13 of the schedule is identical with section 6 of the agreement; and it appears to me to be perfectly clear if you read it. It reads:

"Nothing whatever in this agreement shall be taken to permit, nor shall it be lawful for, at any time during the continuance of this Agreement or afterwards, the Company to export any baitfish or any fishes to be used for the purposes of bait into any place whatsoever beyond the jurisdiction of this Colony." This is clearly and distinctly understood between the Government and the signatories to the agreement, and there is no doubt upon their minds, any more than on the part of the Government. The matter has been fully discussed, and they understand that they cannot export bait fishes. They export for food purposes only, and they would not get clearances for shipments under any other condition.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be

read a third time on to-morrow.

GRAND BANK WATER CO. BILL.

Second reading of the Grand Bank Water Company Bill.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—There is probably no town in Newfoundland that is further advanced than the town of Grand Bank, and it is a privilege either in this Legislature or elsewhere to be able in any way to further the interests of that thriving centre. The people of Grand Bank have learned the spirit of citizenship. Again and again there has been striking illustration of that spirit. They have taxed themselves, they have rendered voluntary service, been mutually helpful, and always self-reliant. Then there is a spirit prevalent there of perfect unity between merchant and fisherman, between the supplier and the supplied. Without eulogizing the town unnecessarily, I may sum up by saying that the town of Grand Bank might well serve as a model for many a city or town in the island. The Bill I am introducing to-day is lengthy, but it is not novel. There is no necessity to say a great deal about it, because already the House has had before it similar bills in past years. The object is the establishment of a water system for Grand Bank on sound business principles,—an object which I am sure all would like to see attained in other towns. There is no country in the world where there is better water, where there is more water, and where the water is in so many cases so easily to be availed of. Placentia, Harbor Grace, Heart's Content, Carbonear, all have their own supply. In Grand Bank they are asking permission to do what other towns have done. The Bill generally is the same as previous Water Co. Bills, with the exceptions to which I shall now refer. Section 2 provides that the capital stock shall be \$30,000 with

power to raise it to \$40,000. The capital stock of the Placentia Company is \$16,000, Carbonear \$40,000, Harbor Grace \$70,400. The next section in which there is any change is number 13, and this is a change which I am sure will be welcomed. Section 13 provides for examination of the Company's affairs by the Auditor General. This is an entirely new section and does not appear in any of the other Acts. The next section to which I would draw attention is 22. Grand Bank owned vessels under this section are to pay ten cents per ton and other vessels entering that port five cents per ton. In the Placentia Act the taxes are five and three and one half cents respectively. That Act exempts fishing and coasting vessels, but the Harbor Grace and Carbonear Acts include these, and now Grand Bank asks the same privilege. In other words, the people of that settlement who, as this House knows, are an exceedingly independent class of people, are at one with the vessel owners. Sections 41, 42 and 43 do not appear in the Placentia Act; they are copied from the Carbonear Act, and provide for arbitration, and also for such action as may be necessary in connection with the laying of pipes. I do not know of any necessity for further trespassing on the time of the House. If we pass this Act we will be simply doing for Grand Bank what we have done for other towns. I accordingly move the second reading.

HON. MR. SQUIRES.—I second the motion made by the hon. gentleman. I feel that the prosperity, enthusiasm, business sense and energy of Grand Bank and immediate neighbourhood, is due in no small sense to the business ability and industry of the people who occupy that section of the coast of Newfoundland. Our island,

our commerce, our city of St. John's itself is due in no small measure to Grand Bank, which made revenue for this country. I am not acquainted with Grand Bank but I do know that the Hon. Mr. Robinson himself has done much for Grand Bank and vicinity. At Grand Bank they labor under very great difficulties in connection with the water supply. This means a very considerable expenditure, much greater than Carbonear or Placentia, but they thought it better to bring in a bill providing for a subsequent slight increase than to bring in an inadequate measure, and then have to come to the Legislature to make a further increase. I do think that with the energy and business ability which the Grand Bank people will put behind this venture for themselves and for their own industry, they will have a service there which will do credit to the town and to the whole island.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I have much pleasure in adding a word to the eulogies of Grand Bank, as having been connected with the business of Grand Bank for a long time, I feel that everything that has been said is justified. At the time when every other place has given up the bank fishery the people of Grand Bank without much assistance, though located in a small port, inaccessible and open, continued to prosecute that fishery successfully simply by the personal ability of the people there. They are undoubtedly an example to every other place in Newfoundland. They built up their business with the finest possible schooners, the finest going out to-day, and their energy and initiative in taxing themselves to dredge that port a few years ago without any assistance to make possible for schooners to enter there is a thing I have always re-

garded with admiration. I wish that every fishing town in the country was as energetic and self helping as Grand Bank, and I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would like to say in addition to what has already been said that it does one good to realize the people of Grand Bank have sufficient faith in the future of the country that now, despite the depression which the war has caused and the uncertainty as to how long it will continue and the effects it will have on the future of individuals and communities they should now be found to come before the Legislature with such a splendid evidence of enterprise and public spirit as to seek legislation for a water company.

The Bill was then read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Robinson ordered to be sent to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the second reading of the Nfld. Products Corporation Ltd. Confirmation Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Anderson the motion to present a petition from the American Nfld. Pulp and Lumber Company was withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Job asked leave to present the report of the Select Committee on the Sealing Bill, which was read.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Anderson petition presented by him yesterday with regard to this Bill was read.

Hon. Mr. Bishop moved this Bill be submitted to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. President announced that he had received messages from the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendments sent down in and upon the Patriotic Fund Incorporation Bill, and the Act respecting Mun-

icipal Affairs without amendment. Also, that they had passed the accompanying bills entitled respectively, an Act to continue in force for a further period Act 5 Geo., Session 2, Cap. 4, entitled an Act respecting a Volunteer Force for the Colony; and an Act respecting the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating Liquors, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council. Also, that the House of Assembly had appointed a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Coaker, Kent, Lloyd, Hon. Mr. Emerson, Higgins, Moulton and Clapp, and requested the Council to appoint a committee from their number to confer with regard to the amendments of the Council in and upon the Bill entitled: "An Act to regulate the employment of men engaged in logging."

Hon. Mr. Harvey moved the appointment of a Select Committee as requested.

Hon. President appointed the following to constitute the committee: Messrs. J. D. Ryan, J. Anderson, J. Harvey, M. G. Winter, W. C. Joh, P. T. McGrath, and J. J. Murphy.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Prohibition Bill and the Volunteer Force Bill were then read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned until tomorrow Friday at four o'clock.

FRIDAY, May 12th.

The House opened at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Third reading of Bank Fishery Bill, Retiring Allowance Bill and Newfoundland-American Packing Co.'s Bill.

On motion these Bills were read a third time, the latter two without, and the former with an amendment. On motion these Bills were passed, and

a message sent to the Assembly acquainting them with the fact.

GRAND BANK WATER CO. BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Robinson the House went into Committee on the bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—Can the hon. gentleman give us any idea of what distance the lakes are from Grand Bank, and also as to the pipe to be used, and one thing and another.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I can't say what the distance is, but it is not great. When I was there some years ago I made some enquiry, and so far as memory goes I believe it is about three or four miles, but I may be wrong. I think the estimate of all this has been made very carefully.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report having been received and adopted, it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

NEWFOUNDLAND PRODUCTS BILL.

Second reading of the Newfoundland Products Corporation Confirmation Bill was moved by the Hon. R. A. Squires, the report of whose speech has not been received.

HON. MR. MILLEY—Mr. President, I must congratulate Hon. Mr. Squires for the able and concise manner in which he has presented this matter to us today, he has made clear or quite a few points which up to now I have been unable to understand fully.

There is no doubt that when this House goes into committee on this measure there will be ample opportunity for the discussion of it in detail. I wish, however, before second reading passes to emphasize two points which appeal to me very forcibly when dealing with such import-

ant legislation as that now before us.

First, I have always been, and always will be strongly opposed to legislation for long periods of time. I consider it highly improper for us to sit here and grant rights to any person, or corporation, for such a long term of years. I consider that a term of fifty years is as far as we should go in a contract of this kind, it should of course, be made possible of renewal for a further period, by those who will be occupying our place at that time. As I look around this house today I do not think many of us will be here in fifty years time, why then should we tie the hands of all succeeding legislators in matters of such supreme importance? My second point is this. When large rights or concessions (such as we are now asked for) are granted, this country should receive a direct revenue yearly for it. I don't mean by this that we should demand a tax for the first year or two, but I do think that there should be provision made in this contract whereby it may be possible, at a given time, to ask from this enterprise a direct yearly tax of say twenty-five to seventy-five thousand dollars, said tax to be decided by the growth and success of the Company's activities. I know it will be said that we shall get an indirect revenue from the labour that will be given to our people. I admit that is true. At the same time I am firmly convinced that this Colony should be able to collect a direct yearly tax from this and all other Corporations that apply to, and receive from us concessions enabling them to organise and successfully conduct large business relations in this country. Bell Island pays large sums in labour, but it also pays directly into our revenue, taxes which are based upon the successful operation of their works. The legislation before us today calls into being "an indus-

try or industries" with possibilities infinitely greater than Bell Island, and yet we as a people get no direct tax or contribution from it.

In this country, Mr. President, the word "deal" has come to have a very offensive, or, to say the least, unpleasant meaning. Since it was first introduced into our legislative language it has increased our debt something over twenty millions of dollars, and I have been wondering if in this "deal" we could not incorporate something that would make the word have a meaning in this Newfoundland of ours altogether different to that which it now enjoys.

While speaking thus I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am in favor of all legislation that has for its object the opening up of our country by the establishment of large industries which will give labor to our people, but I do not think it right to rush too quickly to the acceptance of contracts which give concessions for a hundred years and which do not contribute directly to the revenue of this country.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN—I rise to say that I agree very much with the sentiment expressed by Hon. Mr. Milley. I think his ideas in regard to rushing such a contract as this are quite right. They have had this bill in the Lower House for five or six weeks, and from what we hear from the introducer in this House we must rush it through in two or three minutes. If the House of Assembly took five or six weeks, I do not think we could go through it to get any idea of it in a few hours or minutes. I also agree with Hon. Mr. Milley in saying we should not give this Company or any other the advantage of being free of taxation for all these years. Every other commercial enterprise in this country has to pay taxes; our forefathers had to pay

taxes, and every day we have to pay taxes, and the Government of the day is now taxing things which they said would not be taxed, and still they want to make this company free of taxes for a long number of years, and give them all these concessions for a long period of years. I think with Hon. Mr. Milley that fifty years is long enough for any such company. This is a big thing, and, as Hon. Mr. Milley says, the word "deal" in this country is becoming rather obnoxious (our debt has increased at a rapid rate, and now we are going to make a big plunge and give away another big slice to a lot of people who own a lot of the country today, and with that, give them everything free that they want, while at the same time people now in this country are taxed right up to the hilt, and a few days ago the fishermen were taxed and sur-taxed. The people who are supporting this bill are being taxed more and more, and yet in the face of all that the Government is satisfied to give this company all the material they wish to bring in free of taxation. Why should we do this while the people who are the mainstay of the country at the present time are having their taxes—increased? I think it is very inconsistent on the part of the Government to ask us to support a bill of that kind. I think we should have some time to consider this Bill, and not be expected to go through it in two or three days, when they spent five weeks on it in the Lower House. It will take a day to read it.

HON. J. D. RYAN.—While I am in favour of giving all concessions we possibly can for all new industries as I have been since I entered this chamber. I think there is, to a certain extent, a limit. I remember ten years ago there was an important bill before this legislature known as the Harnsworth Bill, and the Government of

the day were very anxious to have it go through, and thought the introduction of that company would give us a lot of employment. We are always anxious to have something that will provide employment and I think it is most important to support any measure for any company which brings any capital into the country; with that I am in entire accord. As stated here by the introducer, we have heard of this Bill in the public press, by letters and editorials, and we read that it was a Mr. Willson who was the introducer or was to bring in these twenty million dollars into this country in the development of certain resources. Who could be against such a proposal as that; if he or those behind him would bring in millions of dollars, who would, who had the interest of the country at heart, oppose such a proposal? Later on we find according to the Bill before us that Mr. 'Carbide' Willson's name has been dropped from that Bill. He is not mentioned at all; but he may be here. We had the same thing ten years ago, when the Harnsworth Bill came here, and when they came it was Mr. Beaton. He happened to be Chairman, and the Harnsworths were at the back of it. Now Mr. Willson so far as I can find from the public press and the bill before us is not in the Bill at all, and while I am in favour of all new industries—I would like to be conservative to a certain extent like gentlemen who have spoken—we ought to be cautious and see how far we are going. We are only here for a time, and while Hon. Mr. Milley did not say how long I hope he will be here fifty years hence, but we are safe in saying we will not all be here at that time. Is it fair to make laws for those who will be here in fifty or seventy-five years time? I saw a cartoon in a Canadian paper some years ago, showing a train held up by one of our Newfoundland pro-

prietors with the map of Newfoundland on it with the notice "Newfoundland for Sale." A little urchin came along and dug his hand into his pocket and held up a five cent piece and said "give me five cents worth of mountain before it is all gone, because there is only a little left." If we are going to have this Bill carried into law, I think that little fellow did wisely in getting five cents worth before it was all gone. I do not know if we shall have much left, because it is little we will have after this. That was the land! now we have the water wanted. Another case I saw in connection with this. It has received considerable opposition in the other chamber and an hon. gentleman there who was instrumental in selling property which cost this Colony thirteen millions of dollars for one million, is deadily opposed to this Bill. What are we to expect when that gentleman is now flabbergasted at this bill? What are we to expect of this, or is the boot on the other foot. That may be, but at the same time, Mr. President, while agreeing with all those measures which will bring money into this Colony and give labor to our people, I am opposed to long concessions and regret that I am unable to support this Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time, those voting against the second reading being Hons. J. D. Ryan and Jas. Ryan.

PROHIBITION BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—Mr. President, for quite a number of years we have had upon the Statute Book of this country a sectional measure dealing with the Prohibition of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors. One electoral district after another by a plebiscite vote put into effect this local option law, and for a considerable time St. John's East and St. John's West have been the only districts in which intoxicants are legally sold.

The electors of these two districts have had presented to them on two occasions the opportunity of expressing by their votes whether they wished to continue the existence of licensed saloons, or to apply to St. John's the provisions of the local option law, thereby bringing the whole island into line and completely stopping the sale of liquors under license.

These votes of the desire of the electors resulted unfavorably for the advocates of local option and we still have a large number of licensed houses in the city.

The vote upon those occasions referred to did not represent the temperance sentiment, or perhaps I will be more correct if I say it did not represent the prohibition sentiment of the city, for large and influential bodies of men, adherents of temperance or total abstinence pledges did not support the measure. They were doubtless influenced by conservative motives when they admitted their lack of sympathy with local option, but said they would readily support a proposal for total prohibition.

Local option has been found to some extent at least unsatisfactory in two respects, first because while St. John's continues the importation and sale of liquor it is easily taken into the other districts, and secondly, the facilities for obtaining it make illicit sale or shebeening more or less easy.

Now, Sir, the Government, after a great deal of deliberation, has decided upon affording the electors of this country an opportunity to express by their votes their desire for or against an enactment which shall be no half and half measure, which shall present no restriction for the poor man that shall not equally apply to the rich man.

It will be noticed that the provisions of the Bill which has passed the House of Assembly with practical unanimity and is now before this Chamber for

concurrence, leave no room for doubt that it is intended to be an out and out prohibitory measure, and intoxicants, if sufficient votes are cast in the affirmative, will be allowed to come into this country for medicinal purposes only, and shall be dispensed only upon a doctor's prescription the same as any other medicine, and will not be obtainable as a beverage.

To obtain complete unanimity upon a measure of this kind is not humanly possible and it is to be expected that some will entirely object to the Bill, others will think it too sweeping, others again may urge that even if a prohibitory law is desirable, the present is a most inopportune time to bring it forward, while prohibitionists at any cost, will say the provision demanding such a large vote to make it effective is unreasonable, and a majority of the votes cast should be sufficient warrant for putting this as other laws upon the Statute Book and effectively enforcing it.

All these and other views have been anticipated and discussed by the Government prior to the preparation of the Bill, and as we believe, a fair and reasonable enactment is provided for in this Bill.

The vote necessary to secure the bringing of the measure into effect is 40 per cent. of the number of voters registered prior to the last election which were 61,572; therefore there must be 24,750 votes cast in favour, and should there be found a greater number than 24,750 voting "No" then the number voting "Yes" must to effect prohibition exceed the number voting "No."

If the electors decide the question to the affirmative the Bill without any further legislation comes into effect on the first day of January, 1917 and there can be no importation and no sale after that date except, as already stated, by clergymen or by druggists

for sacramental purposes and by a controller for medicinal purposes. There is of course much more that can be said in favor of this Bill and the advantages to this country by the adoption of a prohibitory law, but when the Bill is being considered in Committee of the House ample opportunity will be afforded for presenting arguments more fully.

I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would like to say a word in support of the Bill. I speak purely from the point of view of St. John's, of my own knowledge of the conditions of the working classes of this city and the homes of the poorer class in St. John's. Nobody is anything but a temperance man as a matter of public policy today, and for those who oppose prohibition we must do them the justice to feel that they do it, not on the grounds that they oppose temperance, but as a measure which they believe it is impossible to carry out. I believe, that properly handled in this country, it can be carried out. I don't like the principle of prohibition. I consider that drink is an evil which affects especially one particular class and class legislation, a red rag to so many people, is really what the situation as regards the drink evil calls for. A law which will prevent the retail vending of liquor over the counter is what I should like to see tried first. That, however, would be regarded by the majority of our enfranchised community with jealousy, consequently I am driven back against my better judgment, and because partial legislation would be resented and refused by the electorate to believing in the rightness of supporting prohibition.

But I think it must have a large and active feeling in favor of it if it is to be a success, and 40 per cent. in a really temperate country is a

very fair vote to ask before it comes into force. I don't want to make a long speech upon this matter but as I have said I am swayed in this principally by what I know of St. John's, and I know that if it were not for drink we would not have one quarter of the poverty, one quarter of the ignorance or one quarter of the suffering, or one quarter of the children growing up in ignorance and dirt, and I look upon the future of this city as being largely dependent upon the solving of the drink problem. What I have often wondered at is that our temperance societies don't do more of the kind of work which appears to be called for by what is constantly before our eyes in St. John's. The holding of meetings and issuing of appeals are doubtless good in their way, but I cannot help thinking that if they would also devote some of their energies to another series of practical things they could enormously improve the conditions as regards temperance in this town. I should like to see some effort made along the lines initiated by the S.P.C.A. Something along the lines of the appointment of a moderate and judicious man to keep his eyes open and look out for gross breaches of the temperance laws already on the Statute Book. I cannot but believe that more would be done in a few months in this way for the temperance cause than in many years by the issuing of appeals. You can see drunken men reeling on our streets every day. I am always struck afresh by it when I return to St. John's after having been away, and I know of no city in which I have been where drunkenness is so constantly thrust upon a stranger's attention. I believe that under our present law the proprietor of any establishment that sells liquor to an intoxicated man is liable to punishment, and you can constantly see here obviously drunken

men going into or coming out of public houses. I have myself called the attention of the police to such individual cases occurring within sight of a police station, where a man goes in drunk and comes out drunker. Surely enthusiastic temperance workers could do something that would be of use here.

I think that if they set themselves vigorously to work and made some sound, practical effort to put a stop to things of this sort which are of daily and visible occurrence and would see that the temperance laws are enforced, they could do much for this cause even without prohibition.

HON. J. D. RYAN—I would wish to say a few words on the Bill now before the chamber, and shall be as brief as possible. It is one of the many so-called temperance Bills which we have to consider, and of the many it is the first honest one I have seen. The Bill in the other Chamber, I learn, was different originally from the one before us now, one important section being dropped, which makes this class legislation to which I am opposed. The wealthy man can fill up his wine collar to supply him for many years, while his less wealthy neighbour can only have a small quantity. I cannot at all agree with the last speaker about the intemperance of the people of this country. Every year except this I have crossed the Atlantic, and for the few weeks on the other side I see more drinking than in as many years here. Take other countries' statistics and compare them with those of Newfoundland, and you will find that this is the soberest of them all, and yet we must have prohibition to save us. In districts where local opinion is in force people flock to the polls and vote in its favor, while some of the goody-goodies can procure all they require elsewhere. When speaking to a person last year who belongs to a dry state in the American Union,

he informed me that in his city wines and spirits could be procured in forty-nine places. Another visitor in another town in a dry state required some refreshments, but saw none for sale, so consulted a police officer, who invited him along, and coming to a large building across the street, pointed it out to him; but the visitor said, is not that a church, and the reply was, yes. You will not get it there, but everywhere else. Before this Bill comes into operation I hope the present war will be over, so that our Government can purchase several submarines at a low price for the protection of our coasts and prevent illicit importations, as we have seen by the papers that it has already tried even before Prohibition has come into operation.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN.—I am very pleased to see this Bill, but I was rather disappointed in it. As I understood this bill it meant total prohibition, that nobody would be allowed to sell it, doctor or anybody else. I would go further and would not even put in that. If liquor is not good, it is not good as a medicine. Lots of people never drink liquor and they get on very well, and I meet men who do take it, and they get on very well, too. But the man who never touches it is the better off. I would like to see total prohibition. I think it is the only way the bill will be any good. I don't think a man should be allowed to keep a wine shop any more than a beer shop. I have much pleasure in supporting the bill, but I would rather have a total prohibition measure.

HON. R. A. SQUIRES (Minister of Justice).—I cannot let this motion for the second reading of the Prohibition Prohibitive Bill go to the vote without voicing my support of the measure. As a matter of general principle I am not in favour of legislation which restricts the personal

freedom of the citizen in matters which appertain to his own conduct only, and do not affect the public welfare. But to every rule there is an exception which the adage says "proves the rule." This Bill will when passed, have the effect of curtailing personal liberty. The Legislature has the right to curtail personal liberty if it is so used as to be injurious to the public good. The Legislature has the right to curtail personal liberty for the public good. There are many people in Newfoundland who use wines, beers or spirits just as they or others use tea, coffee, or lemonade, and to prevent such persons from the use of wines, beers or spirits, would, under ordinary circumstances, be an indefensible interference with personal rights, but I am quite sure that the great majority of those who so use these articles will for the public good be prepared to make the personal sacrifice of their own right, pleasure and convenience, and support this measure. I support this Bill not because I consider that the man who, in a temperate manner, makes use of intoxicating liquors is committing a crime, but because I feel that the total prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in Newfoundland for all, save sacramental and medicinal purposes, will be for the material and moral uplift of the community. I believe temperate users will gladly make the personal sacrifice for the benefit of those who for financial, moral, or constitutional reasons are not capable of using, without abusing, these drinks. To give the right to one man to say what another man shall have or shall not have on his dinner table is going a long way in legislation. Were it not for the fact that intoxicating liquors are to many an insidious poison leading to physical, mental and moral wreckage in so many cases, the interference would be without justification. Our history,

however, contains so many instances of bright minds befogged, happy homes wrecked and earning capacity lessened by the intemperate use of intoxicating liquors, that the community will do well in saving the weak from their weakness and in restraining the vicious from vice. With that in view I feel that all public spirited men will gladly give their best effort in support of the prohibition movement. I do not propose to enter into any discussion on the moral or psychological aspect of the matter. As to how far an Act of Parliament can take the place of individual backbone; as to how far a community is made stronger by the removal of a temptation—are questions well worthy of a place on the calendar of a debating organisation, but for us we desire to see some present material improvement in city conditions, and desire to protect the young man who comes into the city from Local Option districts from the possibility of the debauch which leads to the police station, and for this there is but one course. That course is to ask temperance people to become prohibitionists, and temperate people to become extremists for the uplifting of those who are instruments of their own ruin and the suffering, sorrow, and shame of their dependents and friends.

HON. J. D. RYAN—I would like to ask in connection with the Bill, what about the smokers. Liquor enters considerably into the manufacture of tobacco. Perhaps it is the intention to allow it to come in for the purpose of manufacturing tobacco, because after prohibition passes, unless specially provided for, no rum will be imported for the manufacture of tobacco.

On motion the Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Second Reading of the Volunteer Force Bill.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

On motion the House went into Committee on this Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—Just one question with regard to section 2, which says that the right of property in seals killed shall cease if they be not taken on board within 24 hours. Is not this unfair? It may be that seals have been killed a long distance from a ship, but owing to the ship becoming jammed, it is not possible to pick them up within 24 hours. Would it be right that the hard work of the men who killed these seals should go for nothing? It appears to me to be unreasonably and unnecessarily harsh.

HON. MR. JOB—This is a matter that has been discussed for a long time. This clause, I will admit is not perfect, but it is as near to perfection as we can get it. Now I would like to say a few words as to section 3. We do not want to prevent the men when it is required, from having proper medical aid. But it will be ridiculous to keep steamers from the sealfishery and deprive the men of their labour, with the consequent loss to the owners. If they are unable to get doctors to go to the ice. Doctors, as a matter of fact, cannot be got easily; it is very difficult to get them to go, but the owners in their own interest, will make every possible effort to have doctors on board, and under this section they must prove to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when such is the case that a doctor cannot be procured. This is as much as the owners can do.

HON. MR. WINTER—As a member of the Select Committee on this Bill, I would like to mention a few of the reasons which prompted the amendment of this section (9). "It shall be unlawful to kill any hood seals between March 10th, 1916, and April 13th, 1919, or bring into any port of the Colony any seals so killed, under a penalty of \$5,000, to be recovered from the owner of such steamer by any person who shall sue for the same." Now this section must appeal to everybody as being most unfair and objectionable. A steamer goes to the ice and the captain gets instructions to kill no hoods, but while at the ice and contrary to the instructions received, a member of the crew kills some hoods without the knowledge of captain or officers, and, smuggling them on board, they are brought to St. John's, when this man may take action against the owners and recover \$5,000. It is so utterly unfair and unreasonable that the wonder is that such a section could be inserted in the Bill. The amendment that is now recommended is to alter the penalty from \$5,000 to \$500 for such a breach of the Act, to be recovered from the offender by any person who shall sue for the same. You've got to find out who the offender is before prosecuting and making him suffer, not the owners and it is also proposed that any such hood seals so killed, shall be confiscated and the proceeds of their sale given to the Marine Disasters Fund. This, no doubt, will appeal to hon. members of the House to be a much more reasonable and just way to treat any parties who may wish to break the law.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—Owing to the illness of Hon. Mr. Murphy I would suggest that Hon. Mr. Bishop's name be substituted for his on the Joint Committees of both Houses.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I beg leave to move that a message be sent to the House of Assembly advising them that the name of Hon. Mr. Bishop has been substituted for that of Hon. Mr. Murphy on the Joint Committees of both Houses.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I give notice that on to-morrow I will move for the suspension of the 33rd Rule and all other rules of this House in relation to all Bills now before it or to come before it for the remainder of the present session.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till to-morrow at 4.30 of the clock.

—
SATURDAY, May 29th.

The House opened at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to move the suspension of the 33rd and all other rules of this House as regards all Bills, Addresses and other matters now before, or to come before this House for the remainder of this session.

The motion being put was carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Robinson the Grand Bank Water Co. Bill was read a third time, passed, and sent to the Assembly with a message acquainting them that this House had passed the Bill without amendment.

NEWFOUNDLAND PRODUCTS
BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Squires the House went into Committee on this Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

[The manuscript of Hon. Mr. Squires's speech on this measure has not been received.]

HON. MR. HARVEY—Mr. Chairman, I think that the Committee may be congratulated upon having here a contract which, on the whole, is a fair one. I have given the matter a large amount of attention, and I think that the Company and its managers have been largely misjudged. Some of the expressions in the original contract were no doubt uncertain and misleading, and it has been asserted that the Company were anxious to obtain water powers which they really did not want. As far as my knowledge of the matter goes they have shown an eminently desirable attitude towards public rights and towards the rights of other people who might be operating now, or who might be in future operating in their neighborhood. There are, however, still one or two points in the contract that struck me as needing consideration and I intend now to ask about them. The first is in the preamble or schedule at the top of page 3. As it is worded here it calls for the Government to hold back for five years, water privileges on that part of the drainage area of the Hamilton River named, and the succeeding five years, during which the Company are to build, the Government is not to grant any such water powers on the drainage area required by the Company. That, I fancy, is a mistake in the verbiage, and may not be sufficiently important to call for anything in the way of a vote on the Resolution. The point is that for the first five years the Government may reserve that part of the drainage area on the Hamilton River named, and for the second five years the whole of the drainage area may be reserved. This is a mistake. Now I sup-

pose that the Government are perfectly satisfied that this gentleman, Mr. Jesse Critz King (who has deeded his patents to the Company), has entered into an agreement with the Company by which he is entirely protected. No doubt the Government will see to that. Otherwise they would not have given over all his interests to the Company. I would have preferred that this Company should have been brought in with a special act of incorporation, instead of having it incorporated under the general laws of the Colony. I am convinced that that should have been done. The memorandum of Association of the Company enables it to go into any or all kinds of business such as agencies, commissions, buying or selling general produce or anything else, for instance, they could enter into the fishery business, and the Company is exempted from the taxation incident to other concerns here. It would be allowed under its Memorandum of Association to go into the fish business or grocery business, and when the principals die, no taxation is levied as it is in every other business. Of course this is a distant possibility, and is unlikely to become a practical evil here, that they may be in competition with ordinary people. But I do most certainly think that the exemption from taxation ought to refer, so far as stocks, shares and dividends are concerned, to the particular business dealt with in the Contract for which these facilities are given, and the proper way to do this was to make a special act of incorporation to limit the privileges given to the particular work the Company has in hand. I do not wish to be captious about the matter, for the present intentions of the Company, as far as I know are broad-minded and liberal, and there is no intention

on their part to use their power un-justly or unadvisedly. I think it is a case of 'live and let live', and in order to be induced to give their money to carry out their operations, they need unusual privileges. There is, however, no prospect that they will be used in an unfair manner, and we have sufficient safeguards in the Bill to entirely protect anybody in any essential, should they desire to act unfairly. The Government are to be congratulated on getting the various modifications without any pressure at all. It is essentially a matter of fair play between the Government and the Company, and the question of floating down logs through the sluices of the Company, the use of the waters for towns or villages that may be established in their neighborhood, the use of water powers for manufacturing, were given without pressure at all. And so, I think the way in which the amendments were brought in, stands to the credit of the Government and the Company, and we in this Chamber must have much pleasure in doing what we can to give the Company a send off, and wish them God speed and success, not only for their own welfare, but for that of the people of the whole country.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—Before the Bill passes through this stage, I wish to say that no Bill which has ever come into the House has had such a ring of sincerity about it as this Bill. The first thing that struck me on perusing the Bill was the liberality and magnanimity of this Company. Here no monopolies are created; there is liberty for all, and I have not come across in any of the sections of the Bill anything to prevent people entering into business at any time within the Company's domains, if they are anxious to take sites to build shops or stores. This is not so

in the other case, where monopolies are evident, and I therefore join with Hon. Mr. Harvey in wishing them God speed and success and hope to see the day when they will have \$50,000,000 successfully invested in the development of their industries.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I have a few words to say on the Bill, but with the permission of the House will reserve them for the third reading.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on Monday.

PROHIBITION BILL.

On motion the House went into Committee on this Bill. Hon. Mr. Winter in the Chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Is there any reason why the fine should be two months in section 29 and three months in section 30?

HON. MR. BISHOP—I am not aware of any reason why there should be a difference. As the Bill comes to us a medical practitioner is only liable to two months imprisonment and a druggist three months.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Section 29 has also only two months; I suggest making it three months in all cases. While I am on the question of penalties might I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to section 20 which provides that no person shall import under a fine of ten dollars, with no provision for imprisonment, at all. I suggest we make it three months there also.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The conditions here are entirely different to 29 and 30. The one relates to importation which is a matter which must be very much more severely dealt with than the dispensing after the liquors are here. Spirits are not supposed to be sold excepting for medicinal pur-

poses, and there is a money penalty or imprisonment allowed, but in section 20 I do not think there should be any imprisonment but a fine.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would like to point out also that this section 20 is the only one in the Bill which forbids the importation of liquor into the Colony, and there is no imprisonment at all. I submit, with all due deference to my hon. friends opposite, that if you have not the dread of the Penitentiary over these people, who might smuggle in a wholesale way, the act will be worthless.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I quite agree with you now, and think the penalty is light.

HON. MR. SQUIRES—There appears to be some misunderstanding on the matter of penalty. The section now reads as follows:

"20.—From the day named in the Proclamation issued in section 17 no person except the controller shall import into the Colony any intoxicating liquors except for Sacramental purposes, under a penalty not less than ten dollars, and not exceeding five hundred dollars."

The following words should be added: "or in default of payment, imprisonment not exceeding three months."

The hon. members will observe that that is the form used in all the other sections. Under this act the punishment in the first instance is a fine, the payment of the fine is enforceable at the point of imprisonment. It will be noticed that the imprisonment is "in default of payment." I do not concur in Hon. Mr. Bishop's suggestion that there should be no imprisonment penalty. There would be no method by which the payment could be easily enforced except by imprisonment in the default of payment. The punishment for crime is imprisonment. It is only when the offence is a minor one under some circumstances

where the moral guilt is slight, that the option of a fine is given. In cases of larceny for instance, where the offence is light or circumstances of a mitigatory character are shown the option of a fine is given, but where the offence is grave the option of a fine should not be allowed.

Under the various penal sections of this act the penalty in the first instance is a fine and the imprisonment is for the purpose of enforcing the payment of the fine.

I notice that several changes have been made in the bill since it was printed for distribution in the House of Assembly. I notice for instance, in section 21 that: "There is no penalty; a. all attached for breach."

It is thus evident that the bill, in so far as it has been amended by the lower chamber will need careful perusal and consideration.

HON. MR. McGRATH—On reflection it occurs to me that the men who will smuggle liquor will be the fishermen class along certain portions of our coast. If a man like a druggist or a doctor, who ought to act in a more honorable fashion, is let off with a light fine, I do not think the unfortunate fishermen ought to be punished any worse.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I am certainly of opinion that option ought to commence at forty or fifty dollars instead of ten dollars.

HON. MR. RYAN—I must take particular exception to section 21. The clergymen using this wine must use a particular wine, which comes in here every three years, and has a certificate of guarantee as to the quality. The druggist would not know the first thing about it, neither would the controller. They must have a guarantee from the proprietor of the vineyards or their agents in Portugal that the article is genuine. I am not particularly anxious but only know that

they would not be thoroughly qualified.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—It seems to me there is nothing in the act to prevent any person acting in that capacity, such as Mr. Ryan himself, who I presume has been acting in that capacity. If the wine came addressed to the church and was passed for as for the church purposes it would be all right but I do not see how we could give permission to an agent importing in his own name. I do not see any simple way of doing it, but I do see that no exception can be taken to some person acting as agent of the clergymen, that is ordering the wine, provided it is addressed to the clergyman or some person in authority in the church. I am certainly desirous of meeting the views of the hon. gentleman if I can do so.

HON. MR. RYAN.—I may say that the rule at present is that the importer of wine for sacramental purposes usually gets an order in advance from the clergyman, and when that wine comes here it is put into the warehouse, and when the clergyman requires a case or an octave, he sends a certificate to the Custom House that this wine ordered and imported by such person is intended for church purposes. That is the practice now. I know this will be a great inconvenience to those clergymen.

HON. MR. SQUIRES.—I think that section might stand over until Monday in view of the objections made.

HON. MR. RYAN.—There is no need of deferring it. Let it go under the old rule, and have the certificates sent to the Custom House.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—We will not complete the Bill to-day, and will try to work out something to meet the situation.

HON. MR. SQUIRES.—The section to which the Hon. Mr. Ryan has referred reads as follows:

"24.—It shall not be lawful for any person except the controller and all clergymen and duly qualified druggists doing business in the Colony to import wine for sacramental purposes."

I understand Hon. Mr. Ryan wishes it to read "all clergymen and their agents." The addition of these words would be likely to cause considerable trouble and might have the effect of involving clergymen who were acting in absolute good-faith in unmerited trouble. On the other hand, the Hon. Mr. Ryan's suggestion that the clergymen should have an absolutely free hand to secure Sacramental Wine in the manner most convenient to them, is well taken and should receive careful consideration at the hands of this committee. It appears to me that the present system can be worked quite satisfactorily. There is nothing in the bill which calls upon the clergymen to personally look after the correspondence and account, the passing of custom's entries and the storage of the wine. To insert the word "agents" after "clergymen" would necessitate the addition of other sections to the act dealing with the controller and with druggists. So far as clergymen are concerned no special restrictions are necessary for they can be trusted absolutely in the matter. If, however, agents were allowed to import without special restrictions the door might be open to much unpleasantness. I consequently feel that the importation of Sacramental Wine cannot be and will not be in any way obstructed and if when the Act becomes operative it is discovered that any interference or any inconvenience is so occasioned, this Legislature will gladly so amend the measure as to provide the greatest facilities possible in this connection.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—Could not we for sacramental purposes re-

main outside the operation of the Bill altogether? Wines for sacramental purposes are not intoxicating liquors within the meaning of that section.

HON. MR. SQUIRES.—It is covered by section 24, which provides that they shall not be imported.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—I would like to ask one question here. There is an enormous amount of liquor brought into this island under the name of patent medicine. Now, hating liquor as I do, I would rather see people drink liquor a hundred times than the patent medicines. The percentage of alcohol in them is enormous. Now the question is, are these doped medicines included under section 25?

HON. MR. BISHOP.—My opinion is they are not. That will have to be taken up. I agree that more harm may ensue from the drinking of patent medicines, than spirituous liquors.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the whole on the Volunteer Force Bill. Hon. Mr. Job in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was read a third time, passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

SEALING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Sealing Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. JOB.—In explanation of this clause I would like to say that it is found to be impossible to fix any definite sum for which any man's life should be insured, but the owners were agreeable to pay \$1.25 on condition that the men should pay \$1.25, and we

thought that if that matter were left to the Governor in Council some scheme of insurance might be adopted. I have consulted the Government on the matter, and they believe that such scheme can be adopted.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, whereupon the Bill was then read a third time, passed, and sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendments.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned till Monday next at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, May 31st.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received a message from the Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bills, entitled respectively, An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905; and an Act to amend 4 Geo. V. Cap. VI, entitled an Act respecting the Nfld. Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate Ltd., in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

TRAIN FERRY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Nfld. Train Ferry Act was then read a first time.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—In moving the second reading of this Bill I may say that it provides for an extension of time to the Nfld. Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Ltd. In consequence of the outbreak of the war Mr. Thomson has represented that he has found it impossible to complete the raising of the necessary funds to start the Train Ferry and Railway. He, however, on his last visit here felt very confident in his project, which has changed very considerably from the proposition he first put before the Government. Mr. Thomson now

thinks a train ferry service to carry fish fresh to the neighbouring continent is very feasible, and says he has interested a number of people in the project. Hence comes the request for an extension of time, and the Government has conceded it.

The Bill was then read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee of the whole on the Bill, Hon. Mr. Job taking the chair of the Committee.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the bill was then read a third time, passed, and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill further to amend the Revenue Act of 1905 was then read a first time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bills, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council, entitled respectively:

The Amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled an Act respecting the Bank Fishery, without amendment.

An Act to amend the law respecting the exportation of timber.

An Act respecting proceedings against the Crown.

An Act for granting to His Majesty a sum of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year June 30, 1915, to June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the extension of the railway system of the Colony.

An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the Public Service of the Colony.

An Act to provide for a temporary loan for public purposes.

RAILWAY LOAN BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Railway Loan Bill was then read a first time.

HON. MR. BISHOP—In moving the second reading of this Bill I may say that it is the same as last year's act with the exception that the rate of interest provided for under that Act was only three and one-half per cent; and it having been found by the Prime Minister when he went to London that it was impossible to get money at that rate, a temporary loan was taken from the Colony's bankers, Glyns, Mills, Currie & Co., and this bill provides for raising a sum of money as soon as conditions improve in the money market at four per cent. Otherwise there is no difference. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. KNOWLING—Is this a further loan?

HON. MR. BISHOP—No, the same loan.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill having been read a second time, the House went into Committee of the Whole thereon, Hon. Mr. Milley taking the chair of the Committee.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Bill was then read a third time, passed, and it was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN BILL.

Hon. Mr. Bishop moved the first reading of the Bill for raising a sum of money by loan for the public service of the Colony.

The Bill was read a first time.

HON. MR. BISHOP—In moving the second reading, I may say that this Bill is intended to provide funds to pay the anticipated deficit at the end

of the current year. The money is estimated at about half a million dollars, and it is proposed to raise it by temporary loan from the Bank of Montreal as outlined by the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech. The Loan Bill as now read provides for a loan for the short time of ten years, and it is hoped that during the currency of the Bill the war will have ended, and that we shall have returned to something like former conditions when our revenue will be ample and more than ample for current expenses, and should we have surpluses approaching anything like those we have had within recent years, we shall have provided for this within the time allowed in the Bill. In fact should we be fortunate enough to receive surpluses aggregating half what we received during three or four years, the whole of this advance will be provided for and not become a permanent debt against the Colony. The rate of interest is reasonable, and even if it has to be carried by the Bank for more than a year it will not be a burden, and the interest is provided for in the Revenue Act of this session.

The Bill was then read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Bill, Hon. Mr. Blandford in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was read a third time and passed and was sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

TEMPORARY LOAN BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill, "An Act to provide for the temporary loan," was read a first time.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This bill is in relation to the loan bill we have just passed. In agreeing to loan the money

the Bank of Montreal asks for debentures covering the amount, and this bill is for the purpose of furnishing to the Bank of Montreal a debenture for the amount during the time the loan may be outstanding. I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Hon. Mr. McGrath in the chair.

Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, whereupon the bill was read a third time, passed, and sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bills entitled "An Act to amend the law respecting the exportation of timber," and "An Act respecting proceedings against the Crown," were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I have no knowledge that at any previous session of the Legislature has the Legislative Council lost two of its members by death.

On the opening day of the present session the Hon. James Baird and the Hon. J. B. Ayre both occupied their seats here.

The latter we followed to his last resting place some weeks ago, and on last evening the long, active and honourable career of Mr. Baird came to a peaceful end.

Hon. Mr. Baird has travelled a long way beyond the allotted span, being in his eighty-seventh year, and although he had retired from business activities for some years, he has until quite recently maintained a very active interest in Newfoundland and its affairs. Appointed to a seat in this House in 1898, Mr. Baird always evinced a keen interest in all matters affecting the welfare of this country, and often brought to bear upon ques-

tions under discussion affecting the interest of the country, the keen analytical judgment for which he was noted, and through which he became such a prominent figure in the commercial life of St. John's.

As a business man the Hon. James Baird has always been perhaps the most notable example of success that we have seen in this country during the past half century. Though a loyal Scotchman, he has been no less a notable Newfoundlander, so prominent has he been in all of our commercial life and particularly in the establishment and direction of several of our most prominent local industries. A man noted for industry and integrity he has been a conspicuous and universally respected citizen of St. John's for over seventy years, and one who laid down his armour only when well past four score years of active industry. Such men form the most valuable asset of any country. I beg to move the following resolutions:—

Resolved,—That the Legislative Council records with deep regret the death of the Hon. James Baird, late member of this House, whose decease has deprived the Council of an excellent member and the community of an esteemed citizen; and one who held a high place in the public, social, commercial and industrial life of the Colony.

Resolved,—That the Council sincerely sympathizes with the family of the Hon. James Baird in the bereavement; and that a copy of these Resolutions be transmitted to them in token of the sympathy of this House.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I should like on this occasion to make a few brief observations on the resolutions just before submitted to this House. I was brought to this Colony by the hon. gentleman who has just passed to his rest, 40 years ago last winter. During

all the period of my associations with him, I always found him just, upright and straight in every particular. I entirely concur with everything the leader of the Government has said. In looking over the list since I have had a seat in this House, no less than 8 members have departed. As has been said, this is the first time that two members have passed away during one session. We never know who will be next, but I hope all of us will be spared many years to come, and the lesson that our esteemed and honourable friend has left for us is one we might well follow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— I trust it will not be considered improper on the part of the youngest member of this House to add a word of appreciation and esteem. The Hon. James Baird has passed away at the natural close of a distinguished career. His 87 years did not prevent his attendance at this Chamber to but a few weeks ago and that fact alone evidenced his activity of mind and continuing interest in the welfare of his adopted home. His life was a strenuous one, given not merely to his own personal interests but also in no small measure to the upbuilding and wise governing of the Colony.

His career has been one of great personal success. His big brain, warm heart and untiring industry would have compelled success in any line of activity which he would undertake. But it is not merely in the records of his own sphere of personal commercial activities that he has achieved success. He has written his name in letters of gold in the financial and industrial history of the Colony. His success has not been success at the expense of others and of the Colony but a success which has brought prosperity to others in its train. Those of us who

are of a younger generation can see the magnitude of the work of the great captains of industry who have risen in our midst, men who have borne the weight of Newfoundland's commerce; and of them all the Hon. James Baird was one of the greatest. His mental activity and resourcefulness, his breadth of vision and insight into affairs both of commerce and of state ranked him as a man of worth not merely in the commercial enterprises with which he was identified but also in the public and political sphere with which his activities were continuously associated.

His prosperity has been the prosperity of the city in which his business interests were centred, and the development of the trade of the Colony has been materially helped by the many undertakings with which his name has been associated.

The success of our city and our colony depends in no small measure upon the integrity and zeal, the ability and enterprise of such men as the Hon. James Baird and the Hon. John Ayre both of whom have so recently laid down the weapons of earthly combat for a sphere where perchance the ability, integrity and zeal of which they gained such wisdom here may have scope for a fuller development.

HON. MR. BISHOP—As a further mark of respect to our deceased brother member, I beg to move that this House adjourn till to-morrow at 4.30 or after the funeral.

The House adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 1.

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

NEWFOUNDLAND PRODUCTS BILL

Third reading of Newfoundland Products Corporation Bill.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Before the bill is read a third time, Mr. President, I would avail of the opportunity to offer some observations on the measure which I had intended to make previously, but which, owing to the fact that the Bill invited so little criticism, I have reserved until this stage. That the measure has gone through this House with comparatively no opposition, is, I take it, an evidence that the changes made in the Lower Chamber during the past month, have been such as to render it acceptable to both Houses, and that being so, I think we have reason to congratulate ourselves on the part the Legislature has taken towards securing for the country an industrial enterprise calculated to be of such material and abiding benefit. As originally presented, the Bill provoked substantial opposition, much of which, there is reason to think, arose from misunderstandings as to the purpose of some of its clauses, and to the impression, emphasized in the other Chamber, that in certain of its features it aimed at the absorption of industries already existing and being carried on by other corporations.

However, the readiness shown by the promoters of the projected enterprise to withdraw from the Bill entirely the clauses which were held to convey such a meaning proves that there was really no such intention; also the Government on its part, by its readiness to accept all reasonable amendments and by permitting the debate on the measure to extend over a longer period than that attending any previous enactment in the history of the Colony, showed its good faith and its purpose to evolve from the resulting discussions such an enactment as would meet the views of the public generally and safeguard the rights of the country, while at the

same time affording liberal concessions to those who were seeking facilities to establish this enterprise.

In the treatment of this measure by the Legislature there is a marked difference from that which characterized previous measures of a similar character. In connection with the famous Reid contract of 1898, for instance, the fact cannot be denied that it was used to the fullest as a political weapon and exploited by the Opposition of the day for party purposes they making it a large factor in the eventual overthrow of the Administration that brought it into existence. Again, some years later, when the Harmsworth contract was before the House, party advantage was taken of it in the same way, and public meetings were held, and petitions circulated and sent to the foot of the Throne itself, in the endeavor to nullify the Bill though, fortunately for the people, without success, as events have shown since that the Colony was the greatest beneficiary.

Doubtless because of this we have in the meantime broadened out the outlook somewhat with regard to large projects. We have seen that in the case of both the Reid enterprise and the Harmsworth enterprise, the vast profits which it was predicted would result, have not materialized for the investors, and that the injuries to the country which it was feared would follow have not ensued. The Reids, we know from their annual statements, have not made any money in operating the railway. The Harmsworths, we know in the same way, have not yet paid a dividend from their paper mills. Both concerns, however, are giving employment to large numbers of people and spending vast sums of money every year in the country, which probably would not otherwise be spent. Both concerns,

too, are contributing materially to maintain the prosperity of the Island as a whole, and that being so, both parties in the Legislature, in dealing with the present measure, have eschewed political contentions and have set themselves to the consideration of this project on the very proper principle that the desirable thing to do is to secure such an industry for what it has in store for the people and the country as a whole, while at the same time safeguarding the rights of the Colony by refusing concessions that may operate detrimentally. In other words, all have said: "Here is a project involving the possible expenditure of eighteen or twenty million dollars. We have already seen what two familiar, if smaller projects—the Reid enterprise and the Harmsworth enterprise—have done for the country. Therefore let us view it in the right light of how we are to secure this enterprise, by making the least concessions." I put it in this way, advisedly, because an hon. gentleman speaking here last week criticized this project in the light of previous ones, and declared the Legislature should have got more time to consider it, and that the other House has given too many concessions to the promoters of this industry.

That is fair enough from some viewpoints, but it must not be forgotten that every corporation proposing enterprises of this kind, demands the very utmost it thinks it possible to secure, while every Government, on the other hand, confronted with such proposals, tries to make them effective with the granting of as few concessions as possible. When the hon. gentlemen who have previously spoken in this House are interested in companies or enterprises, they work on the same principle. They make the largest demands possible, not, perhaps, expecting to get them all conceded, but hope that eventually by compromise

and concessions on both sides, a workable arrangement can be effected. This is the spirit in which this measure has been dealt with from both sides, and the outcome, it seems to me, is highly creditable to all concerned.

One criticism we have heard is that the concession should not outlast fifty years. Well, all I have to say to that is, that the gentlemen who advanced it here would not go into business on Water Street to-morrow on property held under a 50-year lease, much less undertake to put thousands of dollars into the construction of buildings and the establishment of a plant for the launching of a new industry if the land was held under a lease of only fifty years.

My hon. friend, Mr. Anderson, at our last sitting, in his comments on this Bill, praised the Fertilizer Company for not creating a monopoly as the Harmsworths did. I have no brief for the Harmsworths, but I am somewhat familiar with the conditions which influenced them to create a monopoly at Grand Falls in some respects, and I think that their reasons do much to justify them in the course they took. It is true that they created a monopoly in dry goods, groceries, provisions, and other business, retained control over the housing, waterage, sewerage and sanitation systems, the supplying of milk, meat, etc., and, in other ways, made those living in the town dependent upon the Company to an extent not usual on this side of the Atlantic. The reasons were that they wished to prevent undesirable enterprises being started, undesirable methods being put into effect, undesirable people settling in their town. This policy is more or less general on the other side of the water; but they did not adopt it; nor is it adopted there, for purposes of making profit. For instance, they built their own houses, assessed their own rentals, re-

gulated their own tenants. But they have made no profit whatever out of this side of the business. Indeed, both there and at Bishop's Falls the return from the investment in houses is not 2 per cent. The reason they did it was that they might have control of the sanitation of the village and be able to enforce their own regulations. In the same way, while they established drapery and grocery stores, they did not do this to make a profit, but actually turned over whatever profits accrued to these businesses to a town committee chosen by the people themselves, who were the equivalent of the Municipal Council in this city, and who expended this and other funds coming into their hands for the general good. Similarly they controlled the milk supply to prevent cattle, etc., being kept in the village, and may be, tuberculous milk from being supplied; but, on the other hand, they established a farm at Rushy Pond, three miles from the town and stocked it with the finest of English cattle, including a bull that had taken third place at the Royal Agricultural show in England the year it was brought out here, and on this farm they located two capable English farmers to run it. I am not prepared to say that the system gave satisfaction. One member, speaking on this subject in the Lower House the other evening, said that it might be perhaps better than our own way of doing things on this side of the water, but the people did not like it. That I think describes the situation very accurately. The people did not like it, and ultimately the Harmsworth Company recognized this fact, and withdrew from the position in some respects. They transferred their stores to a St. John's Company, under a contract that this Company would sell at St. John's prices. They turned over their meat and provision business, for which they had installed splendid re-

frigeration, to another Company on the same basis. They now allow any workman who wishes to have his own house, to build it on plans to be approved by the town authorities, just as here in St. John's with the Municipal Council, and only demand a ground rent of 20 cents per year in order to assert their supreme authority. The Company, on its own account, has built a splendid school, superior to anything in the Colony outside of St. John's, which it maintains at a cost of some thousands of dollars a year. It has also provided a hospital at somewhat similar cost, which is maintained on the same scale of perfection. It has established a fine club room, too, and I make bold to say that it would be a fortunate thing for this Colony if we had many other towns as well run and as hygienically up to date as Grand Falls.

My hon. friend also made some comment on the nature of the concessions and the vastness of the land grants given to the Fertilizer Company by this measure, which he deplored; but it is interesting to compare this measure with the Harmsworth Bill. The Harmsworths had five years within which to expend \$250,000, and fifteen more years in which to spend \$750,000. In other words, they had twenty years within which to expend a million dollars. The Bill now before us requires that the Fertilizer Company shall spend five million dollars in the first five years in this Colony, ten millions within the next five years in Labrador, and five million dollars in the following five years in this Colony again, or, in all, would spend fifteen million dollars in fifteen years, while the Harmsworths need spend but a million in twenty years.

Surely this must be our all-sufficient answer to the argument that the concessions granted now are too great. Another, and most peculiar misappre-

hension regarding this Bill is that the Colony gives this Fertilizer Company large areas of land. It will probably be a surprise to most members of this House when I say, and the facts will bear me out, that the Colony is not giving them an acre of land. All the lands that are being given to them are lands already held by the Reid-Nfld. Company, and the title of which is merely further guaranteed by this measure. The same applies to water powers. Whatever powers they are getting on the Humber River are water powers that were given the Reid Company previously, and it is merely the right of the Reids to these water powers and the cession of them from the Reid Company to the Fertilizer Company that is confirmed by this Bill. Anything else the Fertilizer Co. may get is merely a right to take certain lands and certain water powers necessary to the carrying out of their operations on the comprehensive scale they propose, but with regard to these other lands and water powers they can only take them by compensating the present holders.

Under these circumstances it is unfair to argue that vast public rights are being deeded-over to these people for nothing. It is quite true that complaint has been made that the rights of individuals possessing certain claims on property in the Humber Valley may be affected by this Bill, but on the other hand it will hardly be seriously disputed that if an industry of twenty million dollars is to be introduced, those who are prepared to set it on foot and to invest that money are entitled to be protected against the exactions of parties who may be merely using their nominal possession of certain territory within that area to hold up such an enterprise until they are paid extravagant sums for what rights, only shadowy in some instances, they may possess there. The

utmost such people can fairly claim is that they shall be bought out at a price to be fixed by arbitration, and that provision is embodied in this Bill.

The aspect of this problem which most appealed to me was whether the demand for fertilizers throughout the world was sufficiently great to make possible the establishment of such an enterprise in this Colony with any reasonable prospect of success. Some study of the matter soon convinced me it was. In a little volume on "Agriculture," by Professor Sumnerville, in the Home University Library, he states that "except under unusual circumstances, the only three substances that the farmer requires to consider, from the point of view of manuring are nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium the two latter being usually designated under the name of their oxides and called, respectively, phosphoric acid and potash." The first and last of these substances, nitrogen and potassium, are obtainable very extensively in the form of natural salts—the nitrates of Chili and Peru and the potash of Germany and, knowing that this matter was under discussion, I was struck, when the war began, by the fact that one of the first cablegrams from Germany following the outbreak of hostilities, recounted that the German Reichstag, at the special session convened in the first week of the war, considered only two subjects, finance and fertilizers, making provision to cope with financial problems that were involved, and providing against the export of potash from the German Empire. As many people know, potash is one of the chief items of export of that country. In a little book on "Industrial Germany," by Professor W.H. Dawson, which I bought after the war began, I found much material of interest in regard to the potash

export of Germany. On page 146 it gives the value of potash mines now working at £35,000,000 and of those about to be opened, £10,000,000 and it says "It is suggested that if the industry were nationalized, for the State has a substantial interest in the monopoly which at present exists, and if, instead of potash being mined in over a hundred places, in many cases under uneconomic conditions, it were raised only in a limited number of efficient works, these being operated at their full capacity, there would be an immediate surplus of from two to two and a half million on a sale of eight million pounds, rising in the course of a few years to three that amount, as the use of potash for manurial purposes increased."

On page 124 he describes at length the history of the potash syndicate, which he says "is the most powerful in the chemical industry of Germany, existing since 1879. Potash mining has increased so rapidly that the number of works has grown from 68 to 80 and the number of shafts from 76 to 97, while over 100 additional shafts are being sunk, and so colossal is this industry that the syndicate sets apart a large sum for the purpose of advertising both at home and abroad the value of potash for agricultural purposes, the expenditure of this money being left to the Federal Council and £230,000 being expended in this way in 1911."

As a sidelight on this matter, it may not be amiss to point out that in the despatches from Berlin on January 7 of the present year, it was stated that a suit was being brought against the Imperial Chancellor, Bethmann Holwegg, by the German Potash Syndicate demanding from him the return of \$2,000,000, forming the so-called propaganda fund for advertising the merits of the German fertilizer at home and

abroad, which amount was raised by imposing a tax on all potash mined in Germany under the law of 1910, which law was designed to conserve the national reserves of potash in Germany to ensure the prosperity of the German industry and to prevent Americans from getting a too cheap supply. But it was stated that this had been a partial failure, that new potash mines were being constantly opened up and that the time was coming when the bars to the freer and cheaper production of potash must be lowered, unless more effective methods of discouraging potash mining in Germany are devised.

As soon as the war began, Germany, as I have already stated, at once prohibited the export of potash and a problem of no small international interest has since been created in consequence owing to the fact that the world at large would be left without supplies of this substance. Various expedients have been suggested. The Canadian weekly commercial bulletin of January 11 quotes an exhaustive article from the Glasgow Herald on the use of seaweed as a substitute. The International Agricultural Journal for April reviews at some length a special publication on the new potash deposits in Spain. The American Department of Agriculture has sent experts broadcast over the United States seeking potash deposits, and the Saturday Evening Post of Nov. 7, commenting on this matter, points out that Franklyn K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, has shown that large deposits of potash are known to exist in California, but have not been worked because under free competition with the huge and fully developed deposits of Germany, there seemed to be no great inducement to work them, but with the German supply cut off and the price consequently ad-

vanced, potash mining becomes a more tempting field here, and, in fact, in the latter part of September it was announced that the first American potash made in California would be ready for the market early in the New Year."

With regard now to nitrogen, I need only say that this element as a fertilizer is obtained either through natural nitrates in various countries, such as Chili and Peru, or through artificial nitrates produced in various ways, and the magnitude of the South American export of nitrate is an evidence of what a large part this fertilizing agent played in the agricultural industry of the world. A recent publication in Canada shows that the world's consumption of nitrate of soda from South America has grown from 160 tons in 1830 to 150,000 tons in 1904 and now totalling more than 2,500,000 tons. In a recent publication Mr. Frank G. Carpenter, a well known journalist describing a trip to South America he is about to take says: "I want to investigate the guano islands, off the coast of Peru, and also go into the nitrate fields of the great South American desert, which now so largely supply the nitrogen for our American farms. Those deserts have already yielded several hundred million dollars' worth of that fertilizer, and they are now turning out nitrate of soda by the billions of pounds. As it is now we are taking one-fifth of the whole product, and there is scarcely a live orchardist or market gardener in our country who does not nourish his crops with plant food from Chili. I want to go out into the desert and visit the mines, and tell you how the nitrates look in the ground. As to the guano islands, they are scattered along the Pacific coast some distance above

where the nitrate desert begins. They are frequented by millions of birds, and the droppings from these have already produced more than twelve million tons of manure as rich as that of your henhouse. They have brought into the treasure vaults of Peru something over a billion dollars, and although almost exhausted are still yielding guano."

Another form of chemical manure or nitrogenous fertilizer is sulphate of ammonia, which is very extensively used in various countries, and notably in the British Isles. A publication designed to show the advantages of this fertilizer says "there is no kind of plant life which will not benefit from a generous application of sulphate of ammonia, for there is no kind of soil which will not be greatly enriched by its use. Nitrogen may be said to be indirectly the staff of life, because it is the vital principle in the formation of the nourishment of crops. Owing to its gradual availability, sulphate of ammonia is an ideal form in which to apply nitrogen. It feeds the crop through all its stages of growth, while preventing any excess of top, or coarseness through over-stimulation." From what I can ascertain, it appears that Mr. Willson's argument is that sulphate of ammonia embodies a large percentage of material which is not really of value in stimulating the growth of plants, but is merely the vehicle or container by which the life-giving element is handled just as sugar, sawdust, or sand is used to absorb nitro-glycerine, and thus form dynamite. In other words, he holds that a barrel of phosphate of ammonia should manure as much ground as four barrels of sulphate of ammonia; because the former possesses in its make-up two essentials, phosphorus as well as nitrogen.

The supplying of phosphorus, the third form of plant-food mentioned by

Prof. Summerville, is not so easily accomplished, and here it is that Mr. Willson's industry is of the greatest promise. Hitherto, it has been supplied mostly by super-phosphate of lime, obtained by treating phosphatic rock with sulphuric acid; and by basic slag, which as most people know, is a by-product of the manufacture of steel from the phosphorus. In making steel the phosphorus has to be eliminated, and this is done by blowing air through the molten iron until all the phosphorus is converted into phosphoric acid by association with lime and this is then taken off as phosphatic lime in the slag on the surface of the melted metal. This is subsequently ground into powder and applied to the land as manure. All of these articles of fertilizer have been used in this Colony, more or less, but Mr. Willson's claim is that his product, phosphate of ammonia, will in due course, and at no distant date, supersede the other elements altogether, in most cases where artificial fertilizers are used.

It is clear, then, that there is ample ground for believing that this project can become a commercial success. Mr. Willson proposes to crush phosphate rock, extract the phosphoric acid therefrom, combine it with lime and ammonia, and thereby produce a material that will meet the requirements of the world in this respect to a degree not otherwise possible. Moreover, the war is providing a reason for the creation of this enterprise which might not otherwise exist. At the present time, the chief area whence phosphate rock is obtained, is the western shore of the Florida Peninsula, fronting on the Gulf of Mexico. Here there are numerous beaches of pebbles, somewhat like our beaches in Conception Bay, which pebbles are termed phosphate rock. Steam shovels are put to work on them and the material is scooped up and thrust into

the holds of steamers and then it is taken to localities where factories are established, and the rock is crushed and the phosphoric acid extracted. The only other place it appears where phosphate rock exists in anything like similar quantity, is in Northern Africa, in the territory now controlled by France. Thus the argument is advanced in some quarters that one outcome of the war will be that the German potash and basic slag industries, as fertilizer products, will be wiped out after the struggle, because on the one hand Britain is planning to use a higher grade of iron ore from Brazil, which does not yield as much phosphorus and therefore will leave less basic slag as a by-product, consequently giving room for a greater supply of materials, such as Mr. Willson proposes to manufacture, and, on the other hand, because the policy of both France and England will likely be after the war to discourage trade with Germany as much as possible. Indeed, so much is this realized that American technical journals are making a protest against the United States continuing to permit the unrestricted export of pulp wood, on the ground that if the raw material is retained at home domestic manufactures will be greatly stimulated. It is apparent, however, with regard to the local industry proposed under this bill that if, which is unlikely at present, the United States were to stop its export of phosphate rock, other material of equally good quality could be obtained from Northern Africa and the industry therefore be permanently assured in that way.

Moreover, in addition to the making of fertilizer, which is the principal feature of the enterprise, it is also proposed to manufacture wood pulp of a very superior quality, for use in making books, as compared with that which is at present made in the Col-

ony at Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls, and which is used for ordinary newspaper. Besides that, it is likewise in contemplation to undertake the manufacture of cement from the waste material from the output of the furnaces, and I believe it is estimated that about 8,500 barrels daily of the finest cement could be produced from this waste material at the West Coast plant, which is about three times the output of the largest cement-making factory in Canada to-day, that at Ottawa. Indeed, the mere item of making barrels for such a quantity of cement would be an industry of great magnitude in itself, probably equaling the whole of our present lumbering industry. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that in the conversion of coal into coke, certain by-products are available which are coming into more general use lately. One of these is toluol, which we have read and heard much about latterly, owing to its being an ingredient in the manufacture of high explosives for use in torpedoes and great guns. Toluol is a white liquid somewhat like gasoline, but produced at a different temperature, and this toluol, when properly treated by mixing it with strong acids and by other processes, turns into small clear crystals of enormous explosive power, but only explodable by the use of special contrivances, thus making it very safe to store and handle qualities of special value in war time. As many of our readers know, toluol is now being made at the coke ovens of the Dominion Steel Company's plant at Sydney and with other ingredients to form tri-nitro-toluolene, is being every day more largely utilized by the British and other armies for explosive purposes. It is not impossible that this may also be made at the West Coast works.

The next question which arises then, it seems to me, is whether Mr. Willson is a man likely to bring such projects

to a successful issue. In this connection I might say that a gentleman in this Colony, a member of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, has recently sent me a copy of a publication of that Society for last year, wherein is reported at length a paper "Making our Water Powers Valuable," by Mr. Arthur Surveyer, in which that observer deals exhaustively with the various uses to which energy derived in this fashion is applicable. Among the products so obtainable, he mentions calcium carbide, which will be one of the principal elements in the manufacture of the proposed phosphate of ammonia in this Colony, and as to that he says "the industry of calcium carbide was started in 1895, with Mr. Willson, of Ottawa, as one of the pioneers. There are now over fifty plants situated all over the world capable of absorbing 350,000 h.p. in their operation, and the world's production of calcium carbide for 1910 was 250,000 tons; it was 300,000 tons in 1912; and it increased to 340,000 in 1913. The principal exporting countries are Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and United States, the latter producing in 1913 70,000 tons and exporting 15,000 tons mostly to South and Central Africa, where the demand for acetylene house lighting is rapidly increasing. Germany, England, Australia and the South American republics are chief importers of this product, while Canada, with three plants produces about 12,000 tons a year, half of which is exported, these three plants having been recently merged under the name of The Canadian Carbide Company with a capital of two million dollars." Of this Company Mr. Willson is, I understand, the President, and it is said he proposes it to make its base of operations in Newfoundland. There is much matter of interest in throwing new light upon this contemplated fertilizer enterprise in the paper in

question and in the discussion thereon by a number of other students of this problem but it is unnecessary that I should read pages of such matter at the present time. What I have quoted will, I think, suffice to show that in the present instance we are not dealing with a mere company promoter who has come along to try and get a concession from us to farm out to somebody else, as has been unfortunately too often our experience in the past. Mr. Willson, judging from his record, is a scientist of repute, with a business capacity and experience, the outcome of many years of association with large commercial enterprises in America and Canada, and therefore we may take it that in coming here with this project he means business.

It being therefore very evident that this enterprise is both feasible and likely to be commercially profitable, the next question that arises is, what concessions is this Colony asked to give in order to secure the establishment of such an enterprise within its borders. These concessions, in the shape of certain rights on the West Coast, in the shape, at the outset, of other rights on the East Coast since abandoned; and in the shape of rights on Labrador, have been discussed in such detail in the other Chamber, and through the newspapers that it is unnecessary for me to devote much attention to them here. I will content myself with merely saying, as I remarked at the outset, that we have not given, in this island itself, at any rate, either lands or water powers or any other public assets to the Company. All we have done is to provide legal processes by which the Company can acquire lands, water powers, or other rights held to be essential to the establishing of the enterprises, when in the opinion of the Governor in Council it is necessary that the Company should have these.

On Labrador, it is true, we have given rights to a water power in Hamilton Inlet that has been made the subject of criticism, but while that water power may in time attain the value which some parties set upon it, the fact remains that at present there is no evidence of any prospect of such a water power in such a remote locality being commercially exploited, and unless this Company is able to extend its operations to Labrador, it is very doubtful if that water power will be turned to commercial use in our time. Moreover it must be remembered that operations on Labrador are not likely to be attempted until this enterprise proves a paying one in Newfoundland, and that even if they are successful in Newfoundland it by no means follows that the Company will be prepared to go to Labrador at some future time, though the Colony is certain to gain the benefit of a proper survey of the Hamilton Inlet area in the meantime under the terms of the contract, which material may be of value at some future date as a factor in negotiating a contract for some other purpose.

Among the criticisms directed at the present Bill is the fact that the Company has freedom from taxation. That, I think, all of us would prefer to see eliminated from the measure, but apparently such could not be got, and that being so the question the Government had to ask themselves was whether they would sacrifice the project or grant this concession. They chose the latter course, and in justification for them, it must be remembered that the Anglo-American Telegraph Company got such a concession nearly sixty years ago, and that the Blackman contract; the Reid contract; and the Harmsworth contract, of more recent years all contained similar provisions.

Another complaint is that the Com-

pany is exempt from the municipal taxation on its mills and town sites. That, too, would be very desirable not to have in the measure, but the same difficulty arose. The Company claimed similar exemptions to those granted previous contractors contemplating enterprises amongst us, and the Government took the view that it was better to grant such concessions and ensure, as far as could possibly be ensured, the establishment of this industry here. Moreover, with regard to this feature of the matter it must not be forgotten that any Company of this kind locating in Newfoundland will have to build its own town and provide its own municipal facilities if it hopes to secure men to work in its mills. The Harmsworths had to do it, as I have already pointed out. They went into the wilderness to establish an industry calling for a certain amount of highly-technical labor and operatives from large American centres where every modern improvement incident to living in up-to-date towns existed. Therefore, to retain these men the Harmsworth Company had to bring out an eminent English municipal architect, who planned the town of Grand Falls. They had to provide houses of a class superior, taken all in all, to those in any other part of the country outside St. John's. Next they had to bring out an eminent English bacteriologist to study the whole problem of the water supply when a typhoid epidemic occurred, and this involved in time, the installation of a system of sand filtration and hydrochloric treatment of all the water used in that town. I say, therefore, that if this Company comes in and establishes its industry, it will be obliged to create a town out of nothing, with all the accessories that go to make modern existence endurable—good houses, waterage and sewerage, electric lighting, hospitals, schools,

club rooms and places of amusement.

However, as we all now know very well, the measure was thoroughly thrashed out in all its details in the Lower House; various and important amendments were made from day to day; and as it lies before us we may take it as being the finished product of the deliberations of the best minds in that Chamber, working for the past six weeks to turn out a measure that should adequately safeguard the interests of the Colony, while at the same time giving the promoters of this Company every reasonable facility to carry on their operations. Consequently we have accepted it in that light, and seem prepared to approve it without virtually any alterations. In this I think we are doing wisely in the interest of the Colony whose well being should be our chief concern. This project, if it takes shape cannot but benefit our country and our people. Its promoters cannot achieve success without our working classes benefitting also, and the greater the success of the venture the more must the workers benefit. Therefore I close by wishing well to this enterprise and those who are launching it, because I believe that thereby our island home and those who inhabit it must gain greater and more assured prosperity than heretofore.

HON. J. D. RYAN.—I would like to say a few words in connection with the measure. We have listened with much interest to the last speaker in the way in which he has put the matter before us, and we all hope, at any rate I hope, the venture will be a great success, and so will the country because it is of such magnitude. I hope the promoters will meet with great success. But there is one serious matter in connection with it, that we are depriving the country of any similar undertaking which may come for the next 99 years. It is fair to

give to all companies a certain number of years in which to develop their industries, but the time is coming when we should look ahead, and ask ourselves are we doing justice to those who come after us. A few years ago we had the Marconi business introduced here, and owing to the monopoly of another Company we were deprived of the benefits of that Company. There was a monopoly here which deprived the Marconi Company from doing anything here. That monopoly is gone, and the Marconi people are doing business now, but unfortunately not with us here in St. John's. While I am in entire sympathy with the provisions of the Bill, there is one clause which I would ask the House to seriously consider—clause 17—which gives the Company a monopoly of 99 years. We are undertaking too much for the future of the country, so that I beg leave to move that the Bill be read this day 6 months.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—The Bill which we have been considering, the Products Bill, has been so admirably and exhaustively referred to by Hon. Mr. McGrath, that it seems unnecessary to add anything else. At the same time it might be said with regard to it, and indeed it is so important, and the business which it is expected will be undertaken in the Bill is so vast, that it is deserving of the very fullest consideration of the hon. members here, and it has been to me, as representing the Government particularly pleasing to note the attitude of all regarding the Bill, down to the last five minutes. While recognizing the rights of course of the hon. gentleman who last spoke, I exceedingly regret that he should have felt impelled to move that this Bill should lie on the table for six months. Not since the Harnsworth Bill, so called, was considered here, have we had a bill of such magnitude, or affecting business

of such magnitude, and no bill since that has received the discussion given this Bill in the lower branch of the Legislature. It has been discussed from every standpoint; has been criticised day after day for some time before reaching this chamber. Practically no bill has ever been discussed here more important to the future of Newfoundland than this Products Bill. It is not often that we are called on to deal with bills involving the expenditure of millions of dollars, and now when such an advanced enterprise is projected, and we are asked to make concessions to the Company who purpose to come here and spend such vast sums of money, the attitude of certain people, not in this chamber, has been such as to be exceedingly regrettable to all lovers of this country. I can quite understand why any man with proper patriotism would be anxious to see that no concessions should be given, and no terms be permitted which would bear heavily on the Colony and its interests, and on future generations, but, sir, I submit, with all due deference, that there is nothing remaining in this Bill which any honest man, I mean any honest critic, can justly object to. The concessions, first of all, as has been explained by Hon. Mr. McGrath, as regards the water powers in this country, Junction Brook, is a matter with which the Government had nothing whatever to do. These were conveyed to the Reid Newfoundland Company by a former Government, and I am not concerned with the actions of that Government in conveying those water powers. The present Bill merely confirms the transfer of those water powers. As regards the timber areas, the Colony or the Government has nothing to do with that. We do give them the right to quarry limestone which has lain there for centuries, and has yielded nothing to the Colony, and never will, unless

this Company or some other comes and develops an enterprise there. The concession of freedom from taxation as has been shown by Hon. Mr. McGrath, amounts to nothing, because if these people lay out a town they must of necessity give such conditions there as will induce people to reside there, and which will be in keeping with modern civilization. If they want those conveniences they must provide them themselves, and it is a matter of no consequence to this country whether they are free from municipal taxation or not. We have heard a great deal, Mr. President, about the enormous concessions conveyed, but we all know very well that no Company will come in here and spend enormous sums of money unless they get reasonable protection and concessions, but if sir, what we are now conveying to the Products Company is half as valuable as some persons would make us believe, surely we will have no longer to wait for capitalists to come to this country and develop every resource we possess. The water power on Labrador, the Hamilton River, flowing there for centuries and centuries, better known in the Dominion of Canada, if not in the United States than here, is idle, and yet until within the last few months, no one has been around there or thought it worth visiting to see what could be developed there. In saying that no one has visited the Muskrat Falls powers, or the powers on the Hamilton River, I mean with the idea of establishing any considerable enterprise there. It is true, however, that a water power right was given to a party on the Muskrat Falls—an exclusive right was given some years ago by a previous Government—but we all know nothing has been done there, no enterprise started there or anything done to improve that water power. With those who talk

about sacrificing the rights of the country I have no patience, and I consider that those who state that the water powers which are being conveyed to this Company are worth one hundred and fifty millions of dollars are fit subjects for an insane asylum. If this Company are getting concessions to establish a business from which they are going to obtain enormous profits, and the expenditure of enormous sums of money presupposes that there will be profits, why should they not have them? What will be lost by their gain? Nothing whatever, I submit; but their success must be ours. They cannot make large revenues out of handling the products of this country without this Colony obtaining direct benefit. The attitude, however, of opponents of the measure, I repeat, does not extend to the members of this House, and it is very gratifying to me that it has not. I consider that it should be a proud day for Newfoundland when the first sod is turned for the laying down of the plant projected by the Newfoundland Products Corporation, and I for one wish it all the success it can obtain.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I had not meant to say anything on this third reading, but would like to refer to the position, with which anyone can sympathize, taken by Hon. Mr. Ryan. Mr. Ryan is afraid of the effect of this development on future generations, frightened at the ninety-nine years' lease. Well, there is much to be said for that point of view, but with future generations in our memory we must also consider this point—that the best thing to do to help future generations is to cause direct development to-day, to bring in wealth and prosperity to-day, to provide means for educating and looking after posterity, and as my hon. friend on my right has stated, if we allow our assets to run to seed, and if we allow them to lie idle year after

year, we are not doing our duty to posterity; and my view is that while I sympathize with that position, it is purely a matter of judgment whether to develop now or gamble on the chance of development in the future, for it is a gamble. We do not know what other countries may develop, or what may happen if we do not develop now, and our duty calls for the exercise of every effort for development, not only in the interest of the people of to-day, but of posterity itself, which these gentlemen are so much exercised about, though not wisely, I think.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Squires, the debate on this measure was adjourned until to-morrow afternoon.

PROHIBITION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee on the Prohibition Bill, Hon. Mr. Winter in the chair.

HON. J. D. RYAN—The amendment I suggested at the last meeting in section 24, I now beg to withdraw.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was then read a third time, passed, and a message sent to the Lower House that this House had passed the same with some amendment.

REVENUE BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee on the Revenue Act, Hon. Mr. Milley being in the chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—Mr. Chairman, before the passing of the Revenue Bill I wish in the first place to make a few observations on the Financial Policy of the Government, and in the second place to give our people an idea of the financial strength of the four great banking institutions that are doing the business of the Colony.

and its trade and commerce. Like other parts of the Empire, this Colony has suffered very considerably since the war began—not so much in our exports, but our imports have fallen off considerably. I congratulate the Government on placing the duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem on a large quantity of goods that were on the free list.

Under normal conditions of Exports and Imports, I believe the Government will come out at the end of their fiscal year 1914 with a small surplus. This, of course, will entirely depend upon our imports, and the markets abroad.

Mr. Chairman, in looking over the Revenue and Expenditure for the past few years, as explained in the Lower House by the Hon. Minister of Finance, we find the following: Figures at any time are dry and weary to listen to, but I think we should take sufficient interest in this House of the financial affairs of the country, although this House spends very little time over finance.

Mr. Chairman, I have great faith in the Old Land yet. In the crisis which the whole British Empire is passing through, as well as other parts of the world, this country has nobly played a proud part. What we want at the present time throughout the land is greater sympathy and unity amongst our people. Let us all work together for the common welfare and prosperity of Newfoundland. Good normal conditions of trade, I hope, will soon dawn upon the country. Our whole season for the codfishery is still before us. Let us earnestly hope that when the season is over our fishermen will be abundantly blessed with a big catch at good prices.

I also hope, Mr. Chairman, when the Great War is over—when the whole world will begin to realize the awful loss of life and devastation—that we in this part of the British Empire will

have nothing to regret—that we tried at least to do our little bit. To carry on the Government of this Colony, especially during the continuation of this war, it was found necessary to put on extra duties, but I am sure when the world is again at peace with all mankind, and the trade and commerce of this Colony is normal, the Government will have a thorough revision of the Tariff adjusted to suit all classes of our people.

Fiscal Year 1913-14—

Expenditure \$3,928,178
Estimated Expenditure 1914-15—

To the end of June—

Current \$4,614,970
Estimated Expenditure on

New Estimates—

Anticipated, 1915-16 . . . \$4,672,000
Increase of Expenditure in

1914-15 over 1913-14 . . . 86,792
Increased Expenditure 1914-15, as estimated 1915-16, \$57,030, or a decrease of \$29,752 against 1913-14.

Fiscal Year 1913-14—

Total Expenditure \$3,928,178
Total Revenue 3,618,328

Deficit \$309,850

Fiscal Year 1914-15, closing 30th June present—

Estimated Expenditure . . . \$4,614,970
Estimated Revenue 3,300,578

Deficit \$714,392

Or a total Deficit 1913, 1914, 1915, of \$1,024,242.

To meet this Deficit the Reserve to the credit of the Colony in the Bank of Montreal will be applied, \$500,000; and a loan to be consolidated with the funded debt of the Colony of \$524,000. Total, \$1,024,000.

On the 1st July the Government will start with a clean slate with an estimated Revenue of \$4,672,000; and an Estimated Expenditure of \$4,672,000.

NORMAL CONDITIONS OF TRADE.

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Surplus.
1909-10	\$1,447,988	\$1,137,774	\$310,214
1910-11	3,527,128	3,354,746	172,380
1911-12	3,736,456	3,524,653	211,803
1912-13	3,919,440	3,803,561	115,879
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$14,630,619	\$13,826,734	\$803,874
Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Deficit.
1913-14	3,618,328	\$3,928,178	\$309,850
1914-15, estimated	3,500,578	4,014,970	714,392
1915-16, estimated	4,072,000	4,072,000	
			<hr/>
			\$1,024,242

Total Imports 1912-13, \$16,012,365.

Dutiable, \$9,272,730. Free List, \$4,739,635. Total, \$16,012,365.

Average Revenue, 1915-16 under normal conditions from all sources:

Revenue	\$2,750,000
Free List, \$1,500,000, 10 per cent, and 10 per cent surtax	165,000
Estimated from other sources on the Free List, Stamps, etc.	175,000
	<hr/>
	\$4,990,000

Mr. Chairman, this is a wonderful recuperative country—how losses are made—how the people take them, and how we are to-day.

Take the great fire of 1892, take the Bank Crash of 1894, and add to this the loss made upon the Whaling Industry. Three great calamities, one coming shortly after the other. Let us have a look at the estimated loss, and the savings of our people in the banks and other investments:

Estimated Loss by the people of this City in the Great Fire of 1892	\$10,000,000
The Financial Crisis, 1894, Union and Commercial Bank	3,087,500
	<hr/>
	\$13,087,500

Within two years this City and the Colony suffered a loss of over thirteen million dollars. Add to the above

amount \$1,500,000 which was lost in the Whaling Industry, making a total of fourteen millions, five hundred and eighty-seven thousand, five hundred dollars. Loss, \$14,587,500.

SAVINGS OF THE PEOPLE.

Govt. Savings Bank	\$2,452,722.95
Other Banks of the Colony	6,187,985.49
Deposited at Interest	2,723,958.19
Govt. Debenture held by people of the Colony.	3,894,218.64
Estimated Gold, etc., in possession of people of the Colony	2,500,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$17,709,895.27

Securities held by the Colony last year on account of Life Insurance were \$1,688,480.00

In addition to advances made upon Life Policies there must be over \$5,000,000 cash surrendered value due to the people of the Colony on Life Insurance

\$5,000,000.00

\$22,709,895.27

Making a total of Twenty-Two Million, Seven Hundred and Nine Thousand, Eight Hundred and Ninety-Five Dollars.

Mr. Chairman, for the past twenty years—there is not a shadow of a

doubt—the Canadian Banks doing business in this City and the Outports, have played a very important part in the material development of our country. Since last August—when the War broke out—the Banks have in every way that it was possible to do so, assisted and carried the Trade through a very trying per-

iod of our Country's history. Let us have a hurried glance at the great wealth these vast financial institutions that handle the Products of our Island, and the harvest of the sea.

Take the Bank of Montreal with its branch banks in Curling and Grand Falls.

LAST HALF-YEARLY STATEMENT, 1915.

Assets	\$289,562,678.08
Capital	\$15,900,000.00
Reserve and Profits	17,252,864.40
	<hr/> 23,252,864.40

The Canadian Bank of Commerce,—

GENERAL STATEMENT, 1914.

Assets	\$245,264,298.64
Capital	\$15,000,000.00
Reserve and Balance Profits	14,617,763.27
	<hr/> \$29,617,763.27

The Royal Bank of Canada with its West End Branch, and a Branch Bank in Trinity.

GENERAL STATEMENT, 1914.

Assets	\$179,494,054.26
Capital	\$11,560,000.00
Reserve	12,560,000.00
	<hr/> \$24,120,000.00

The Bank of Nova Scotia with its Branch Banks in Bay Roberts, Bell Island, Bonaville, Bonne Bay, Brigus, Burin, Carbonar, Fogo, Grand Bank Harbor, Greens, Twillingate, Wesleyville and Channel.

GENERAL STATEMENT, 1914.

Assets	\$95,732,676.63
Capital	12,201,957.84
Reserve and Undivided Profits	5,589,995.00
	<hr/>

\$18,791,957.84

Let the people of this Colony ponder over the combined Assets of these four Banks of the Dominion of Canada doing business in this city, amounting to \$805,983,786.88.

Let Depositors and the whole country interested in our Trade and Commerce ponder over the combined Capital and Reserve of four of Canada's largest Banks of \$106,671,490.53.

Add to this the Deposits of our own

people in the Government Savings Bank, and the Deposits in the City Banking Institutions, amounting to \$11,405,676.63, and ask yourself the question: Have we in this country, and as a small nation, been financially mesmerised during the past twenty years by the progress and development of banking in this Colony?

These Banks during the past twenty years have played a very real part in

the development of our country and its trade.

Over twenty years ago the whole trade was managed by two Banks— to-day we have twenty-one doing a general banking business in different parts of the Island.

As the sole surviving Trustee of the late Commercial Bank I feel it a duty I owe to the Creditors and to myself.

and as a record to put before them a statement through this House of the final winding up.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to make a speech this afternoon, nor yet do I intend to give a historical review of my experience as a Trustee of the late Commercial Bank for the past thirteen years, but simply submit a general financial statement to the Creditors of the country.

ESTATE COMMERCIAL BANK. BALANCE SHEET, 30th JUNE, 1894

Half yearly statement upon which the last dividend was paid. 4½ per cent dividend and 1 per cent bonus. 5½ per cent. on a capital of £200,000.00—\$16,820.00.

		DR.	
To Balance			\$920,317.55
Real Estate	\$ 82,020.56		
Investments	235,928.80		\$397,965.36
Adjusting Interest		5,826.63	
Past Du Bills		22,821.20	
New Counters		5,992.00	
Suspense Ist account		5,000.00	
Heating and Plumbing		5,000.00	
Repairs to Bkg. House		22,000.00	
Architect's Fees		2,100.00	
British Bills		43,290.00	
Interest Bills		20,452.02	
Local Bills		128,005.04	
Current Accounts		1,820,566.44	
Union Bank of Halifax		2,565.04	
E. Moritz & Co.		12,044.20	
Bank of Liverpool, Ap. ac.		22,100.00	
J. & N. Phillips & Co.		574.00	
			1,925,822.78
			\$3,244,115.09
To Balance		\$920,317.55	
Explanation:—			
Cross Entry Notes on Hand		\$770,791.00	
Gold, Silver, Cheques and Notes of other Banks		149,516.55	
		\$920,317.55	
			\$1,299,612.00
			410,000.00
			\$1,299,612.00
By Notes on Hand		\$770,791.00	
By Notes in Circulation		527,911.00	
Capital		200,000.00	
Reserve		110,000.00	
		\$1,299,612.00	

Real Estate	7,885.07	
Profits and Loss	12,118.76	
Adjusting Premiums	59,254.05	
Rebate Account	1,400.00	
Contingent Fund	78,559.49	
Dividend 75 and Bonus	18,830.00	
Deposit Receipts	437,827.75	
Interest on Deposits	8,536.47	
Union Bank of Newfoundland	47,800.00	
Savings Bank	428,409.32	
London and Westminster Bank	308,421.58	
Bank of Liverpool	97,582.94	
Merchants Bank of Canada	4,844.12	
Ntl. Bank of Republic	11,909.55	
Atlas National Bank	932.72	
Union Bank of Halifax	42.37	
Merchants Bank of Canada	1,290.99	
Ontario Bank	125.59	
Molson's Bank	102.69	
Canada's Bank of Commerce	348.25	
New York Produce Exchange	583.23	
Mftrs. Ntl. Bank	77.28	
Bank Des Isles	1,805.91	
Austin Nichols & Co.	2,174.98	
Libby, McNeill & Co.	232.00	
J. J. Langley	102.53	
		<u>\$1,528,503.69</u>
		<u>\$2,244,155.69</u>

First summarized statement of estate of the Commercial Bank of Newfoundland presented on December 19th, 1904, by the late Trustees shows a shortage of Four Hundred and Seventy-Seven Thousand, Eight Hundred and Sixty-Seven Dollars and Four Cents (\$477,867.94), and on this statement shows 83½ cents to the Dollar.

LIABILITIES.

To amount Newfoundland Savings Bank ..		B436,780.75
Notes in Circulation	B614,552.00	
Amount due customers on Current ac.	B992,227.81	
Amt. due Depositors and Int. thereon	B292,782.45	
Amount due on exchange	B546,985.53	
		<u>\$2,460,548.79</u>
		<u>\$2,897,329.54</u>

First Valuation of Assets shows 83½ cents to the Dollar.

ASSETS.

By Special in Treasury		C23,747.69
Notes of other Banks		3,103.06
Nfld. Government Debentures	47,164.99	
Bank Premiums and Real Estate as valued by the Directors	40,000.00	

Local Bills discounted and not yet due	145,924.75	
Amount due by Morris & Co.	21,906.41	
Exchange remitted to the London and West. Bank on special act, for collection	21,925.96	
Amts. due by customers on current account	12,112,659.62	
*Balance due from G. Griener & Co.	19.93	
		2,392,611.74
		\$2,419,462.56

THIS STATEMENT SHOWS THE CONDITION OF THE BANK AS PREPARED BY THE MANAGER.

DR.

Balance Sheet 31st Dec., 1894, including all Entries in Cash Book up to the 12th, including Jan. 12th, 1895.

To Balance		\$476,961.74
Real Estate, 2nd Account	61,586.56	
Investments	236,228.89	
		\$557,925.26
Real Estate	32,296.93	
Past Due Bills	23,711.29	
Duckworth St. property	5,999.00	
British Bills	72,941.43	
Intercolonial Bills	1,292.53	
Local Bills	143,269.26	
Adjusting Interest	5,946.63	
Current Accounts	1,324,996.45	
Union Bank of Halifax	2,515.74	
Natl. Bank of Dep.	1,585.77	
Atlas Bdtl. Bank	44.79	
E. Morris & Co.	11,245.28	
G. Griener & Co.	19.93	
Trustees Coml. Bank	282.60	
		\$2,225,274.18
		\$2,399,262.28
To Balance	\$476,961.74	
Explanation:—		
Cross Entry Notes on Hand	\$671,211.60	
Gold and Silver	4,550.74	
		\$675,961.74

The Bank Building which cost ab ut \$50,000 was sold May 4th, 1897, for \$19,100

*This amount was over remitted to Griener just before the Crash, and was returned by them 4th May, 1895.

	Ch.	
By Notes on Hand	\$671,211.00	
Notes in Circulation	638,401.00	
	<hr/>	\$1,309,612.00
Capital	206,000.00	
Reserve	110,000.00	
Profit and Loss	418,000.00	
	129,340.98	
Adjusting Premiums	72,561.00	
Deposit Receipts	405,588.34	
Interest on Receipts	10,000.00	
Union Bank of Newfoundland	59,273.68	
London and Westminster Bank	351,949.64	
Bank of Liverpool	116,610.49	
Merc. Bank of Canada	2,780.20	
Union Bank of Halifax	790.24	
Merc. Bank Can. Col. ac.	2,488.14	
Merc. Bank Canada, Galt	1,399.00	
Merc. Bank Canada, Ottawa	146.89	
Merc. Bank Canada, Berlin	284.05	
Molson's Bank Canada, Montreal	263.30	
Ontario Bank, Peterboro	656.00	
Ontario Bank, Montreal	1,127.10	
La Bank National (du Peuple)	80.00	
Bank of Hamilton	75.00	
Canadian Bank Commerce, Mont.	3,564.96	
Canadian Bank Commerce, Tor.	122.88	
New York Produce Exchange	85.34	
Bank des Isles	1,097.08	
Eaton, Cole and Burnham	68.74	
Austin Nichols and Co.	291.75	
Clydesdale Bank	241.47	
Consolidated Bank	177.50	
Hopkins, Casser & H.	93.35	
J. J. Langley	1,196.63	
Nat. Prov. Bank England	539.15	
Quebec Bank	2,688.05	
Scholesfield Goodm.	1,123.20	
Canada Bank Co., Guelph	1,920.00	
Canada Bank Com., Galt	25.00	
Gordon and Keith	195.75	
J.E. Morse and Co.	133.69	
Tower Mfct. Co.	1.80	
L.J. Mott, Iron Works	137.96	
Gilbert and Sheridan	514.61	
Fourth Nat. Bank	236.28	
J.A. Horsey and Son	69.97	
John Matthews Appr. Co.	10.31	
United States Mfg. Co.	174.59	

Whitall Tatum and Co.	8.00	
Blackstone Nat Bank	22.00	
Bank d'Hochelaga	100.00	
Jacobs and Dunovitch	163.40	
National Ex. Bank	70.35	
Merchant Bank Canada, Ont.	11.64	
Standard Bank Canada	23.53	
Trader's Bank	34.92	
Sterling Machine Co.	125.00	
Boston Natl. Bank	22.15	
H.A. Johnson and Co.	142.07	
		\$1,168,970.53
Savings Bank		414,780.75
		<u>\$1,583,751.28</u>

SECOND SUMMARIZED STATEMENT, 31st DECEMBER, 1896.
RECEIPTS.

C. To amount of Specie on hand at failure	\$ 22,747.69
C. Notes on other Banks on hand 10th December, 1894	2,102.05
H. Exchange held by London and Western Bank on special account	21,749.62
G. Proceeds Estate Moritz and Co.	8,535.31
D. Proceeds Nfid. Debentures over and above those claimed by the London and Westminster Bank	27,164.99
Proceeds G. Gruener and Co.	19.33
E. Proceeds Real Estate and Rents thereon	22,372.77
I. Proceeds Current accounts	695,421.20
J. Proceeds Rent: from Bank Premises and other Real Estate	4,878.00
F. Proceeds Dishonored Local Bills	76,418.96
K. Proceeds Interest account	8,070.27
L. Proceeds Incidentals	652.08
M. Proceeds Duder's Mortgage	60,109.04
N. Proceeds Dishonoured Foreign Bills	4,499.50
	<u>\$975,485.78</u>

Showing balance in hand, \$572.09

DISBURSEMENTS.

By paid on ac. 1. Legal Expenses	\$ 5,078.70
2. Incidentals	5,465.34
3. Charges account	1,744.00
4. Postages and Telegrams	26.92
5. Rental account	1,735.44
6. Real Estate	787.18
7. Duder's Mortgage	4,968.17
8. Dividends paid Foreign Creditors	226,975.65

9. Dividends paid Local Creditors	134,719.02
10. Newfoundland Savings Bank	435,780.75
11. Dividends to Nfld Government on ac- count guaranteed notes	98,757.00
12. Salaries to Officers and Trustees	26,629.65
Deposits receipts in the Bank of Mont. Amount to Credit of current account in Bank of Montreal	23,000.00
Amount to Credit of first dividend ac- count Bank Montreal	1,504.91
Second Dividend	639.37
Third Dividend	623.23
Dividends paid on Commercial Bank Notes unregarded	470.36
Balance London and Western Bank spe- cial account	2,829.20
Balance on hand 31st December 1898. ...	183.38
	572.09
	<hr/>
	\$973,448.78

GENERAL STATEMENT.

To the Creditors of the Commercial Bank of Newfoundland.

I beg to submit for the information of the Creditors of the late Commercial Bank of St. John's, Nfld, the following information of the affairs of that Institution:

The Commercial Bank, suspended payment on the 10th of December, 1894, and by Acts 58 Vic., Cap. 3, it was enacted that it should be wound up, as and from that date. Section 4 provided for the vesting of the Assets and effects of the defunct Bank in three Trustees, one of whom was to be elected by its Shareholders, a second was to be appointed by the Supreme Court upon the nomination of the majority of the Creditors, and the third was to be appointed by the Governor in Council.

In January, 1895, the late James Fox was appointed by the Governor in Council as one of the Trustees. On the 31st of the same month, the late Maurice Fenelon was appointed as Trustee by the Shareholders of the Bank. In February, 1895, the late Robert L. Mare was nominated by the Creditors as Trustee, and such nomi-

ation was confirmed by the Supreme Court on the 19th of the said month. The late James P. Furlong was appointed in March, 1897, by the Shareholders, to succeed the late Maurice Fenelon.

LATE TRUSTEES.

Maurice Fenelon died on the 31st January, 1897, having occupied the position of Trustee for two years.

James P. Fox resigned his office of Trustee, and on February 27th, 1899, he died, remaining as Trustee for two years and nine months.

James P. Furlong died on the 9th of November, 1901, having served as Trustee for four years and eight months.

Robert L. Mare died in April, 1904, occupying the position of trustee for nine years and two months.

GOLD.

The Commercial Bank had in its Treasury at the commencement of their financial year, 1894, gold amounting to \$158,000. Of this amount \$142,820 was paid out prior to December 10th. The balance of \$15,180 was paid out to the Government Savings Bank.

SILVER.

During the financial year, 1894, the amount of silver which passed through the Treasury Department was \$30,740. The amount paid out was \$23,920, leaving a balance on the 10th of December of \$6,820, which amount was also paid out to the Government Savings Bank.

NOTES

The notes of the Bank in circulation on June 30th, 1894, amounted to \$527,911. From this date until the 10th December they increased to \$638,401. This amount was reduced by \$16,749, leaving the holders of the balance creditors to the amount of \$621,652, which is accounted for as follows:

Notes registered by the Government	\$574,345.00
Notes registered by Trustee Bank	20,231.00
Notes lost, etc.	27,076.00
	<hr/>
	\$621,652.00
Notes outstanding or lost	27,076.00
	<hr/>
Capital Commercial Bank	306,000.00
Reserve	110,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$416,000.00

LIABILITIES.

The late Trustees had great difficulty, due to the various complications of accounts, in arriving at the actual liability of the Bank. During my visits to England since my appointment as Trustee, I have given considerable time and attention to this matter, and I am pleased to be able to report that complications as to British accounts have now been adjusted. The London and Westminster Bank ranked as Creditors originally for £132,685 7 11 stg. This amount has since been decreased by realization of Hypothecated Securities, payments on bills of exchange, etc., by £65,946 9 5 stg. leaving them creditors now in the sum of £66,738 9 5 stg. There have also

been general reductions made in the claims of the Bank of Liverpool, London and County Banking Co., National Discount Co., Prescott, Dimsdale & Co. and others, as per statement I give you in detail further on. The amount of £10,429 6 10 stg. recovered by arrangement in London from three cargoes of fish pooled. I have traced and made the necessary reductions on the Bills of Exchange for final dividend. This was divided as follows:

Bank of British N.	
America	202 12 0stg.
Bank of Liverpool	2,611 2 1
C. T. Bowring, Liv. for Ayre & Sons	279 18 6
Ladenburg, Thalman & Co., New York	485 17 1
J. J. Langley, Liv.	141 6 9
London and Westminster Bank	4,379 10 6
Prescott, Dimsdale & Co.	967 18 4
General Mining Co.	41 3 3
Union Bank of Lon.	1,319 18 4
	<hr/>
	£10,429 6 10stg.

Gross Liabilities of the Commercial Bank when the Doors Closed Saturday, 8th Dec., 1894.

This does not include the portion of the indebtedness to the London and Westminster Bank, which was covered by Hypothecation of Newfoundland and British securities.

CREDITORS.

Current Account and Deposit Receipt	\$1,884,536.00
Notes in circulation	621,652.00
Govt. Savings Bank	436,780.75
Capital Shareholders	306,000.00
Reserve	110,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$3,358,968.75

Less Specie which was paid over to the Government Savings Bank:—

Dividends Paid the Following to Close	London and County Bank	9,222.91
Current Accounts and Exchange.	National Discount	3,224.00
Mark Alcock	Prowse, Hall and Morris	13,560.72
Bank of Liverpool	Govt. and Education	1,964.85
Rd. Foxlow		
Hannah Higgins		235,106.04

CREDITS TO GROSS LIABILITIES.

London and Westminster Bank	£121,140	1 11	45,191	12 6	65,728	9 6
(Afterwards increased to 122,095 1 11.)						
Reductions, 65,946 18 6.	Leaving the balance for final dividend at 65,728 9 5.					
	Claims		Reductions		Bal. for Div.	
Bank of Liverpool	52,117	11 0	8,899	12 10	43,217	19 2
Prescott, Dimsdale & Co.	19,021	2 0	967	15 6	18,053	4 6
National Discount Co.	10,385	12 6	3,200	0 0	7,005	12 6
London County Banking Co.	3,062	1 6	3,062	1 6	Settled	
London City and Midland Bank	5,502	19 9	2,000	0 0	3,502	19 8
C. T. Bennett, Bristol						
Prowse, Hall & Morris, London						
Exchange transferred to C. Bank	8,300	0 0	8,300	0 0	Settled	
General Mining Co.	3,503	12 0	41	2 3	3,464	8 9
Bank of British North America	5,095	2 6	202	12 0	4,892	11 6
J. J. Langley	2,904	10 2	141	8 9	2,762	9 6
	£247,501	1 1	97,957	7 4	149,543	13 9
At 4.86% to the Pound Stg.	\$1,204,505.13		476,725.85		727,779.28	
Ladenburg, Thalman & Co., N.Y.						
Exchange	49,828.41		16,072.64		24,753.67	
Union Bank of London and Union						
Bank, St. John's	183,888.97		8,480.80		157,408.17	
Ayre & Sons, Exchange	48,684.93		22,181.22		26,392.71	
Local			\$521,470.71			
			\$85,194.51			
	\$1,457,894.54		\$606,605.22		\$856,289.32	
Reductions					521,470.71	
Claim for Fifth Dividend					936,232.32	
					\$1,457,894.54	
Liabilities					\$1,457,894.54	
The above statement shows part of the work that had to be done in England, which caused considerable delay.						
The following Statement Shows the	Fox, Fenelon and Mare	\$769,393.83				
Collections and Disbursements	Fox, Mare and Furlong	81,556.47				
Collections.	Mare and Furlong	122,628.48				
December 10th, 1894, to Dec. 21st,						
1898, Collected by		\$973,488.78				

January 1st, 1899, to November 30th, 1904:	
Mare and Furlong	\$23,629.06
Mare, Furlong, Anderson ..	52,732.21
Mare and Anderson	1,594.19
Anderson	2,276.22

\$80,531.53

December 1st, 1904, to 1906:	
Anderson	\$45,145.41

Recapitulation	\$973,488.78
Recapitulation	80,531.53
Recapitulation	45,145.41

\$1,099,165.72

Adjustments:—	
Local	\$ 85,194.51
English, etc.	106,357.97
	<hr/>
	\$191,552.48

Bills of Exchange	\$415,112.74
	<hr/>
	\$606,665.22

ASSETS.

Cash Collections	\$1,099,165.72
Reductions	191,552.48
Reductions	415,112.74
	<hr/>
	\$1,705,830.94

DISBURSEMENTS.

Govt. Savings Bank	\$414,790.75
Reductions	191,552.48
Reductions	415,112.74
Dividend to Creditors—	
\$2,287,559.52 22 p.c.	503,263.09
\$2,287,559.52 ¼ p.c.	54,312.29
London, etc., dividend	25,196.06
Legal Expenses	28,128.94
Trustees Expenses	44,628.29
Rental Account	4,872.74
Salaries Account	15,527.67
Stationery Account	240.59
Incidentals and Sundries ..	8,592.99
Charged, Account	5,327.19
Preferential Account	4,050.00
Profit and Loss to close	203.83

\$1,705,830.94

I only propose to deal in detail with two amounts under the heading of Disbursements, that of Trustees Expenses and Preferential Accounts.

It will be remembered that a special Act to amend the Act 58 Vic, Cap. 2, was passed 4th July 1895 and by Section 4 of that Act the Provisional Trustees shall be paid \$1,500 for their services this amount to be apportioned among them as they shall agree.

Legal Expenses	\$36,421.52
Salaries	16,187.67
Charges account, etc.	14,982.67

Late Trustees and Remuneration for Services.

During the first 4 years from December 10th, 1894, to January 31st, 1898, an application was made on behalf of the Trustees to have the amount due to them as compensation for their services ascertained. In addition to the amount paid at this time to the Trustees it cost \$15,527.67 for salaries.

Amount collected in four years—\$973,488.78; of this sum \$769,303.82 had been collected up to the time of the death of Mr. Fenslon; \$81,556.48 between the time of Mr. Fenslon's death and the resignation of Mr. Fox, and the balance \$122,628.48 between Mr. Fox's resignation and the 31st December, 1898, on a basis of 2½ per cent commission amounted to \$24,327.22. Mr Fenslon died the first two years; the late Mr. Fox resigned after serving two years and nine months; late Mr. Mare was the whole of this time, four years, and the late James P. Furlong was only in office one year and eleven months. The question arose as to the basis upon which this amount should be distributed among the Trustees.

Two methods were suggested. One method was to distribute the amount rateable among the several Trustees according to the amounts realized

and collected during the respective periods of their tenure of office. The other was suggested by one of the Creditors represented on this application who proposed to distribute the Commission among the several Trustees on the basis of the length of time during which each Trustee held office. The Court carefully considered both methods and decided that in the present case the latter will be more equitable in its operation, but in making the distribution and following the method, we have not made it a matter of exact calculation, but we the Court, have practically accepted it as the basis for distribution. On this basis the amount payable to each of the Trustees will be as follows:

Jas. P. Fox, \$6,400, and for extra services \$2,400 or an average of \$3,100 a year for two years and nine months.

Maurice Fenelon, \$4,600, or an average of \$2,300 a year for two years.

Robert L. Mare, \$8,937.22 or an average of \$2,235 a year for four years.

Jas. P. Furlong, \$4,400, or an average of \$2,200 a year for one year and eleven months.

Total collections from Dec., 1894, to Dec, 1909, \$1, 109,233 in 15 years. You will note that in four years \$973,488.78 was collected, and that it took eleven years with more work, worry and trouble to collect \$136,744.22. Of this latter amount Mare and Furlong collected \$23,629. Mare, Furlong and Anderson, \$52,732.21, Mare and Anderson, \$1,894.10, Anderson, \$48,488.91. This last amount was collected after the death of the late Mr. Mare from accounts that had been overlooked both at home and abroad which were impossible for the late Trustees to get at without being in England. In my opinion one of the Trustees should have gone to England, at least once

in every two years in the interest of the Bank.

Trustees Expenses	\$44,628.39
Add	139.15
	<hr/>
	\$44,767.54

Bal. to credit of Dividend	
Account	\$19,406.44
Late Jas. P. Fox	5,600.00
Late Maurice Fenelon	4,600.00
Late Jas. P. Furlong	5,901.10
Late R. L. Mare	11,260.00
John Anderson	4,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$44,767.54

Cash Collections per statement on November 27th, 1906:

This amount	\$1,099,165.72
Extra Collections be-	
tween 1907-1909	1,067.28
	<hr/>
	\$1,100,233.00

Late Jas. P. Fox	\$ 8,600.00
Late Maurice Fenelon	4,600.00
Late Jas. P. Furlong	5,901.10
Late R. L. Mare	11,260.00
John Anderson	4,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$34,361.10

The commission paid Trustees has been a little over 2 per cent. on gross collections covering a period of twenty years.

On November 27th, 1906.

Estimated Preferential Account of Liquidation, \$4,980.

Wages	\$1300.00
Rent of Office	740.00
Telephone	80.00
Water Rates	45.00
Advertising, etc.	250.00
Stationery, Stamps, etc.	65.00
Janitor for Office	150.00
Labor Office, etc., and out-	
standing amts. due	200.00

Outstanding Legal Bills, and other expenses for final winding up and other	
Legal Expenses	1250.00

\$4080.00

ASSETS.

Commercial Bank for Fifth Dividend.

Cash:	
Bank of Montreal, St. John's	
London and Int.	\$38,445.62
Pescott, Dimsdale & Co., Bristol overpaid dividend 136 10 7	664.44
London and Westminster Bank, London, Overpaid dividend 106 6 7	488.26
National Discount Co., London, overpaid dividend, 106	321.20
Bank of Montreal, dividend, Account	133.34
Bank of Montreal, Current Account	672.58
Cash on Hand	129.34
Dividend on notes registered	92.12
Estimated value office furniture, etc., per valuation P. C. O'Driscoll	385.16

\$41,332.04

Amount Required to Pay Dividend 1½ Per Cent.

The notes were guaranteed by the Government 20 cents to the dollar. The Bank has paid 23½ per cent. to the fifth dividend.

Assets, November, 1906.

Per statement for fifth dividend Ordinary and Preferential Creditors this amount, \$41,332.04.

Amount required to pay dividend of 1½ per cent.

Unclaimed dividend cheques per list	\$2,421.74
Unclaimed dividend on Notes registered by Trustees	
Commercial Bank	516.91
Preferential	4,080.00

\$7,018.65

Ordinary Creditors for fifth dividend on \$2,287,559.52 at 1½ per cent.	34,313.39
---	-----------

\$41,332.04

Cost of Liquidation.

Commercial Bank, St. John's, Nfld. From December 10th, 1894, to December 16th, 1906, 12 years.

Legal Expenses	\$6,179.39
Legal Expenses	28,126.98
	<hr/>
	\$34,306.37
Trustee acct.	44,628.39
Rental acct.	4,872.74
Salaries acct.	15,527.67
Stationery acct.	340.59
Incidental Expenses	8,592.99
Charges acct.	5,327.19
Preferential acct.	4,080.00
Profit and Loss	203.88

\$117,881.83

Cash Collections \$1,099,165.72

Creditors Profit and Loss Account.

Liabilities, \$2,942,968.75.	
Savings Bank, paid in full	436,780.75
Reductions on accounts	191,552.48
Notes Lost, etc.	27,076.00
To bal. for fifth dividend	2,287,559.52

\$2,942,968.75

To bal. for fifth dividend \$2,287,559.52

Paid in dividends, \$2,287,559.52 at 22 p.c.	\$503,263.09
Fifth dividend, \$2,287,559.52 at 1½ p.c.	34,313.38
Paid in Dividends, Loans, etc.	35,106.06

Amount paid to Ordinary Creditors	\$572,682.53
Loss to Creditors	\$1,714,876.99
	<hr/>
	\$2,287,559.52

Loss to Creditors at the fifth dividend \$1,714,876.99

**Creditors and Shareholders Profit and
Loss Account Commercial Bank.**
DR.**LIABILITIES.**

Current accts. and De-	
posit Receipt	\$1,884,528.00
Notes in circulation	621,652.00
Govt. Savings Bank	438,780.75
Capital Shareholders	206,000.00
Reserve	110,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$3,258,960.75

CR.**ASSETS, ETC.**

Govt. Savings Bank Gold	
and Silver	\$22,000.00
Govt. Savings Bank in full	414,780.75
Dividend paid to ordinary	
Creditors	572,682.53
Reductions on Accts.	191,552.48
Loss to Noteholders	27,076.00
Loss to Ordinary Credit-	
ors	1,714,876.99
Loss to Shareholders	206,000.00
Loss to Reserve	110,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$3,258,960.75

TOTAL LOSS.

Creditors	\$1,714,876.99
Shareholders	206,000.00
Reserve	110,000.00
Notes	27,076.00
	<hr/>
To the Fifth Dividend	\$2,107,502.99

STATEMENT COMMERCIAL BANK.

Aug. 31st, 1898, this amt.	\$2,607.06
Dec. 1 Received from estate	
W. Waterman & Co.	125.92
	<hr/>
	\$2,732.98
Less	1.42
	<hr/>
	\$2,730.46

1899. Paid for Paper	75
Dec. 14. Geo. Coen	105.00
Paid in dividends	124.40
Dec. 15. Cash in B. of Mont.	3,555.16
Cash in hand	7.87
Sundries paid out	3.42
	<hr/>
	\$3,796.40
Credit Balance in Bank	\$3,555.16
Cash paid out	241.24
	<hr/>
	\$3,796.40

Third Summarized Statement from the 1-1 January, 1899, to 31st Aug-
ust, 1899. Showing Balance in hand, \$3,796.40.

RECEIPTS.

To Balance as shown by	
the Cash Book, 31st Dec.	
1898.	\$ 572.08
Proceeds dist. on local	
bills	2,811.04
Proceeds Current accts	87,723.45
Proceeds Rental acct.	45.96
Proceeds Interest acct.	1,662.62
Proceeds Dist For. Bills	6,997.96
Proceeds Incidentals acct.	112.00
Proceeds Real Estate	383.24
Proceeds Charges acct.	7.95
Proceeds C. B. Notes acct.	284.60
Proceeds Bills receiv.	690.00
Proceeds Past Due Bills	187.17
Proceeds E. Moritz and Co.	1.68
Proceeds B. of M. Int. acct.	33,465.00

PAYMENTS.

By Paid Act. Legal Exp.	\$ 16,522.42
Incidentals account	3,224.04
Charges account	2,206.21
Stationery account	126.76
Rental account	2,711.00
Travelling Expenses	885.24
Salaries of Officers and re-	
muneration to the Trus-	
tees and others	21,709.49
Real Estate	50.73
Dishonored Local Bills	196.46
Bank of Montreal Drafts	2,700.00
Foreign Dividends	21,097.42
Current account	23,722.22
Deposit Receipts	8,049.73
Current account and depon-	
it receipt	23,490.23

Proceeds Int. same 3 p.c.	1,158.30
Dividend account Bank of Montreal:	
1st Dividend	3,515.83
2nd Dividend	1,848.24
3rd Dividend	2,158.03
4th Dividend	33,869.16
Dividend Account	5,250.00
Current Account	91,036.20
Interest Account	17,243.00
Savings Dept.	23,437.92
Profit and Loss being pro- ceeds M. G. Lash's est.	999.09

\$312,508.77

Creditors for Final Dividend on
\$2,282,666.69.

Two million, two hundred and eighty two thousand, six hundred and sixty-six dollars and sixty-nine cents. Credit balance for	
Dividend	\$16,300.93
Debit paid Credit- ors Bank	7,776.57
Paid note holders	2,958.40
Unclaim divi.	\$1,654.28
Less paid out	167.47
	<hr/>
	1,486.81
Expense account leg- al salaries:	
Advertis'g. paper, stamps, etc.	2,834.62
Surplus	1,274.53
	<hr/>
	\$16,430.93

February 1st, 1915.

Paid into Court and deposited in
the Newfoundland Government Sav-
ings Bank, \$2,773.22.

Against which are outstanding:—

Cheques and unclaimed dividends and unclaimed dividends on notes.	
Unclaimed divi.	\$1,486.81
Less sent out	92.08
	<hr/>
	\$1,394.73

Nfd. Govt. Notes	11,486.90
Registered Notes	4,551.40
Dividend account Bank of Montreal:	
Current account	65,548.10
Interest account	22,200.00
1st dividend	733.33
2nd dividend	333.33
3rd dividend	833.34
4th dividend	32,875.91
Dividends account	7,206.76
Interest account	27,071.25
	<hr/>
	\$398,712.37
Balance in hand	3,796.40

\$312,508.77

Cheques not pre- sented to Bank for payment	11.95
Unclaimed cheques on notes	9.01
Cheques on notes not presented	7.00
Surplus	1,274.53
	<hr/>
	\$2,773.22

Against the Surplus are the final
advertising expenses, etc., 58 Vic., Cap.
2, Section 17, Dissolution of Bank
and release of Trustees.

Cash Collections—One million, one
hundred thousand, two hundred and
thirty-three dollars—\$1,100,233.00.

Final Liability upon which a divi-
dend of half of one per cent. has
been paid—Two million, two hundred
and eighty-two thousand, six hundred
and sixty-six dollars and sixty-nine
cents—\$2,282,666.69.

Adjustments—Local	\$ 85,194.51
Adjustments—English, etc.	106,357.97
Bills of Exchange and three cargoes, fish, etc.	415,112.74
	<hr/>
	\$606,665.22

Adjustments that had to be arranged in England and elsewhere before the payment of a final dividend amounted to six hundred and six thousand, six hundred and sixty-five dollars and twenty-two cents.

ASSETS.

Cash Collections	\$1,100,232.00
Reductions	191,552.48
Reductions	415,112.74
	<hr/>
	\$1,706,898.22

Total Assets—One million, seven hundred and six thousand, eight hundred and ninety-eight dollars and twenty-two cents—\$1,706,898.22.

DISBURSEMENTS.

Govt. Savings Bank	\$ 414,780.75
Reductions	191,552.48
Reductions	415,112.74
Dividends	583,417.30
Legal Expenses	28,128.58
Trustees Expenses	34,361.10
Rental Account	4,872.74
Salaries	16,167.67
Stationery	340.51
Incidental Sundries and Charges	14,083.57
Preferential	4,080.00

\$1,706,898.22

To bal. 5th dividend

8,227,550.52

Reductions on acct.

892.87

Creditors for final divi.

2,282,666.66

Paid in dividends

503,263.09

Paid in dividends

34,312.28

Paid in dividends

16,734.37

Paid London account to close

35,104.04

Loss to Creditors

1,696,478.66

\$2,282,666.66

Total loss to Creditors

\$1,696,478.66

Final Cost of Liquidation.

Commercial Bank, from Dec. 10th, 1894, to Dec. 10th, 1906, and continued to Feby. 1st, 1915:

Collect. 1894 to 1906	\$1,999,165.72
Collect. 1907 to 1909	1,067.28

\$1,100,232.00

Total Collections—One million, one hundred thousand, two hundred and thirty-three dollars—\$1,100,232.00.

Final Cost of Liquidation.

Trustees account over 3 per cent.	\$ 34,361.10
Legal Expenses over 3¼ per cent.	36,421.52
Rental account	4,872.74
Salaries account	16,167.67
Stationery account	340.59
Charges account, etc.	14,083.67
Preferential account	4,080.00
	<hr/>
	\$110,327.20

Total cost of Liquidation in twenty years—10 per cent—or an average cost of one-half of one per cent per annum.

CREDITORS AND SHAREHOLDERS.**Profit and Loss. Final.****DR.****LIABILITIES.**

Current account and deposit Receipt	\$1,379,643.11
Notes in circulation	421,622.00
Govt. Savings Bank	436,780.75
Capital Shareholders	306,900.00
Reserve	110,900.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,354,975.92

DR.**ASSETS, ETC.**

Govt. Savings Bank—Gold and Silver	\$22,000.00
Govt. Savings Bank in full	414,780.75
Dividend Creditors	583,417.30

Reductions on account ..	191,552.48
Loss to Note Holders ..	27,074.00
Loss to Creditors	1,696,475.86
Loss to Shareholders	396,000.00
Loss of Reserve	110,000.00
Cash in Savings Bank	2,773.53
	<hr/>
	\$3,254,075.92

Total Loss:—

Creditors	\$1,696,475.86
Shareholders	396,000.00
Reserve	110,000.00
Notes	27,074.00
	<hr/>
	\$2,129,551.64

Total Loss—Two million, one hundred and thirty-nine thousand, five hundred and fifty-one dollars and sixty-six cents.

I hereby certify that I kept the books of the estate of the Commercial Bank of Newfoundland from the 10th December, 1894, to the 20th June, 1895; I also prepared a general statement of the Bank's affairs from December 10th, 1894, to 31st December, 1895, during the trusteeship of late Messrs. Fox, Ponclon and Mars, and portion of the late Mr. Furlong's Trusteeship. Since then I have been called in by Mr. Anderson, the present Trustee, to go over the books and accounts from January 1st, 1899, to December 31st, 1900, during the trusteeship of the late Messrs. Mars and Furlong. I have also gone over the books and accounts during the joint Trusteeship of the late Messrs. Mars and Furlong, and the surviving Trustee, Mr. Anderson; from 1st January, 1901, to 31st August, 1901. I have also audited and found correct the balance of account to date, and I now certify that the accounts of the estate filed in Court are correct and true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

GEORGE COEN,

St. John's, Nfld., Jan. 19th, 1919.

I hereby certify that I have exam-

ined the books, statements and vouchers of the Commercial Bank of Newfoundland from the 31st August, 1909, to February 1st 1915, and I now certify that the accounts of the estate wound up and filed in court are correct and true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

GEORGE COEN.

St. John's, Nfld., March 29th, 1915.

Even at this late period of the Bank's history I wish to inform the Creditors throughout the country:

For two past thirteen years with the able assistance of Mr. John Doyle, I have given the best of my energy and attention, both at home and abroad, in the interest of the Bank. I have tried to do my duty faithfully and well for the benefit of the Creditors, being one of the largest Creditors myself.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, whereupon it was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT.—I beg leave to inform the House that I have received the following message from the House of Assembly: "The House of Assembly begs leave to report to the Legislative Council that they have passed the Bill entitled 'An Act to incorporate the Newfoundland Master Builders Association, in which they request the concurrence of the Council, with the same.'"

LABRADOR CODFISH BILL.

I also beg leave to acquaint the House that the Select Committee of the House of Assembly, to whom were referred the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and to the Bill "An Act relating to the sale of codfish on the Labrador," report as follows:

"The amendments referred to the fish exporters and outport members

of the House, but contained no definition of such terms. (2) They provided for certain action by such outport members under the direction of the House, and the House has no authority to direct; (3) It will create a partisan and political difference in relation to the matter, which should not be treated in a partisan manner; (4) provision for the appointment of members of the Board by the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof, is stricken out of the Bill by the effect of one amendment; (5) The proposed board is by another amendment deprived of all power to summon and examine witnesses, or of acquiring necessary information; (6) The provision that fees and expenses may be allowed witnesses will tend to make the work of the Board or the Court expensive; (7) There is no provision for imposing the costs on any person; (8) If it be the intention that it shall be borne by the Consolidated revenue, then this House is the only one which can originate such provision. For these and other reasons, we, the Committee, say that the proposed amendments will destroy the effect of the Bill."

HON. MR. WINTER—I beg leave to move that the report be allowed to lay upon the table until to-morrow.

The motion was carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill to incorporate the Nfld. Master Builders Association was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Public Service Bill was read a second time, when the House went into Committee on the Bill. Hon. Mr. McGrath in the Chair.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, whereupon the Bill was read a third time, passed and sent to the Assembly with a message that

this House had passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House adjourned until 3 of the clock to-morrow.

WEDNESDAY, June 2nd.

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

LABRADOR CODFISH BILL.

HON. MR. WINTER—I beg leave to move that the following message be sent to the House of Assembly in reply to their message of the 31st May with regard to the Act relating to the sale of Labrador codfish: (1) Labrador fish exporters are a well known and recognized body of business men in this country and the term or phrase "Labrador Fish Exporters," is, they submit, a sufficient definition. The phrase in the amendment, "the members of the House of Assembly who sit for outport districts," defines clearly all members of the House of Assembly who represent districts in the House of Assembly, other than those who represent the Districts of St. John's East and West; (2) The Council regret that they cannot agree with the contention that the effect of one amendment takes away the power of the Supreme Court, or a Judge hereof, to appoint members of the Board; (3) The Council submits that it is not necessary to give the Board power to summon and examine witnesses on oath, all facts necessary to enable the Board to fix a fair and reasonable price for fish, shipped off the Labrador coast when no price is agreed upon, can be obtained. To give a Board, constituted as it will be, power to examine books of account, business dealings and other like transactions connected with the sale of Labrador codfish, would not be conducive to the successful carrying on of trade and business, and is invidious and objectionable. The Council has no ob-

jection to rescinding the amendment in relation to fees and expenses. For these reasons stated, the Council is of opinion that the amendments made to the Bill do not destroy the usefulness of the proposed measure, but are in many respects recommendations similar to those of the Commissioners on Fishery Matters."

NEWFOUNDLAND PRODUCTS BILL.

Third reading of Newfoundland Products Corporation, Limited, Confirmation Bill, as amended.

HON. J. D. RYAN—I understood at the last sitting of the House that the Bill was to be allowed to stand over for further discussion, but evidently it is not, and there is nothing further to be said, but the more I look at section 17 of the Bill in the schedule, the more I adhere to the principle. I suggested at first, that we are not legislating for 99 years alone, but for 99 years after, in fact forever, for this Company and the Company's representatives afterward, and I for one regard it as going beyond our rights in legislating for generations to come. And while I may not be able to carry out my wish to reduce this to 50 years, still I wish to be placed on record as one who has adhered to his position given at the last sitting, and will now propose that the Bill be given its third reading six months hence.

On Hon. Mr. Ryan's amendment being put, it was lost.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Squires the Bill was read a third time and passed, and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message acquainting them that this House had passed the Bill with some amendments.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL.

Second reading of the Bill respecting the exportation of timber.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill, Mr. President, is to further extend the time permitted for the cutting and ex-

portation of timber, known as "pit props." At the last session of the Legislature, known as the War Session, in consequence of a request from the authorities in England, the exportation of this class of timber was permitted up to the 1st September, 1915, and the exportation of pulp wood from Labrador, up to 31st December of this year. The war continued, unfortunately, and it was found necessary that the time should be extended, and at the request also of the representatives of the Government of the French Republic, one of our Allies, the export of the timber is to be permitted to France as well as Great Britain. There is a change, however, in the Act from that of last year, in that timber for pulpwood is to be permitted to be exported from Labrador for a period of 15 years, and upon such exports a royalty of \$1 per cord is to be paid. Another change is that the cutting of green timber for export must not be within three miles from the sea. In other words, what was known as the Three Mile Limit must still be preserved, and this extends to pit props also; they must not be cut on the three mile limit, but further inland. On timber also cut after Sept. 1st an export royalty of one dollar per cord will have to be paid. The Bill as printed provides only for wood cut prior to the passing of this Act as being free from the export duty. That, however, is an error, and the Bill will be amended in committee stage by changing that date to the 1st of September and bringing it into accord with that of last year.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I was only going to say a word in support of this Bill. For a great many years there was a strong feeling against the export of pit props and pulpwood from anywhere. I was strongly in favor of exporting from the Labrador, and I think the development on the Labrador has been retarded by the Colony refusing

to permit the export under any terms whatever. I am sure that as long ago as eight years the Council of the Board of Trade passed resolutions recommending that as far as the Labrador limits were concerned the export of wood in the round should be permitted from that coast, and calling attention to the fact that there were really large lumber resources down there, and I think that when the export of pit props and pulp wood assumes fair dimensions on the Labrador we may after that look with much confidence perhaps for the industrial development of the lumber resources of that district, but until attention is called and people abroad are aware that there is really wood down there which is accessible, it will be tied up. I have very much pleasure in supporting this Bill, because I have been for years in favour of such a policy.

HON. J. D. RYAN—According to the first section of this Bill, last year we were asked to pass it for one year; now on account of the war we are asked to extend it for ten years. I am not so sure if it is on account of the war, but it has been hinted abroad that there were several tracts of land down there hung up by parties who have no desire to operate those tracts which they have obtained grants for, but simply to hold them up and see what price they can get for them and dispose of them to outsiders, and it is on the strength of this that the ten years have been granted. While I would like to see the war ended next week, if possible, I think we would be doing what I consider a fair share of our business in this Legislature if we extended this act for another year, but I think it unfair to the general public of this country that a few enterprising men, if you wish so to call them, who have never intended to cut a log of wood, but simply take out these grants when the previous grant would be ex-

hausted and pay nothing for it should be thus advantaged; for now that we are asked to extend the time for ten years I fear that it is greatly in the interests of those speculators, and that this country will never derive one cent of benefit by such an enactment. I would like to see, as we had in the last Bill, something to protect the interests of the people coming after us, and when the Bill comes into Committee I hope to see something added that will protect the inhabitants of this country under this Act.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I have no objection to the principle of this bill but would have preferred that the period for which permission is given was shorter than ten years. With the proposal to permit the exportation of pit props as a war measure there can be no quarrel. The permission to export wood from the Labrador for ten years stands on a different footing. Last year we were asked to pass this for a year on the ground that it was a war measure; also that it would give employment to our people. That argument could be advanced this year with greater force because of prevailing conditions of unemployment and the small prospect of fishery supplies. There are said to be substantial areas of timber on the Labrador from which considerable quantities of this wood can be cut. Therefore, it is but fair that the people of this country, in view of existing conditions, should be permitted the opportunity of cutting this wood and gaining whatever advantage there is from the export of it, but to allow that for ten years is I think a mistaken principle at this juncture for this reason: Last year when this Bill was brought in in September the promiscuous cutting on land areas on our own island was allowed. We now find ourselves, as a result of the wasteful method of cutting that were

then put in practice compelled to restrict the cutting to burned woods. In other words, the destruction of growing timber was so great that numerous petitions were presented to the other House, I understand, protesting against the continuance of the practice and there was a very manifest feeling throughout the Colony that if this was permitted to continue the result would be none other than disastrous. That is to say, after an experience of nine months we have to amend this bill so as to limit the cutting on the fishermen's reserve to burned woods. Now the effect of this bill if it realizes the hopes of the Government and those responsible for its enactment will be that there will be a large movement of people in the Labrador to cut pit props or pulpwood because I understand that for all practical purposes the terms under this bill are synonymous. The result is going to be, in my opinion, somewhat similar; and I think it would be wiser to limit the period to say three years, so that the Government would be able to obtain some evidence of how the policy was working, and be in a position to make such amendments as the evidence would show to be necessary. With this bill as it stands however the result will be that for ten years the hands of the Legislature will be tied to all interests and purposes. I can understand that the argument may be advanced that the Legislature can introduce amendments to restrict cutting, but that may not be very easy because there will be complaints from people who acquire areas there that injustice is thereby done them. The proviso, for instance, at the foot of section three in the bill now before us allowing export this year without payment of duty, of all wood cut last winter is the result of representations

by the people now engaged in cutting pit-props in our island, that owing to the inability to secure shipping facilities it has been impossible to get out of the Colony before this time, a large proportion of the pit props cut last winter. It is not difficult to foresee that similar arguments will be made regarding pit props on the Labrador next season and the season after that and particularly if any amendments are introduced in later sessions, for restriction, to prevent wasteful and improper proceeding there. There is also the further contingency that while this bill provides for the imposition of an export duty of one dollar per cord on the cut on Labrador, at the next session or the following one, we may be faced with a petition asking that it be not enforced on the grounds that it will be impossible for parties who have taken areas to go into the industry and export that wood and pay the duty and compete successfully with other countries. The reason that I advance that argument is that I have reason to know that that very contention is being already put forward by parties now interested in the matter, and who say to-day it will not be commercially feasible to cut and pay a royalty of one dollar per cord, and I will not be at all surprised to find that next session we shall have representations made that it will be imperative to have that duty removed, or else the pit-prop industry will have to be abandoned. We can see the way in which things are progressing. In September we were asked to provide for the export of wood for a year. After that was passed it became notorious that parties interested in having it put on the Statute Book stated that they had got the thin edge of the wedge in and that they would get

more next session. They have got the thin edge in and I look to find them ask more next session. With the principle of providing work for our people, in view of the gloomy outlook and short Labrador supply this year, I am in entire accord, and to that extent I am prepared to support the Bill. At the same time I would point out that the strongest objection I find to the proposition, to allow timber cutting on Labrador for ten years, is that if it is successful it will take away a large number of people from the fishery altogether. Men to cut pitwood will have to go to Labrador in October, and will not be able to get away again until the next June or July. This will mean diverting them from our staple industry altogether. The people who are advocating this bill and claiming that it is in the interest of the fisheries ought to take this into account, because it seems to me to seriously threaten the future of our fishing industries. At the same time I am prepared to support the bill because it provides immediate employment for so many of our people who need it at present, and also because of the imposition of the royalty of one dollar per acre for the Government, though it will be noticed that the Government are not likely to get royalties this year, but I would very much prefer and would have supported it with much greater warmth if it had limited the period to three or four years at the most.

HON. MR. JOB.—I take it that this House meets from year to year for the purpose not only of making laws, but of initiating legislation that will help to employ the people. We have two important matters to consider in dealing with this Bill. First the fishery, which must under no circumstances be interfered with. The first ob-

ject of this bill is to see that no timber limits are interfered with where-in timber is that can be used by the fishermen, and the clause providing for the three mile limit protects them in that respect. Under the present circumstances we know that the war conditions make it incumbent on us to do our duty and try to find the pit props necessary to work mines. We have therefore limited the cutting to one year. Now my hon. friend Mr. Ryan referred to a class of men called speculators, not in any offensive way I know, but they have been referred to for many years in an offensive sense. Now I want to refer to these so-called speculators. The Government in order to open up the country for the last seventy years have framed certain rules whereby people can obtain property by the payment of fees. That has a twofold object; first of all these fees are of great advantage to the revenues of the Colony and I believe range from 150,000 to 200,000 dollars per year, a very handsome adjunct to the revenue. When you look at that map and think that these speculators for the last sixty or seventy years have been paying out this money you can see that there have been practically no returns for their payments to the Government, to say nothing of the money invested otherwise. Now, sir, these men have been for the last fifteen years the embodiment of enterprise, and this is the last place where they should be discouraged. They are allowed by the law a certain mileage of timber and land for mining purposes, and pay their money and that is all there is about it. Now a new feature has developed in this pit prop business besides that mentioned by hon. members before to-day, and that is that lumber cutting today has been proved absolutely unprofitable. It has been

proved within the last ten years that lumber cannot be cut with a profit, but the cutting of pulpwood may—I say only “may”—be worked up into an industry, and the cutting of these props will give the people as much employment as the lumber cutting, because all the lumber is cut now by machinery, and the logging is really the only labor part of it. I think that some of us realize that in the future most of this labor may be needed. Things do not look so bright that we can afford to turn down what possibly may be a good industry. I say “possibly,” because there are many difficulties in the way. The tax of one dollar a cord may be too much. I am afraid that on the Labrador it will prevent many enterprises from going ahead. Some will be attempted no doubt. We will take another view of it. We are always looking out for a new industry. We find the pit props trade of Finland is crippled, and that we have an opportunity, but we have not made much of an attempt to grapple with this industry. If it is encouraged it may prove a profitable industry and there is not a man with any responsibility who ought not to encourage it. For these reasons I support the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, Hon. J. D. Ryan taking the Chair of the Committee.

HON. JOHN HARVEY—In the issuing of licenses for cutting and export of pulp wood from the Labrador, are the old licenses under which rental was paid surrendered, and special licenses for cutting pit props taken out, or are the rents still being paid, or can a license be given for the cutting of pit props on which no rentals are paid at all.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—There have been no licenses issued at all for the cutting of pit props. The only people I am aware of that have gone into the business at all is upon private property, that is upon an area which had been approved some three or four years ago.

HON. MR. HARVEY—For which they are paying rental? Is it possible for somebody to cut and pay no rental at all?

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—I do not think so, because it would be on private property. Of course they could do so on Crown Lands.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Then it is practically possible for me to go and apply for the right to cut pit props over Crown lands and pay no rental, whereas an ordinary licensee has to pay his rental. As I read this new Act the extension of time for the exportation of pit props from the Labrador is not extended. It may be meant to be extended but I don't think it is extended. Last year it was generally stated that pulp wood and pit props were not synonymous terms. They were dealt with as being two entirely different things. To me the whole Act seems to be extremely mixed up, and it ought to be made clear before it leaves this House. It isn't fair that those people, who have been paying rentals for the past ten or fifteen years, should be obliged to go on paying rentals for a license which any man can get free.

HON. MR. McGRATH—It certainly seems to me that the phraseology of the Bill is such as to make it very debatable as to what is intended. It looks as if men may come in now, apply for and obtain a right to cut pit props, without paying any fees whatever, except the export tax, and operate on Crown Lands in close proximity to other parties, who will have

to pay a rental of \$2 per square mile for the lands which they hold under lease from the Colony at the present time. This certainly should not be. All parties ought to be on the same footing in regard to this matter.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again, so that an informal discussion between himself, Hon. Mr. Squires, Hon. Mr. Blandford, Hon. Mr. Harvey, and Hon. Mr. McGrath, might take place with a view to seeing if some understanding could not be reached on this matter.

At the suggestion of Hon. the President, the House then took a short recess, while the conferees on the Pitt Prop. Bill were considering the measure.

After recess the House went into Committee of the Bill respecting the exportation of timber, when Hon. Mr. Bishop moved to delete the words 'passing of the Act' in section three and insert instead the words '1st September, 1915.' This amendment being put was passed when the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion the Bill was then read a third time, passed, and was sent to the House of Assembly with a message acquainting them that this House had passed the Bill with some amendments.

NEWFOUNDLAND PRODUCTS BILL.

HON. THE PRESIDENT acquainted the House that he had received a message from the Assembly intimating that they had passed the Council's amendments to the Newfoundland Products Corporation Bill with some amendments, in which they asked the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the amendment was read a first time.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The section referred to at present reads: The granting of water powers shall not be made except for the direct production of power. It is difficult for a layman to discover wherein the amendment made by the Council will restrict public rights. It was intended of course, to better protect public rights.

HON. MR. SQUIRES—I would like to observe that when in Committee I said that I did not think the amendment was necessary. That the Lower House also does not think it necessary is evidenced by the fact that they have stricken it out. There are some matters in the contract which were not clearly worded, and it was necessary to have them made clear and definite, so that the thanks of the House are due to the hon. gentlemen who suggested this.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I think, from the point of view of common sense it is a valuable amendment, and I am sorry to see it out of the Bill. However, I do not intend to fight the matter.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the amendments were read a second time and passed, and a message sent to the Assembly intimating that the House had passed the amendments without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till Friday next at 3 p.m.

FRIDAY, June 4th.

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

SEAL FISHERY BILL.

HON. PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up,

entitled: 'An Act respecting the Seal-fishery' with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the amendments were read a first and second time and the House went into Committee of the Whole on the same.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The first amendment made by the Assembly is an amendment to their own Bill. Under section 2 of the bill, as it stood it might be held that seal pelts not taken on board within 24 hours shall belong to the owners and not be a part of the voyage.

The amendment to sections 3 and 4 appear to be perfectly reasonable and I presume there will be no objection.

HON. MR. JOB—It strikes me as possible that this fifth section may be capable of some arrangement. As hon. gentlemen will remember the original clause imposed a fine of \$1,000 for every man lost. Now it was contended by the owners that this was practically impossible. There are steamers going out to the seal-fishery valued at about \$50,000 which might be liable to pay \$200,000. The owners were prepared to compromise the matter and offered in their petition to pay part of the premium of insurance. This was considered reasonable by many members, but unfortunately, when the clause which was passed in this House went to the Lower House they took umbrage at our having usurped their powers, and the clause was not discussed at all. This is the most important clause in the whole Bill, and it is most important that the Bill should not be thrown out because of it, and I think that if we can arrange ten minutes conversation with the Committee of the Lower House, it could be settled satisfactorily. When we consider that this House is as an-

xious to protect the men going to the Seal-fishery as the Lower House I think it a pity to allow the Bill to be thrown out.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I certainly think it would be wise to make a further effort to come to some agreement on this matter. The original clause rendering ships liable for \$1,000 for every man lost at the icefields under certain conditions, was of such a character as would have made it impossible to send any more wooden ships to the ice, and might have involved the selling of the steel ships also. On the other hand, if the Bill is dropped there is no protection whatever for the men going to the seal-fishery. I hold that it would be deplorable if the Legislature should allow this session to pass without some revision for the safety of the lives of the sealing crews. Analysis of the original Bill reveals the fact that what was meant as a protection was really no protection at all. The steamer Newfoundland under that section would have been liable for a sum of \$78,000, as having lost 78 men. As a matter of fact she was sold the other day for \$4,000 and being owned by a limited liability company could not be further proceeded against. Consequently, commendable as was the motive of the Bill, as originally constructed it is apparent that it will have to be re-constructed if the ideas of the Select Committee which reported the measure to the Lower House are to be put into effect now. All will agree that, on the one hand, this is not the time to see our sealing steamers driven away from the Colony, while on the other hand it would be criminal to do nothing to protect the men's lives after last year's tragedy, consequently the compromise has been made, to start a scheme of insurance whereby the men would be insured for the

whole voyage, from the time of leaving until the ships come back, and this strikes me as being the best compromise. An insurance of \$500 to a man would cost we are told only \$250. Any man wanting to go to the sealfishery would be required to pay half of this or \$125 to be insured for \$500. Because of a misunderstanding in the Lower House of the motives of this Chamber, the amendment made by us with this object in view was thrown out, and now if we refuse to accept their amendment the Bill is killed, and there will be no measure in effect at the time of the next sealfishery. Therefore I think we ought to try and provide some protection for the men, in view of what happened last spring.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. MR. JOB—I beg leave to propose that a Committee be appointed to consider the Bill and amendments in relation to the Sealfishery and confer with the committee to be appointed by the House of Assembly in relation to the same Bill, with power to sit out of session and to report at the next session of the Legislature.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I do not object to the form of motion, but I was under the impression that it was not competent for either House to appoint a Joint Committee to sit out of session. If the contrary is the case, I have no objection to it, but would call the attention of the hon. member to last session's Joint Committee of both Houses, dealing with the Fishery resolutions which abandoned its work the day before the session closed and made a recommendation that they be reappointed as a commission to continue their work until next session of the House, and I would suggest that this should be

the practice adopted in the present case, though, of course, I bow to any precedent that may be quoted to the contrary effect.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I may say that it is not an unusual thing with regard to legislating matters here for a Committee to be appointed to sit out of session. The Hon. member may be constitutionally correct in what he states, but it has been done.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Can you give me an instance?

HON. MR. GIBBS—I cannot quote an instance, but it has been done.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I speak from an experience of 12 years as Clerk in the Lower House, and I do not recall its ever having been done there. I suggest that we adopt the same course as last year, that a motion be made that this House requests the other House to concur in an address to His Excellency to appoint a commission to report at the next session.

HON. MR. SQUIRES—I understand that this proposition is a result of a conference between members of both Houses, and that this House is not throwing out this Bill. I want to be clear on that point, as this is an important bill and having received the enthusiastic support of the House, I want to be sure that this will not appear as an attempt by this House to throw it out.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—If I suspect that resolution it will only be for the want of something better, and I shall do it with a great deal of reluctance. I think it is a most unfortunate thing, after all the talk which we had on this Bill, which is the result of recommendations of three Judges of the Supreme Court and the Committee which sat on this matter, that we come to the end of the session and are not able to agree on the

at any rate rudimentary reforms that are necessary. The intention is that we shall have plenty of time next year when the House meets to so completely reform the Bill as to make it operative before the steamers go to the ice. Well, Mr. President, I have very little confidence in that. In the first place I question very much if the Legislature will meet in time to discuss it, and second, if it does, we will have such a lengthy discussion on it, and it will be so long in the Lower House that by the time it comes to us, the steamers will be ready to sail, and whatever is going to be done, especially in connection with the insurance clause which I regard as specially important, ought to be done, and the owners know at least a month before. I regard this as a very unsatisfactory compromise. I do not blame this House for it at all. If there had been a little give and take on the other side, we could have brought in some of the principles at any rate of the recommendations of the Supreme Court judges. I do not say I shall not support this resolution, but if I do so it will be with great reluctance.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I should like also to say that it seems to me that it will be extremely unlikely should this resolution pass, that there will be any insurance measure effected for the sealers of 1914. The Bill as it came to this House threw a burden on the steamer owners that no sane man could possibly accept, and did not insure the men. We amended that Bill by providing what, I submit, was a most reasonable scheme of insurance by which the men themselves could contribute to a small extent, not against accident alone, arising out of carelessness of the master of the ship but against all accidents from the time they left St. John's till they returned. If a man lost his life his dependents

would have about five or six hundred dollars, and, for that he would have to contribute only one dollar and fifty cents. The owners most generously agreed to be responsible for a like amount for every man on board ship. This, I submit, was a most reasonable thing for these men and a reasonable charge for the benefits they were to receive. But this was spurned by the Lower Chamber and sent back, and it was stated that we had interfered with the prerogatives of that House. I must confess that I entirely fail to see where the prerogatives of the Lower House were infringed by this Chamber. It is certainly unfortunate, as the last speaker said, that the Bill is to be thrown out and we are to await another session to bring in a bill either better or inferior. It will be quite impossible to effect legislation to operate for next year's fishery, because the owners will be compelled to protect themselves by refusing to engage men for next year's fishery, not knowing but that when the Legislature next meets they may be saddled with a measure whose possibilities they cannot venture to risk. I am very sorry that the Lower House has not accepted these amendments we sent down, which I think would have been thoroughly satisfactory to every sealer seeking a berth.

Hon. Mr. Job's resolution was then put and carried, and the President appointed the following as a Committee from this House—Hons. Messrs. Harvey, Gibbs, Job, Winter and McGrath.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled 'An Act to amend the law respecting the exportation of timber,' without amendment.

MASTER BUILDERS BILL

Second reading of Master Builders' Association Incorporation Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—As regards this

BILL its object, as hon. members will see, is to incorporate a number of builders and contractors in the City into an Association to be known as the "Master Builders' Association." Associations of this character are to be found everywhere from the Pacific to the Atlantic. The objects of the Association, as you will see by section 2, are to amicably adjust and settle differences or disputes in the building trades, to bring about uniformity in the customs and usages of the trades, and to diffuse knowledge with regard to classes and styles of architecture, the strength of concrete and other building material. There are a great many problems arising day after day in connection with buildings, and one of the objects of the Association is to grapple with difficulties of the kind, and by means of lectures, literature and the reading of papers, to keep its members informed as to the progress that is being made in different parts of the world in the use of materials of various kinds, for construction work. This Bill was submitted to a Select Committee of the Lower House to inquire into it, and they found that it meets the requirements of the Association. Associations of this kind will be very helpful in a country like this, because we have no building laws or regulations, and if the Municipal Council or any other body were to draw up building regulations, they have nobody with whom to consult with regard to such laws, or in relation to any proposed improvements in plumbing, heating or other things connected with these operations. The names of the gentlemen who appear as incorporators of the Association are sufficient guarantee, and the object of the Bill will, I feel sure, appeal to hon. members. I have much pleasure, therefore, in moving the second reading of the Bill.

On motion, the Bill was read a sec-

ond time, after which the House went into Committee on the Bill, Hon. Dr. Skelton in the chair.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the bill without amendment.

On motion the Bill was read a third time, passed and sent to the Assembly with a message, intimating that this House had passed the same without amendment.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CROWN.

Second reading of BILL, An Act respecting proceedings against the Crown.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In moving the second reading of this Bill I beg to point out that its object is to simplify proceedings against the Crown by petition. I may say that as a general rule no action can be brought against the Sovereign in person. It will therefore be asked what is the remedy where there is no action? It is by what is known as a Petition of right. This proceeding is supposed to have originated about the time of Magna Charter. It is doubtful if we have any such remedy in this country at all. In England the proceedings are commenced by a petition to the King. It is presented to the Home Secretary, who lays it before the Sovereign. The King appoints a committee to inquire into the facts, and if it is found that the facts set forth in the petition are correct, he endorses on the petition his fiat, "Let justice be done." The petition is then served on the Attorney General, who appears on behalf of the Crown. A proceeding of this kind so applies when lands, goods or monies of the subject have found their way into the possession of the Crown, and the purpose of the petition is to obtain restitution of his money or property or compensation therefor. This Bill is similar to other enactments of this nature in all the British Colonies, but

instead of the petition being laid before the King, it is presented to the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof and then filed and a copy served on the Minister of Justice. It does away with the necessity for a preliminary enquiry as to the truth of the facts alleged in the petition, and sets forth that the Minister of Justice shall, within ten days, file an appearance and answer. Any defence to the petition can be raised by the Minister of Justice, as can be raised in an ordinary proceeding, and the usual rules of practice apply. The Act does not give the subject any remedy against the Crown that he is not ordinarily entitled to, but is really intended to simplify proceedings which formerly were cumbersome and costly. I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time, and the House went into committee of the whole on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion, the Bill was then read a third time, passed and sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had appointed a Select Committee, consisting of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Coaker, Moulton, Winsor, Young, Jennings and the Minister of Finance to confer with the committee of the Council respecting the Seal Fishery Bill, but the House of Assembly acquainted the Council that they have no power to direct the Committee to sit out of session. Also, that they had passed the amendment sent down in and upon the bill entitled "An Act to regulate the employment of men engaged in logging" with some amendment, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs these amendments were then read a first and second time, and the House went into Committee of the Whole on the same; Hon. Mr. Blandford taking the chair.

LOGGING BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—Before that motion is put I wish to say that the amendment to our amendments as now sent up by the Lower House, I am perfectly willing at this late stage to agree to but the penalty for a breach of not complying strictly with the food schedule, and which was made should not be more than \$25, and which is now amended, to be not less than \$25 and more than \$500. That appears to me to be so perfectly unreasonable that I shall record my vote against it to that extent.

The owner should not be liable to a fine of more than \$25 on any one day, and the same next day provided there be no more than one camp so fined on a day. Otherwise I am quite agreeable that the amendments should pass, but I think all will agree with me that such a penalty for such a breach is quite absurd.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I beg to support the hon. gentleman's motion. I was hoping we would be able to support these amendments as they came on. But this is liable to cause injustice. The difference is this; for a breach of schedule of food any one day the amendment throws on the offending company a tax of not less than \$25 with a maximum possible fine of \$500. This Council after considering the matter and on the advice of the sub-committee recommended that the tax should not exceed \$25 for each breach on any one day. One of the things asked for particularly by the representatives of the logging companies who were before us was that there should be no force majeure

used against them in this respect; the railways may be blocked and it may be impossible for them to get supplies to some of the camps, and under such circumstances I think the Courts should be allowed some discretion where a company is not doing wrong intentionally. I think that this is a case where so much injustice might be done that even at this late date we should oppose it.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I cannot agree with the Hon. member that a penalty of five hundred dollars is too excessive, to be inflicted upon a company that has disregarded a regulation made in relation to the supply of food to men engaged in logging. Any company that would flagrantly violate a regulation of this character, the infliction of a fine of five hundred dollars would be a small one compared with the injury done the men. Let us look at this matter, not from a commercial standpoint, but from a humane one. A hundred or more men are engaged in logging. The work demands food of a character which will enable men to perform it and at the same time not impair their health, or strength; consequently, it is necessary that it be wholesome and nutritious, and if it is not, then it is not only right, but in the highest degree necessary that the company disregarding the regulation made should be subjected to the extreme penalty. It is only in cases of a wilful disregard of the law and not an unintentional one, that a Court would inflict such a penalty. If as the Honourable member argues, the railway should become blocked by reason of the storms, no court is going to fine a company for not having food required by the regulation. If the officials of the company can show that they did all that reasonable men ought to have done

to obtain it, no wilful breach of the law has occurred. No law calls upon an official of a company to do impossibilities. In cases of the kind, if they have done all that reasonable and prudent men should do, then the law casts no further responsibility upon them. This gives the Court a discretion to inflict the extreme penalty if the case is one of a flagrant character, and if it is not, then the fine may be as low as \$25. If a number of men in a camp be given insufficient food on any day this would not constitute a breach of the act in respect of each man, but would be construed as one violation of the law and the penalty provided for will be imposed in respect of the offence committed on that day. Our duty as legislators is to protect those who because of the lack of wealth and influential friends at court are unable to safeguard their own rights. Corporations or individuals carrying on industrial work at which a number of men are employed should not be allowed to do so, unless they give full and ample protection to the lives and health of the operatives. If we would look at it from the proper standpoint, the business is in reality a partnership. The members of the company invest their capital, and the workmen their skill and muscle. A company safeguards its capital by seeking concessions, in some cases, of a most extraordinary character, from the public and by bringing to bear in the development and carrying on of the work, all the knowledge which skill, experience and foresight teach, as being necessary. The plant is insured against loss by fire, the stock is similarly protected, everything that human skill can do, is done to protect the capital invested. Why should not the other partner, the worker, be protected while employed? Are we to

legislate one rule of conduct and management in relation to the investment of money and then he who is superior to capital, whose rights and claims stand upon a higher plane, be told that he must be content with that which companies or individuals may offer him, and as he must win bread for himself and family, he can only do so, under conditions which may be injurious to him and bring loss to those depending upon him. Our duty is to protect the individual, the bread winner, capital can always find ways and means to protect itself, while the other party, man, has to suffer wrong and injustice.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would suggest that the hon. gentleman agree to a compromise such as has already been suggested viz: that we hold to the maximum penalty and cut out the minimum. I move that the word "minimum" be struck out.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I think before passing this amendment we should carefully consider it. In every penalty there is a maximum and minimum fixed. There is very little difference between stealing a man's money and stealing his health and the degrees of guilt can very easily be determined by the Judge. I don't think we should compel any man living miles and miles in the interior of the country and who is under the control of the company to submit to things to which he would not if he were nearer home. And after all companies have very little sympathy with the individual. The boss is there to get all he can out of his men. He is not there in the interests of their health, and if there is a flagrant violation of the Bill, I cannot see why a fine of five hundred dollars should be considered excessive.

HON. MR. MURPHY—My experience

of supplying logging camps 40 or 50 miles away from headquarters, is that there are times when it is quite impossible to get supplies out to these camps, and when hauling a load of supplies over the country with a pair of horses it is out of the question. Then just because these camps happen to be short of a few items their owners are to be fined. A man not on good terms with his boss will be only too glad to make a fuss, and the Magistrate will be compelled to fine the employer not less than twenty-five dollars. So far as the remarks of hon. gentlemen with reference to the treatment of the men are concerned, the companies for their own interest are going to treat their men well, so that they will get the greatest amount of work out of them. I take a great interest in the men after thirty-eight years experience in logging, and I think that this law will not affect the big companies as much as the small struggling mill-owners, who employ in the aggregate considerably more men than do the big companies against whom this bill is aimed. The small mill owners who cannot comply with this law are the ones who will suffer most, and in their interest I maintain that it is unjust that a magistrate must be compelled to fine them a minimum of twenty-five dollars, and that possibly two or three times a month. In the United States and Canada with their immense lumbering industry, as compared with our very small one, they have never yet been called upon to make a law between the lumbermen and their employers, yet we must start in down here, and make laws that will bear harder on the small mill owners than on the big companies, I do not see any justice in this. It is easier for the large companies to supply their camps with luxuries which are out of

the question for the small mill owner, who merely employs his neighbours in the settlement and who should be allowed to build and supply his camps to suit himself and as best he can, and whose employees do not expect his camps to be equipped in the manner required of the big companies by this law. Even the maximum fine of \$500 would make very little difference to the big companies with their large business. If the big companies do not treat their men properly, by all means fine them up to the limit; but it is hardly fair for the small mill owner to have to pay a minimum of \$25 for every offense against this law, and I consider that it is perfectly safe to leave the amount of the fine to the discretion of the Magistrate.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I move as an amendment that "food as prescribed shall be supplied by employers, to loggers working for them, under a penalty not exceeding \$500 for each offence, provided that no more than one penalty shall be payable as penalty for breaches of the section on any one day in any one camp."

The amendment being put was carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported the amendments passed with an amendment.

On motion the Bill was read a third time, passed, and sent to the Assembly with a message intimating that the Council had passed the amendments with an amendment.

On motion the House went into Committee on the Sealing amendments. Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose.

Hon. the President informed the House that it was the intention of His Excellency the Governor to close

the Legislature at three of the clock on to-morrow Saturday.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till 2.30 p. m. to-morrow.

SATURDAY, June 5.

The House met at 2.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. BISHOP tabled the report of the Public Schools under Roman Catholic Boards.

HON. PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendment sent down by the Council in and upon the amendment sent up by the House of Assembly in and upon the amendment sent down by the Council in and upon the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the employment of men engaged in Logging," without amendment.

His Excellency the Governor having arrived, and being seated on the Throne, Hon. the President Commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to summon the members of the House of Assembly to the bar of the House, and they being there assembled, His Excellency was pleased to assent to the Bills passed during the session.

His Excellency was then pleased to make the following address to both branches of the Legislature:—

Mr. President and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

In relieving you from your sessional duties, rendered unusually arduous by the lateness of the season, and the consequent interference with your personal affairs, I desire to thank you, in the first place, for the spirit

in which you have responded to the call to perform your legislative functions at a necessarily inconvenient period, and, in the second place, for the unanimity that has marked your deliberations in all matters of Imperial interest.

I also warmly thank you for the measures you have taken to ensure the Colony's participation with the rest of the Empire in the great war which is calling forth all the resources of the British race for the maintenance of the world's freedom and the advancement of civilisation. I earnestly trust that the Colony's contingents towards the naval and military strength of the Empire, will prove effective in proportion to the numbers engaged, as they will serve to make manifest the desire of the whole people of Newfoundland to ensure an early and successful termination of this great struggle through an honorable and lasting peace dictated by the allied nations.

The provision you have made for pensions and allowances for those of our men on active service by sea or land who may suffer disablement and for the dependents of those who may fall in defence of the flag, is highly creditable to you and testifies to the praiseworthy spirit in which every aspect of this overpowering problem is dealt with by the Legislature and people of this Colony.

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

I thank you for the appropriations you have made for carrying on the

Public Service, and for meeting the obligations which the war has brought upon the Colony. The money so provided will be expended with special regard to economy in view of the trying circumstances which confront us and the world at large.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

The Bill which you have passed providing for the establishment on the West Coast and on the Labrador of industrial enterprise of exceptional magnitude will, I trust, result in the early initiation of those undertakings and the providing of further means whereby great numbers of our people may secure permanent and remunerative employment and the Colony a further addition to an enhanced and lasting prosperity.

In bidding you farewell I earnestly pray that the appalling conflict, now raging in the Old World, may be brought to a speedy and honourable issue and that our country, with the blessings of Peace, may then renew the conditions of material well-being which were its portion for many years past.

PROROGATION.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor, declared the General Assembly prorogued until Wednesday, the fourteenth day of July next.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

- Motion for, 3.
- Committee on, 17.
- Draft, 18.
- Governor's Reply to, 18.

ANGEL, HON. J.

- On Sealfishery Bill, 43.

ANDERSON, HON. J.

- On Logging Bill, 60.
- Labrador Fishery Bill, 110, 112, 118, 128, 137, 138.
- General Hospital Bill, 115, 116.
- Municipal Bill, 132.
- Grand Bank Water Co. Bill, 156.
- Products Co. Bill, 166.
- Resolution of Condolence—Baird—172.
- Revenue Bill, 185.

BISHOP, HON. R. K.

- On Labrador Codfish Bill, 21, 32, 82, 88, 94, 95, 100, 111, 118, 120.
- Sawmills Bill, 27, 106.
- Customs Amendment Bill, 37.
- Death Duties Bill, 38.
- Sealfishery Bill, 41, 45, 47, 72, 212, 214.
- Logging Bill, 54, 70, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 216.
- Local Affairs Bill, 70, 85, 96.
- General Hospital Bill, 107, 115.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 108.
- Municipal Bill, 133.
- Patriotic Fund Bill, 137, 148.
- Bank Fishery Bill, 148, 150.
- Retiring Allowances Bill, 148.
- Packing Co. Bill, 149, 151, 152.

- Prohibition Bill, 159, 166, 168, 169.
- Train Ferry Service Bill, 169.
- Loan Bill, 170, 171.
- Products Co. Bill, 183, 211.
- Exportation of Timber Bill, 206.

BLANDFORD, HON. S. D.

- On Sawmills Bill, 27, 104, 105, 107.
- Local Affairs Bill, 84.
- Labrador Fishery Bill, 86, 88, 129. ✓
- Municipal Bill, 135.
- Bank Fishery Bill, 151. ✓
- Sealfishery Bill, 163. ✓
- Exportation of Timber Bill, 210.

BANK FISHERY BILL, 148, 150. ✓

CUSTOMS AMENDMENT BILL, 37, 40, 114.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTIONS OF,—

- On Death Hon. J. B. Ayre, 20.
- Death Hon. James Baird, 171.

DEATH DUTIES BILL, 38, 39, 40.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL, 206, 210.

GIBBS, HON. M. P.

- On Labrador Fishery Bill, 26, 75, 77, 82, 83, 86, 88, 92, 94, 96, 98, 104, 109, 111, 113, 116, 118, 119, 120.
- Sawmills Bill, 26, 105.
- Logging Bill, 47, 53, 62, 127, 139, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 217, 218.
- Customs Amendment Bill, 114.
- Sealfishery Bill, 213.
- Master Builders Incorporation Bill, 214.
- Proceedings against the Crown Bill, 215.

GOODRIDGE, HON. A. F.

- On Labrador Fishery Bill, 26, 30, 36, 76, 98, 112, 120.
- Sealfishery Bill, 46.

GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL, 72, 107, 114, 136.

GRAND BANK WATER CO. BILL, 154, 156.

HARVEY, HON. J.

- On Motion for Address in Reply, 3.
- Sawmills Bill, 27, 105.
- Labrador Codfish Bill, 28, 79, 82, 92, 97, 98, 102,
109, 110, 118, 127, 129, 137, 138.
- Customs Amendment Bill, 37.
- Sealfishery Bill, 42, 46, 212.
- Logging Bill, 61, 127, 140, 141, 144, 145, 216.
- Municipal Bill, 126, 130, 133, 135, 136, 139, 142.
- General Hospital Bill, 136.
- Packing Co. Bill, 149.
- Grand Bank Water Co. Bill, 155.
- Prohibition Bill, 160.
- Products Co. Bill, 165, 185, 211.
- Exportation of Timber Bill, 206, 210.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 17.

JOB, HON. W. C.

- On Labrador Codfish Bill, 23, 79, 83, 113, 116, 128.
- Sealfishery Bill, 41, 163, 169, 212, 213.
- Municipal Bill, 133.
- Logging Bill, 144.
- Exportation of Timber Bill, 209 .

KNOWLING, HON. G.

- On Death Duties Bill, 40.
- Logging Bill, 52.
- Labrador Fishery Bill, 90.
- Packing Co. Bill, 151.

LABRADOR CODFISH SALE BILL, 19, 28, 72, 96, 109, 116, 125,
127, 137, 204, 205.

LOGGING BILL, 40, 47, 62, 127, 139, 148, 216.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL, 46, 70, 84, 95, 96.

LOAN BILL (RAILWAY), 170.

LOAN BILL (PUBLIC SERVICE), 170.

LOAN BILL (TEMPORARY), 171.

MILLEY, HON. S.

- On Labrador Fishery Bill, 95.
- Products Co. Bill, 156.

MARINE DISASTERS FUND BILL, 86, 96, 108, 121, 125, 130.

MASTER BUILDERS INCORPORATION BILL, 214.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL, 109, 126, 130, 139, 148.

MURPHY, HON. J. J.

- On Logging Bill, 218.

McGRATH, HON. P. T.

- On motion for Address in Reply, 8.
- Labrador Fishery Bill, 37, 75, 81, 82, 83, 87, 88, 94, 101, 110, 112, 114, 118, 119, 120, 121, 128.
- Death Duties Bill, 39, 40.
- Seafishery Bill, 43, 46, 213.
- Logging Bill, 52, 69, 70, 140, 143, 144, 145, 218, 219.
- Marine Disasters Bill, 124.
- Municipal Bill, 130, 135.
- Packing Co. Bill, 153.
- Grand Bank Water Co. Bill, 155.
- Prohibition Bill, 166, 167, 168.
- Products Co. Bill, 173.
- Exportation of Timber Bill, 207, 210.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL, 19, 28, 37.

NEWFOUNDLAND-AMERICAN PACKING CO. BILL, 149, 151.

NEWFOUNDLAND PRODUCTS BILL, 156, 164, 173, 206, 211.

PATENTS AND TRADE MARKS BILL, 18, 19, 21, 28.

PETITIONS,—

- Hon. J. Harvey, 46.

PRESIDENT, THE HON. (Hon. J. Harris).

- On Labrador Fishery Bill, 89, 120.
- Marine Disasters Bill, 124.
- Municipal Bill, 134.
- Bank Fishery Bill, 151.
- Packing Co. Bill, 151.

PATRIOTIC FUND BILL, 137, 148.

- PROHIBITION BILL, 159, 166, 185.
- PUBLIC SERVICE BILL, 205.
- PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CROWN BILL, 215.
- ROBINSON, HON. J. A.
- On Labrador Codfish Bill, 30, 74, 79, 97, 113, 118, 125, 137.
 - Sealfishery Bill, 45, 213.
 - Logging Bill, 69.
 - Marine Disasters Bill, 108, 114, 121, 125.
 - Municipal Bill, 131.
 - General Hospital Bill, 136.
 - Bank Fishery Bill, 150.
 - Grand Bank Water Co. Bill, 154, 156.
 - Prohibition Bill, 169.
- RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 148.
- RULES SUSPENDED, 164.
- REVENUE BILL, 185.
- RYAN, HON. J. D.
- On Customs Amendment Bill, 38.
 - Local Affairs Bill, 95.
 - General Hospital Bill, 115.
 - Packing Co. Bill, 151, 152.
 - Products Co. Bill, 158, 183, 206.
 - Prohibition Bill, 161, 163, 167, 168, 185.
 - Exportation of Timber Bill, 207.
- RYAN, HON. JAMES.
- On Labrador Codfish Bill, 72.
- SAWMILLS BILL, 20, 26, 95, 104, 114, 121.
- SEALFISHERY BILL, 40, 41, 46, 72, 163, 169, 211.
- SELECT COMMITTEES.
- On Sealing Bill, 47.
 - Logging Bill, 70, 156.
- STAMP DUTIES BILL, 85, 108, 116.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Closing, 219.

SQUIRES, HON. R. A.

- On Patents and Trades Marks Bill, 21.
- Death Duties Bill, 39, 40.
- Logging Bill, 70.
- Local Affairs Bill, 70.
- General Hospital Bill, 115.
- Bank Fishery Bill, 150.
- Packing Co. Bill, 152.
- Grand Bank Water Co. Bill, 154.
- Prohibition Bill, 162, 167, 168.
- Resolution of Condolence—Baird—172.
- Products Co. Bill, 211.
- Sealfishery Bill, 213.

TEMPLEMAN, HON. P.

- On Labrador Fishery Bill, 36, 93, 102, 128.
- Logging Bill, 144.
- Products Co. Bill, 153.
- Prohibition Bill, 162.

TRAIN FERRY SERVICE BILL, 169.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL, 169.

WINTER, HON. M. G.

- On Labrador Fishery Bill, 33, 91, 96, 113, 205.
- Sealfishery Bill, 164.